

ANTIDOTE

TO THE

POISON OF POPERY,

IN THE WRITINGS AND CONDUCT OF

PROFESSORS NEVIN & SCHAFF,

PROFESSORS IN THE

German Reformed Church,

IN THE U. S. OF AMERICA.

IN THREE PARTS.

BY J. J. JANEWAY, D. D.

NEW-BRUNSWICK, N. J.:
PRESS OF J. TERHUNE, 31 ALBANY STREET.
1856.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1856, by
J. J. JANEWAY, D. D.,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the U. S. for the District
of New-Jersey.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

If I understand the dispensations of Divine Providence, I think it may be correctly said, the publication of this volume is the result of the dealings of a merciful God with myself and family.

From the time it pleased Him to impart to me his grace, I have endeavored to consult and follow the guidance of his Providence.

~~In this endeavor, I believe I have done my duty, except in one case which resulted in a disappointment of no particular importance.~~

Here it is unnecessary to go into particulars. I will only say that in 1850 I had turned my attention to the Romish claims; and in 1852 prepared and published my "*Contrast*," in reply to a passage marked in Prof. Schaff's "*Principle of Protestantism*," with no intention or expectation of replying to any notice that might be taken of it in Mercersburg. But when Schaff's bulky history came out, in the English language, with a long and singular note, unconnected with his history in the German language, I determined to prepare and publish my "*Antidote to the Poison of Popery, &c.*," and assigned, in the Introduction to it, in pamphlet form, my reasons. It appeared from the press in 1854.

Here I thought my labors would end.

But a ministerial brother, who had seen published in the *Puritan Recorder* a very favorable notice of it, suggested to me to enlarge it into a volume; observing, "It may do good when you are dead."

Reflecting on the suggestion, I soon found I could collect matter to fill a small volume. I determined to prepare one; and in writing it, the difficulty has been to compress the materials at hand into a duodecimo of a moderate size. It might have been greatly extended.

By reading the numerous quotations from MOSHEIM and EDGAR, FOX and QUICK, BISHOP NEWTON, BOWER, and DE CORMENIN, scattered through the three Parts, the reader may gain an accurate and pretty full acquaintance with the history of the Papacy or the Romish Church.

If any reader shall observe that I have not taken notice of the popes in chronological order, it will, I think, be a sufficient apology to remind him that, as I was not writing a history of the popes, I was justified in presenting them to view as they came to my notice, in the course of my investigations, and to recall some, at different times, when the argument made it proper. In acting so, I have, I believe, only imitated courts of justice.

J. J. J.

New-Brunswick, April 1856.

NOTICES OF CONTRAST.

The Presbyterian Magazine, vol. ii. Nov. 1852, writes thus :

A CONTRAST between the erroneous assertions of Professor Schaff, and the Testimony of credible Ecclesiastical Historians in regard to the STATE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By the Rev. J. J. JANEWAY, D. D. New-Brunswick, N. J.

Dr. Schaff, in one of his publications, took occasion to land the Church of the Middle Ages, its religious spirit, political influence, magnificent cathedrals, rich paintings, lofty music, theological and poetic literature, &c. Dr. Janeway, having no faith in external pomp, popish ceremonies, church vanities, and doctrinal heresies, brings the Professor up to the bar of history, and makes him listen to an array of testimony which, if he that hath ears hears, must sound not only like a "contrast," but like awful truth. Dr. Janeway has hit upon a good expedient to enlighten the public mind. and produced a publication worthy of his Protestant spirit and evangelical character. Among his concluding paragraphs, he says :

"If they (Professors Schaff and Nevin) are inclined to make a pilgrimage to Rome, for the purpose of worshipping madonnas and saints, we feel inclined to remain at home and worship the only true object of worship, who will not give his glory to another."

The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, vol. xxv. Jan. 1853, publishes this short notice :

A Contrast, between the Erroneous Assertions of Prof. Schaff, and the Testimony of credible Ecclesiastical Historians, in regard to the state of the Church in the Middle Ages. By J. J. Janeway, D. D. New-Brunswick, N. J. 1852.

It is the fashion of the day to turn from Puritan simplicity to the pomp and symbolizations of the middle ages, to mis-

take æsthetical for spiritual excellence, and to make beauty cover a multitude of sins. The middle ages doubtless had their wonders of art and intellect, and also of piety, but as a period of the Church, they are the last to be held up for admiration or imitation. Dr. Janeway's pamphlet, we hope, will do good, by presenting moral deformities of an age, upon which philosophers and young ladies, in illustration of the adage that extremes meet, unite in doting.

The Rev. Dr. Sprague, of Albany, wrote to the author of the Contrast, Jan. 24, 1853, thus :

"I was greatly interested in your homily written for the benefit of Dr. Nevin and other travelers towards the dark ages.

"I have written a brief notice of it for the Puritan Recorder."

NOTICES OF ANTIDOTE.

The Christian Intelligencer, April 27, 1854, has this notice :

ANTIDOTE TO THE POISON OF POPYERY IN THE PUBLICATIONS OF PROFESSOR SCHAFF. By J. J. Janeway, D. D. 50 pages, 8vo. J. Terhune & Son, New-Brunswick.

Our octogenarian friend is wakeful in the detection of error, and vigorous still in the defence of truth. The Puseyistic tendencies of Professor Schaff's writings, and his sympathy with Rome, are no longer secrets to the Christian community. An able, popular, and plausible writer, occupying an influential position, he has done much to unsettle from its moorings the branch of the American Church with which he is connected. His errors have called out animadversion, pointed and just, from many quarters. In the pamphlet before us, Dr. Janeway exposes the Papistical sym-

pathies of the Professor, his perversion of history, and his inconsistency and self-contradiction, and interweaves with his work an argument in proof of the fallacy of the assumption on which is founded the usurpations of the Papacy.

The pamphlet embodies in concise form a large amount of matter, is earnest and able, and well calculated to subserve the cause of truth. We hope that it will find extensive circulation, and especially in quarters where it is most needed.

K.

The Theological and Literary Journal, edited by David N. Lord, July, 1854, says :

ANTIDOTE TO THE POISON OF POKERY, in the Publications of Professor Schaff, first in his Essay, and then in his History. By J. J. Janeway, D. D. New-Brunswick, N. J. 1854.

The object of this pamphlet is to show first, that the theory of development advanced by Professor Schaff in his Essay several years since on Protestantism, and the lavish commendations he bestowed in it on the Catholic church of the middle ages, indicate that he was then in fact a philosophic Papist, and that some of the worst features of that apostate power were the objects of his enthusiastic admiration. Next, to confute from the Scripture the Romish doctrine of the primacy of Peter, and the enormous usurpations and impieties that have been founded on it. And thirdly, to show that though there is a large infusion in his recently translated history of modified and opposite views, Professor Schaff, nevertheless, gives the most unequivocal evidence that he still retains his Romish principles and predilections ; that notwithstanding his ostentatious professions and showy flourishes of rhetoric, the theoretic system on which he proceeds will naturally carry those who take him as a guide, into unsophisticated Romanism ; and that he must, therefore, be regarded either as unreliable in his protestations against Popery, or else as not understanding himself. That the estimate Dr. Janeway has formed of Professor Schaff as a Papist, as far as he has any religious faith or sentiment, as deceptive, and as resolved at all events, if practicable, to spread his philosophic and historical doctrines here, is correct, we do not doubt. That Prof. Schaff does not comprehend his own principles, no one who has read his work, and

is familiar with the theories of his brother Germans, of which they are a mere echo, will for a moment imagine. The system was long since wrought out in all its great features by Schelling Schleiermacher, Hegel, Neander, and a crowd of others, and is as well understood in all its relations, as any other branch of modern false and dreamy speculation. Professor Schaff has not changed its great outline in any important degree, nor varied its prevailing coloring. He has only altered the grouping of some of the subordinate parts, and given here and there a softer touch to the delineations. To suppose, therefore, that with his principles of philosophy and of development, he can be a sincere Protestant, and believer in the work of redemption, is as impossible as it is to suppose that pitch darkness and dazzling light, to the same eyes, reign at the same time in the same place. In the fancy in which some indulge that Professor Schaff disagrees in any essential particular from Nevin, we have not the slightest faith. Their philosophy is the same; all the Romish doctrines advanced by Nevin are advanced also, or sanctioned by Professor Schaff; and he openly endorses Nevin in his principal writings, and commends him with lavish eulogy. What sort of estimate must be formed of Professor Schaff's principles, if, after all he disagrees with him in the forms, and in the degrees, in which Protestants disagree with Romanists?

The pamphlet is written with spirit and point; is marked by high moral feelings; and, which is a rare merit, is free from the heartless professions of respect with which many are accustomed to soften and countervail the protestations they utter against false and dangerous teachers. It confutes effectually the doctrine of Peter's primacy, which Professor Schaff sanctions, and points out a series of misstatements, blunders, and inconsistencies, which reveal to the reader the deceptive character of his work, and show with what caution its representations, on the subject of the Papacy especially, are to be received.

NOTICES OF HOPE FOR THE JEWS.

The Theological and Literary Journal, No. xxv., July, 1854, says:

HOPE FOR THE JEWS; or, the Jews will be converted to the Christian Faith, and settled and organized as a nation in the land of Palestine. By J. J. Janeway, D. D. New-Brunswick, N. J. J. Terhune & Son. 1853.

This volume presents a brief view of the great predictions which occupy a large share of the Old and a portion of the New Testament, of the restoration, conversion, and national re-organization of the Israelites; and a confutation of the false notion lately advanced by Mr. Williamson, that they are no longer the subjects of the covenant with Abraham, nor of any of the promises that were originally made to them. The disbelief by the Protestant church generally of the redemption of the Israelites, according to the prophecies, is one of the events that characterize the age, and bespeaks an astonishing misconception of the laws of language, and the aims of the divine government. We once asked a young gentleman who had just finished his medical education by attending the lectures of several distinguished professors in this city, if he would inform us where the muscles are situated by which breathing is performed. After a pause of a few moments, he answered that he had never heard the subject treated by his instructors, and, indeed, that the question had never presented itself to him. His oversight of so important a part of the human frame was of little significance compared with that of ministers of the sacred word who have never learned that the prophets foreshow, and with a frequency, copiousness, and emphasis that distinguish the theme from others which their revelations respect, that the Israelites are to be recalled from their dispersion, re-established in their ancient land, and re-adopted and honored as God's chosen people. It were not more singular, nor would it indicate a more extraordinary blindness, to overlook the prediction of the resurrection of the dead, or the immortality of the life to which the dead are to be raised. Those who wish a plain, summary, and pointed exhibition of the teachings of the sacred word on the subject, will find it in the statements and reasonings of this volume.

INDEX.

PART I.—CONTRAST.

	PAGE.
CHAPTER I. Extract from Schaff's Principle of Protestantism,	17
“ II. Darkness not Light,	21
“ III. Ignorance and Depravity of Clergy and People,	23
CENTURY XIII. Ignorance and Depravity increases,	24
CHAPTER IV. Roman Pontiffs and Church Government in Middle Ages,	28
CENTURY X. Popes Excessively Wicked,	29
“ XI. Form of Government Changed—Hildebrand,	36-41
“ XIII. Complicated Crimes of Popes,	46-49
CHAPTER V. Amazing Contrast,	50-52
“ VI. Government of the Church,	52-54
“ VII. Concluding Remarks,	54-57

PART II.—ANTIDOTE.

Introduction,	61-68
CHAPTER I. False Claims of Schaff in favor of Papacy in Middle Ages Exposed,	65-75
“ II. Arguments against the Primacy of Peter,	75-86
“ III. “ “ “ “	86-91
“ IV. “ “ “ “ Confirmed, 91-100 Summary of the Arguments,	100-102
“ V. The Great Fact Fatal to the Claims of Rome, &c.,	102-105
“ VI. Poison of Popery in Schaff's History Exposed,	106-116
“ VII. “ “ “ “ further Exposed, 116-124	116-124
“ VIII. Merit of Popes,	125-127
“ IX. Poison of Popery—Schaff in Opposition to Protest- ant world,	128-136

	PAGE.
CHAPTER X. Schaff's <i>Art and Deception</i> ,	136-144
“ XI. <i>Development Exposed</i> ,	144-154
“ XII. <i>Great Error Underlying his Theory</i> ,	154-162
“ XIII. <i>Schaff's Reasoning Exposed</i> ,	163-171
“ XIV. <i>Continued Review and Analysis of S.'s note</i> ,	174-181
“ XV. <i>Same Subject Continued</i> ,	181-190
<i>Contrast between Peter and Popes</i> ,	182
<i>Apology for Wicked Popes</i> ,	184
“ XVI. <i>Character of Papacy by Pen of Inspiration</i> ,	191-203
“ XVII. <i>Roman Catholic Church or Papacy no part of the</i> <i>Visible Church of Christ</i> ,	203-208
“ XVIII. <i>Persecution of the Waldenses</i> ,	209-216
“ XIX. <i>Massacre at Vassy</i> ,	216-221
“ XX. <i>Massacre of St. Bartholemew's Day</i> ,	221-228
“ XXI. <i>Ruin of Protestants by Louis XIV</i> ,	223-246
MARK OF THE BEAST :	231
<i>Creed</i> ,	231-235
<i>Remarks on do.</i> ,	235-238
<i>Triumphant Death of a Martyr</i> ,	238-239
“ XXII. <i>Papacy Irreclaimable</i> ,	247-258
COUNCILS :	
Pisa,	247
Constance,	249
Basil,	253
WICKED POPES CONNECTED WITH THE COUNCILS :	
Boniface IX., Benedict XIII.,	243
John XXIII.,	249
Martin V.,	250
Pius II.,	256
Paul II.,	257
“ XXIII. WICKED POPES AFTER THE REFORMATION :	
Leo X.,	258
Pius III.,	267
Innocent IX.,	268
“ XXIV. <i>Papacy Guilty of High Treason and Murder</i> ,	272-276
<i>A Caution</i> ,	276

Schaff's Long, Sophistical, Papistical Note Reviewed and Analysed, pp. 106-190. His Folly, while Professing to be a Protestant, he Upholds the Papacy, and sets himself in Opposition to the Whole Protestant World, pp. 130-136. Contradicts Himself, pp. 107-110. Again pp. 110, 111. Again, 112, 113 Stultifies Himself, pp. 114, 115.

PART III.

	PAGE.
First Contrast,	288
Second Contrast, relating to Dr. Nevin,	294
Third " " Dr. Schaff,	299
Fourth " between Germany Enlightened and Vivified by the Reformation, and Germany Darkened and Para- lyzed by Irreligion Subsequently,	304
Fifth, Contrast between the Description of the Church by Paul and Peter and the Church Erected by the Papal Hierarchy,	313

PART I.



A CONTRAST

BETWEEN THE

ERRONEOUS ASSERTIONS

OF

PROFESSOR SCHAF,

AND THE TESTIMONY OF

Credible Ecclesiastical Historians,

IN REGARD TO THE

STATE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

ADVERTISEMENT.



This humble performance is published to awaken the attention of Protestants and others to the false representations made in favor of **POPERY**; and to excite them to search for the testimonies of credible historians in regard to the fatal errors, the gross ignorance, shameful licentiousness, and heathenish idolatry, that have prevailed among the priests and bishops, and been patronized by the Pontiffs of the Roman Catholic Church: and to study the Holy Scriptures, that they may learn that its glory is departed, and that it can no longer be acknowledged to be a true church of Jesus Christ,

A CONTRAST, &c.



CHAPTER I.

LAUDATION OF THE PAPACY.

In 1845, a pamphlet of 215 pages was published at Chambersburg, Penn., "PUBLICATION OFFICE" of *the German Reformed Church*.

TITLE.

"THE PRINCIPLE OF PROTESTANTISM as related to the PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH, by PHILIP SCHAF, PH. D., Professor of Church History and Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church.

The pamphlet was translated from the German, with an INTRODUCTION, by JOHN W. NEVIN, D. D.

When the writer of the CONTRAST read this pamphlet, several years ago, he marked with double pencil lines in the MARGIN, a long paragraph, on pp. 137 and 138. It surprised him that such a paragraph should be published by Professor SCHAF, and be endorsed by Professor NEVIN; both professing to be PROTESTANTS. The paragraph is this:

"Catholicism, particularly in its mediæval Romano-Germanic period, carried with it, if we put out of view its monastic institutions, a very distinct sense of the

nihil humani a me alienum puto as just described. It is this precisely which renders the Middle Ages so grand and venerable, that religion in this period appears the all moving, all ruling force, the centre around which all moral struggles and triumphs, all thought, poetry and action, are found to revolve. All sciences, and philosophy itself, the science of the sciences, were handmaids to theology, which based itself on the principle of Augustine, *Fides praeceedit intellectum*. Before the pope, as the head and representative of Christendom, all states bowed themselves with reverent homage; and even the German emperor himself could not feel secure in his place, save as formally acknowledged by the chief bishop of the Church. Princes and people arose at his bidding, forsook country and friends, submitted to the most severe privations, to kneel at the Savior's tomb and water it with thankful tears. According to the reigning idea, the State stood related to the Church like the moon to the sun, from which it borrows all its light. All forms of life, all national manners, were suffused with magic interest from the unseen world. The holy sacraments ran like threads of gold through the whole texture of life, in all its relations, from infancy to old age. The different arts vied with each other, in the service of the Church. The most magnificent and beautiful buildings of the period, are the cathedrals; those giant stone flowers, with their countless turrets, storming the heavens and bearing the soul on high, and their mysterious devotional gloom, visited never by the light of the natural day, but only by mystic irradiations poured through stained glass; domes, the authors of which stood so completely in the general life of the Church, and were so occupied only with

the honor of God in their work, that with a divine carelessness they have left even their own names to perish in oblivion. The maxim was, let the best house belong to the Lord. The richest paintings were madonnas and images of the saints, as produced by a FRA BEATO ANGELICO DA FIESOLE, a FRA BARTOLOMEO, a LEONARDO DA VINCI, a PERUGINO, a RAPHAEL, and a MICHAEL ANGELO. It was felt, that the fairest among the sons of men, and the connections in which he stood, must furnish the most worthy material for the pencil. The most lofty and impressive music, according to Old Testament example, resounded in the public worship of God. Poetry sang her deepest and most tender strains to the Lord and his bride; and the greatest poet of the Middle Ages, DANTE, has left behind him in his "Divine Comedy" an image simply of the religious spirit and theological wisdom of the age, as occupied with eternity itself and all its dread realities. Truly a great time, and for one who is prepared to understand it, fraught with the richest spiritual interest. He that has no heart for the excellencies of this period, the beauty that belongs to the Middle Ages, must be wanting in genuine culture, or at least in all right historical feeling."

Does this contain historical truth? Was religion in such a desirable and flourishing state during the *middle ages*? Did true scriptural knowledge so prevail in the Church, and bring forth such rich fruits in the lives of professing christians, as this statement imports? Was the government of the Church in relation to civil government, as it ought to be; and did it accord with the views and instructions of the great FOUNDER and HEAD of the Church, our LORD JESUS CHRIST?

So affirm Professors SCHAF and NEVIN.

Let this be remembered by the reader.

Now, we do not intend to set up our affirmation in opposition to their affirmation. We merely design to set their confident statements in contrast with the testimony of CREDIBLE AND FAITHFUL ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIANS.

CHAPTER II.

DARKNESS NOT LIGHT.

MOSHEIM, speaking of the LATINS of the XTH CENTURY, says, "They were, almost without exception, sunk in the most brutish and barbarous ignorance; so that according to the unanimous accounts of the most credible writers, nothing could be more melancholy and deplorable than the darkness that reigned in the western world, during this century; which, with respect to learning and philosophy at least, may be called the *Iron Age* of the Latins. Vol. ii. p. 383.

EDGAR, in his "Variations of Popery," says, (p. 405) "The state of the Latin communion, at the introduction of transubstantiation, was perhaps the chief reason of its origin, progress, and final establishment. The *tenth* century was a period of darkness and superstition. Philosophy seems to have taken its departure from Christendom, and to have left mankind to grovel in a night of ignorance, unenlightened with a single ray of learning. Cimmérian clouds overspread the literary horizon, and quenched the sun of science. Immorality kept pace with ignorance, and extended itself to the priesthood and to the people. The floodgates of moral pollution seemed to have been set wide open, and inundations of all impurity, poured on the Christian world through the channels of the Roman Hierarchy. The enormity of the clergy was faithfully copied by the laity. Both sunk into equal degeneracy, and the popedom appeared one vast, deep, frightful, overflowing ocean of

corruption, horror, and contamination. Ignorance and immorality are the parents of error and superstition. The mind void of information, and the heart destitute of sanctity, are prepared to embrace any fabrication or absurdity."

CHAPTER III.

IGNORANCE AND DEPRAVITY OF THE CLERGY AND OF THE PEOPLE.

CENTURY X.

“Both in the eastern and western provinces,” says *Mosheim*, “the clergy were, for the most part, composed of a most worthless set of men, shamefully illiterate and stupid, ignorant more especially in religious matters, equally enslaved to sensuality and superstition, and capable of the most abominable and flagitious deeds. This dismal degeneracy of the sacred order was, according to the most credible accounts, principally owing to the pretended chiefs and rulers of the universal church, who indulged themselves in the commission of the most odious crimes, and abandoned themselves to the lawless impulse of the most licentious passions without reluctance or remorse, who confounded, in short, all difference between just and unjust, to satisfy their impious ambition, and whose spiritual empire was such a diversified scene of iniquity and violence, as never was exhibited under any of those temporal tyrants, who have been the scourges of mankind.” Vol. ii. p. 389.

Again he says, pp. 400–401, “Besides the reproach of the grossest ignorance, which the Latin clergy in this century so justly deserve, they were also chargeable, in a very heinous degree, with two other odious and enormous vices, even *concupinage* and *simony*, which the greatest part of the writers of these unhappy

times acknowledge and deplore. As to the first of these vices, it was practiced too openly to admit of any doubt. The priests, and what is still more surprising, even the sanctimonious monks, fell victims to the triumphant charms of the sex, and to the imperious dominion of their carnal lusts; and, entering into the bonds of wedlock or concubinage, squandered away in a most luxurious manner, with their wives and mistresses, the revenues of the church. The other vice above mentioned reigned with an equal degree of impudence and licentiousness. The election of bishops and abbots was no longer made according to the laws of the church; but kings and princes, or their ministers and favourites, either conferred these ecclesiastical dignities upon their friends and creatures, or sold them, without shame, to the highest bidder. Hence it happened, that the most stupid and flagitious wretches were frequently advanced to the most important stations in the church; and that, upon several occasions, even soldiers, civil magistrates, counts, and such like persons, were, by a strange metamorphosis, converted into bishops and abbots. GREGORY VII. endeavoured, in the following century, to put a stop to these two growing evils."

CENTURY XIII.

The darkness increases through succeeding centuries, so that this historian writes of the XIIIth thus: "Among the Latins, many concurring causes united to augment the darkness of that cloud that had already been cast over the divine lustre of genuine Christianity. On the one hand, the Roman pontiffs could not bear the thoughts of any thing that might have

the remotest tendency to diminish their authority, or to encroach upon their prerogatives; and therefore they laboured assiduously to keep the multitude in the dark, and to blast every attempt that was made towards a reformation in the doctrine or discipline of the church. On the other hand, the school divines, among whom the Dominican and Franciscan monks made the greatest figure on account of their unintelligible jargon and subtilty, shed perplexity and darkness over the plain truths of religion by their intricate distinctions and endless divisions, and by that caviling, quibbling, disputatious spirit, that is the mortal enemy both of truth and virtue. It is true, that these scholastic doctors were not all equally chargeable with corrupting the truth; the most enormous and criminal corrupters of Christianity were those who led the multitude into the two following abominable errors: that it was in the power of man to perform, if he pleased, a more perfect obedience than God required; and that the whole of religion consisted in an external air of gravity, and in certain composed bodily gestures.

“It will be easy to confirm this general account of the state of religion by particular facts. In the fourth council of the Lateran that was held by INNOCENT III. in the year 1215, and at which a prodigious number of ecclesiastics were assembled, that imperious pontiff, without deigning to consult any body, published no less than seventy laws or decrees, by which not only the authority of the popes and the power of the clergy were confirmed and extended, but also new doctrines, or *articles of faith*, were imposed upon Christians. Hitherto the opinions of the Christian doctors, concerning the *manner* in which the body and

blood of CHRIST were *present* in the eucharist, were extremely different; nor had the church determined by any clear and positive decree, the sentiment that was to be embraced in relation to that important matter. It was reserved for INNOCENT to put an end to the liberty, which every Christian had hitherto enjoyed, of interpreting this presence in the manner he thought most agreeable to the declarations of scripture, and to decide in favor of the most monstrous doctrine that the frenzy of superstition was capable of inventing. This audacious pontiff pronounced the opinion that is embraced at this day in the church of *Rome* relating to that point, to be the only true and orthodox account of the matter; and he *had the honor* of introducing and establishing the use of the term *Transubstantiation*, which was hitherto absolutely unknown. The same pontiff placed, by his own authority, among the duties prescribed by the divine laws, that of *auricular confession* to a priest; a confession that implied not only a general acknowledgment, but also a particular innumeration of the sins and follies of the penitent. Before this period several doctors, indeed, looked upon this kind of *confession*, as a duty inculcated by divine authority; but this opinion was not publicly received as the doctrine of the church. For though the confession of sins was justly looked upon as an essential duty, yet it was left to every Christian's choice, to make this confession mentally to the Supreme Being, or to express it in words to a spiritual confidant and director. These two laws, which, by the authority of INNOCENT, were received as laws of God, and adopted, of consequence, as laws of the church, occasioned a multitude of new injunctions and rites, of which not even

the smallest traces are to be found in the sacred writings, or in the apostolic and primitive ages, and which were much more adapted to establish and extend the reign of superstition, than to open the eyes of the blinded multitude upon the enormous abuses of which it had been the source." Vol. iii. pp. 235-237.

On page 252, speaking of the rites and ceremonies of the church, the historian says, "Instead of mentioning these additions, we shall only observe in general, that religion was now become a sort of raree-show in the hands of the rulers of the church, who, to render its impressions more deep and lasting, thought proper to exhibit it in a striking manner to the external senses. For this purpose, at certain stated times, and especially upon the more illustrious festivals, the miraculous dispensations of the divine wisdom in favor of the church, and the more remarkable events in the Christian history, were represented under certain allegorical figures and images, or rather in a kind of mimic show. But these scenic representations, in which there was a motley mixture of mirth and gravity, these tragi-comical spectacles, though they amused and affected in a certain manner the gazing populace, were highly detrimental, instead of being useful, to the cause of religion; they degraded its dignity, and furnished abundant matter of laughter to its enemies."

So much for the prevalence of true knowledge of the gospel, and of true piety, among the clergy and people. How ignorant and unchristian were both! What are we to think of the confident representations of Professor SCHAF?

CHAPTER IV.

ROMAN PONTIFFS AND CHURCH GOVERNMENT IN THE MIDDLE AGES,

“The pope, as the head and representative of Christendom,” and his influence over Princes and people—the government of the church and its control over civil government, are extolled by Professor SCHAF in the highest terms.

Do facts justify his glowing statement? What is the true and sober testimony of history in relation both to the Popes, the self-styled heads and representatives of Christendom, and to the government of the church, and its unchristian assumption of a dominant power over states and kingdoms? It condemns the *Professor's* confident and erroneous representations!

Bearing on these two important particulars, we might transcribe many pages from MOSHEIM and other historians. But, as we study brevity, we limit ourselves to a few of his pages, to expose the utter unworthiness of the Roman pontiffs of their exalted station, and their unholy and wicked ambition in aspiring to establish absolutism over both church and state, in the *middle ages*.

CENTURY X.

“The history of the Roman pontiffs, that lived in this century, is a history of so many monsters, and not of men, and exhibits a horrible series of the most flagitious, tremendous, and complicated crimes, as all writers, even those of the Romish communion, unani-

mously confess. The source of these disorders must be sought for principally in the calamities that fell upon the greatest part of *Europe*, and that afflicted *Italy* in a particular manner, after the extinction of the race of CHARLEMAGNE. Upon the death of the pontiff BENEDICT IV., which happened in the year 903, LEO V. was raised to the pontificate, which he enjoyed no longer than forty days, being dethroned by CHRISTOPHER, and cast into prison. CHRISTOPHER, in his turn, was deprived of the pontifical dignity the year following by SERGIUS III., a Roman presbyter, seconded by the protection and influence of ADALBERT, a most powerful Tuscan prince, who had a supreme and unlimited direction in all the affairs that were transacted at *Rome*. ANASTASIUS III. and LANDO, who, upon the death of SERGIUS, in the year 911, were raised successively to the papal dignity, enjoyed it but for a short time, and did nothing that could contribute to render their names illustrious.

“After the death of LANDO, which happened in the year 914, ALBERIC, marquis or count of *Tuscany*, whose opulence was prodigious, and whose authority in *Rome* was despotic and unlimited, obtained the pontificate for JOHN X., archbishop of *Ravenna*, in compliance with the solicitation of THEODORA, his mother-in-law, whose lewdness was the principle that interested her in this promotion. This infamous election will not surprise such as know that the laws of *Rome* were at this time absolutely silent; that the dictates of justice and equity were overpowered and suspended; and that all things were carried on in that great city by interest or corruption, by violence or fraud. JOHN X., though in other respects a scandalous example of iniquity and lewdness in the papal

chair, acquired a certain degree of reputation by his glorious campaign against the Saracens, whom he drove from the settlements they had made upon the banks of the *Garigliano*. He did not, however, enjoy his glory long: the enmity of MAROZIA, daughter of THEODORA, and wife of ALBERIC, proved fatal to him. For this bloody-minded woman having espoused WIDO, or GUY, marquis of *Tuscany*, after the death of her first consort, engaged him to seize the wanton pontiff, who was her mother's lover, and to put him to death in the prison where he lay confined. This licentious and unlucky pontiff was succeeded by LEO VI. who sat but seven months in the apostolic chair, which was filled after him by STEPHEN VII. The death of this latter, which happened in the year 931, presented to the ambition of MAROZIA an object worthy of its grasp; and accordingly she raised to the papal dignity JOHN XI. who was the fruit of her lawless amours with one of the pretended successors of St. PETER, SERGIUS III., whose adulterous commerce with that infamous woman gave an *infallible* guide to the Roman church.

JOHN XI., who was placed at the head of the church by the credit and influence of his mother, was pulled down from this summit of spiritual grandeur A. D. 933, by ALBERIC his half-brother, who had conceived the utmost aversion against him. His mother MAROZIA, had, after the death of WIDO, entered anew into the bonds of matrimony with HUGO, king of *Italy*, who, having offended his step-son ALBERIC, felt severely the weight of his resentment, which vented its fury upon the whole family; for ALBERIC drove out of *Rome* not only HUGO, but also MAROZIA and her son the pontiff, and confined them

in prison, where the latter ended his days in the year 936. The four pontiffs, who, in their turns, succeeded JOHN XI., and filled the papal chair until the year 956, were LEO VII. STEPHEN VIII. MARINUS II. and AGAPET, whose characters were much better than that of their predecessor, and whose government, at least, was not attended with those tumults and revolutions that had so often shook the pontifical throne, and banished from *Rome* the inestimable blessings of peace and concord. Upon the death of AGAPET, which happened in the year 956, ALBERIC II. who, to the dignity of Roman consul, joined a degree of authority and opulence which nothing could resist, raised to the pontificate his son OCTAVIAN, who was yet in the early bloom of youth, and destitute, besides, of every quality that was requisite in order to discharge the duties of that high and important office. This unworthy pontiff assumed the name of JOHN XII. and thus introduced the custom that has since been adopted by all his successors in the see of *Rome*, of changing each their usual name for another upon their accession to the pontificate.

The fate of JOHN XII. was as unhappy as his promotion had been scandalous. Unable to bear the oppressive yoke of BERENGER II. king of *Italy*, he sent ambassadors, in the year 960 to OTHO the Great, entreating him to march into *Italy* at the head of a powerful army, to deliver the church and the people from the tyranny under which they groaned. To these entreaties the perplexed pontiff added a solemn promise, that, if the German monarch came to his assistance, he would array him with the purple and the other ensigns of sovereignty, and proclaim him emperor of the Romans. OTHO received this embassy

with pleasure, marched into *Italy* at the head of a large body of troops, and was accordingly saluted by JOHN with the title of emperor of the Romans. The pontiff, however, soon perceived that he had acted with too much precipitation, repented of the step he had taken, and, though he had sworn allegiance to the emperor as his lawful sovereign, and that in the most solemn manner, yet he broke his oath, and joined with ADALBERT, the son of BERENGER, against OTHO. This revolt was not left unpunished. The emperor returned to *Rome* in the year 964; called a council, before which he accused and convicted the pontiff of many crimes; and, after having degraded him, in the most ignominious manner, from his high office, he appointed LEO, VIII. to fill his place. Upon OTHO's departure from *Rome*, JOHN returned to that city, and in a council, which he assembled in the year 964, condemned the pontiff whom the emperor had elected, and soon after died in a miserable and violent manner. After his death the Romans chose BENEDICT V. bishop of *Rome*, in opposition to LEO; but the emperor annulled this election, restored LEO to the papal chair, and carried BENEDICT to *Hamburgh*, where he died in exile.

The pontiffs who governed the see of *Rome* from LEO VIII. who died A. D. 965, to GERBERT or SYLTESTER II. who was raised to the pontificate towards the conclusion of this century, were more happy in their administration, as well as more decent in their conduct, than their infamous predecessors; yet none of them so exemplary as to deserve the applause that is due to eminent virtue. JOHN XIII. who was raised to the pontificate in the year 965, by the authority of OTHO the Great, was driven out of

Rome in the beginning of his administration ; but, the year following, upon the emperor's return to *Italy*, he was restored to his high dignity, in the calm possession of which he ended his days, A. D. 972. His successor BENEDICT VI. was not so happy ; cast into prison by CRESCENTIUS, son of the famous THEODORA, in consequence of the hatred which the Romans had conceived both against his person and government, he was loaded with all sorts of ignominy, and was strangled in the year 974, in the apartment where he lay confined. Unfortunately for him, OTHO the Great, whose power and severity kept the Romans in awe, died in the year 973, and with him expired that order and discipline which he had restored in *Rome* by salutary laws executed with impartiality and vigor. The face of things was entirely changed by that event ; licentiousness and disorder, seditions and assassinations resumed their former sway, and diffused their horrors through that miserable city. After the death of BENEDICT, the papal chair was filled by FRANCO, who assumed the name of BONIFACE VII. but enjoyed his dignity only for a short time ; for scarcely a month had passed after his promotion, when he was deposed from his office, expelled the city, and succeeded by DONUS II. who is known by no other circumstance than his name. Upon his death, which happened in the year 975, BENEDICT VII. was created pontiff ; and, during the space of nine years, ruled the church without much opposition, and ended his days in peace. This peculiar happiness was, without doubt, principally owing to the opulence and credit of the family to which he belonged ; for he was nearly related to the famous ALBERIC, whose power, or rather despotism, had been unlimited in *Rome*.

“His successor JOHN XIV. who, from the bishopric of *Pavia* was raised to the pontificate, derived no support from his birth, which was obscure, nor did he continue to enjoy the protection of OTHO III. to whom he owed his promotion. Hence the calamities that fell upon him with such fury, and the misery that concluded his transitory grandeur; for BONIFACE VII. who had usurped the papal throne in the year 974, and in a little time after had been banished *Rome*, returned from *Constantinople*, whither he had fled for refuge, and seizing the unhappy pontiff, had him thrown into prison, and afterwards put to death. Thus BONIFACE resumed the government of the church; but his reign was also transitory, for he died about six months after his restoration. He was succeeded by JOHN XV. whom some writers called JOHN XVI. because, as they allege, there was another JOHN, who ruled the church for the space of four months, and whom they consequently call JOHN XV. Leaving it to the reader's choice to call that JOHN of whom we speak, the XV. or the XVI. of that name, we shall only observe that he possessed the papal dignity from the year 985 to 996; that his administration was as happy as the troubled state of the Roman affairs would permit; and that the tranquility he enjoyed was not so much owing to his wisdom and prudence, as to his being a Roman by birth, and to his descent from noble and illustrious ancestors. Certain it is, at least, that his successor GREGORY V. who was a German, and who was elected pontiff by the order of OTHO III. A. D. 996, met with a quite different treatment; for CRESCENS, the Roman consul, drove him out of the city, and conferred the dignity upon JOHN XVI. formerly known by the name of

PHILAGATHUS. This revolution was not, however, permanent in its effects, for OTHO III. alarmed by these disturbances at *Rome*, marched into *Italy*, A. D. 998, at the head of a powerful army, and casting into prison the new pontiff, whom the soldiers, in the first moment of their fury, had maimed and abused in a most barbarous manner, he reinstated GREGORY in his former honours, and placed him anew at the head of the church. It was upon the death of this latter pontiff, which happened soon after his restoration, that the same emperor raised to the papal dignity his preceptor and friend, the famous and learned GERBERT, or SYLVESTER II. whose promotion was attended with the universal approbation of the Roman people.

“Amidst these frequent commotions, and even amidst the repeated enormities and flagitious crimes of those who gave themselves out for CHRIST’s vicegerents upon earth, the power and authority of the Roman pontiffs increased imperceptibly from day to day; such were the effects of that ignorance and superstition that reigned without controul in these miserable times. OTHO the Great had indeed published a solemn edict, prohibiting the election of any pontiff without the previous knowledge and consent of the emperor: which edict, as all writers unanimously agree, remained in force from the time of its publication to the conclusion of this century. It is also to be observed, that the same emperor, as likewise his son and grandson, who succeeded him in the empire, maintained, without interruption, their right of supremacy over the city of *Rome*, its territory, and its pontiff, as may be demonstrably proved from a multitude of examples. It is, moreover, equally certain, that the German, French and Italian bishops, who were

not ignorant of the nature of their privileges, and the extent of their jurisdiction, were, during this whole century, perpetually upon their guard against every attempt the Roman pontiff might make to assume to himself *alone* a legislative authority in the church. But, notwithstanding all this, the bishops of *Rome* found means of augmenting their influence, and, partly by open violence, partly by secret and fraudulent stratagems, encroached not only upon the privileges of the bishops, but also upon the jurisdiction and rights of kings and emperors. Their ambitious attempts were seconded and justified by the scandalous adulation of certain mercenary prelates, who exalted the dignity and prerogatives of, what they called, the apostolic see, in the most pompous and extravagant terms. Several learned writers have observed, that in this century certain bishops maintained publicly, that the Roman pontiffs were not only bishops of *Rome*, but of the whole world, an assertion, which hitherto none had ventured to make; and that even among the French clergy, it had been affirmed by some, that *the authority of the Bishops, though divine in its origin, was conveyed to them by St. PETER, the prince of the apostles.*" Vol. ii. pp. 390-399.

CENTURY XI.

"The authority and lustre of the Latin church, or, to speak more properly, the power and dominion of the Roman pontiffs, arose in this century to their highest period, though they arose by degrees, and had much opposition and many difficulties to conquer. In the preceding age the pontiffs had acquired a great degree of authority in religious matters, and in

every thing that related to the government of the church; and their credit and influence increased prodigiously towards the commencement of this century. For then they received the pompous titles of *masters of the world*, and *popes*, i. e. *universal fathers*: they presided also every where in the councils by their legates; assumed the authority of supreme arbiters in all controversies that arose concerning religion or church discipline; and maintained the pretended rights of the church against the encroachments and usurpations of kings and princes. Their authority, however, was confined within certain limits; for, on the one hand, it was restrained by sovereign princes, that it might not arrogantly aim at civil dominion; and on the other it was opposed by the bishops themselves, that it might not arise to a spiritual despotism, and utterly destroy the liberty and privileges of synods and councils. From the time of LEO IX. the popes employed every method, which the most artful ambition could suggest, to remove these limits, and to render their dominion both despotic and universal. They not only aspired to the character of supreme legislators in the church, to an unlimited jurisdiction over all synods and councils whether general or provincial, to the sole distribution of all ecclesiastical honours and benefices as divinely authorized and appointed for that purpose, but they carried their insolent pretensions so far as to give themselves out for lords of the universe, arbiters of the fate of kingdoms and empires, and supreme rulers over the kings and princes of the earth. Before LEO IX. no pope was so enormously impudent as to claim this unbounded authority, or to assume the power of transferring territories and provinces from their law-

ful possessors to new masters. This pontiff gave the example of such an amazing pretension to his *holy* successors, by granting to the Normans, who had settled in *Italy*, the lands and territories which they had already usurped, or were employed in forcing out of the hands of the Greeks and Saraccens. The ambition, however, of the aspiring popes was opposed by the emperors, the kings of *France*, by WILLIAM the Conqueror, who was now seated on the throne of *England*, and was the boldest asserter of the rights and privileges of royalty against the high claims of the apostolic see, and also by several other princes. Nor did the bishops, particularly those of *France* and *Germany*, sit tamely silent under the papal yoke; many of them endeavored to maintain their rights and the privileges of the church; but as many, seduced by the allurements of interest or the dictates of superstition, sacrificed their liberties, and yielded to the pontiffs. Hence it happened, that these imperious lords of the church, though they did not entirely gain their point, nor satisfy to the full their raging ambition, yet obtained vast augmentations of power, and extended their authority from day to day." Vol. ii. pp. 459-461.

On pages 462, 463 the historian writes, "The five pontiffs we have now been mentioning were not chargeable with dishonouring their high station by that licentiousness and immorality that rendered so many of their successors infamous; their lives were virtuous; at least, their conduct was decent. But their examples had little effect upon BENEDICT IX. a most abandoned profligate, and a wretch capable of the most horrid crimes, whose flagitious conduct drew upon him the just resentment of the Romans,

who, in the year 1033, degraded him from his office. He was afterwards indeed restored, by the emperor CONRAD, to the papal chair; but, instead of learning circumspection and prudence from his former disgrace, he grew still more scandalous in his life and manners, and so provoked the Roman people by his repeated crimes, that they deposed him a second time A. D. 1044, and elected in his place JOHN, bishop of *Sabina*, who assumed the name of SYLVESTER III. About three months after this new revolution, the relations and adherents of BENEDICT rose up in arms, drove SYLVESTER out of the city, and restored the degraded pontiff to his forfeited honours, which, however, he did not enjoy long; for, perceiving that there was no possibility of appeasing the resentment of the Romans, he sold the pontificate to JOHN GRATIAN, arch-priester of *Rome*, who took the name of GREGORY VI. Thus the church had, at the same time, two chiefs, SYLVESTER and GREGORY, whose rivalry was the occasion of much trouble and confusion. This contest was terminated in the year 1046, in the council held at *Sutri* by the emperor HENRY III. who so ordered matters, that BENEDICT, GREGORY, and SYLVESTER were declared unworthy of the pontificate, and SUIDGER, bishop of *Bamberg*, was raised to that dignity, which he enjoyed for a short time under the title of CLEMENT II."

"This contest, indeed, (referring to a bloody contest between two rival pontiffs) was of little consequence when viewed in comparison with the dreadful commotions which HILDEBRAND, who succeeded ALEXANDER, and assumed the name of GREGORY VII. excited both in church and state, and nourished and fomented until the end of his days. This vehemence

ment pontiff, who was a Tuscan, born of mean parents, rose, by various steps, from the obscure station of a monk of *Clugni*, to the rank of archdeacon in the Roman church, and, from the time of LEO IX. who treated him with peculiar marks of distinction, was accustomed to govern the Roman pontiffs by his counsels, which had acquired the highest degree of influence and authority. In the year 1073, and the same day that ALEXANDER was interred, he was raised to the pontificate by the unanimous suffrages of the cardinals, bishops, abbotts, monks, and people, and, consequently, without any regard being paid to the edict of NICOLAS II. and his election was confirmed by the approbation and consent of HENRY IV. king of the Romans, to whom ambassadors had been sent for that purpose. This prince, indeed, had soon reason to repent of the consent he had given to an election, which became so prejudicial to his own authority, so fatal to the interests and liberties of the church, and so detrimental, in general, to the sovereignty and independence of kingdoms and empires. HILDEBRAND was a man of uncommon genius, whose ambition in forming the most arduous projects was equalled by his dexterity in bringing them into execution; sagacious, crafty, and intrepid, nothing could escape his penetration, defeat his stratagems, or daunt his courage; haughty and arrogant beyond all measure; obstinate, impetuous, and intractable; he looked up to the summit of universal empire with a wishful eye, and laboured up the steep ascent with uninterrupted ardour, and invincible perseverance; void of all principle, and destitute of every pious and virtuous feeling, he suffered little restraint in his audacious pursuits, from the dictates of religion or the remon-

strances of conscience. Such was the character of HILDEBRAND, and his conduct was every way suitable to it; for no sooner did he find himself in the papal chair, than he displayed to the world the most odious marks of his tyrannic ambition. Not contented to enlarge the jurisdiction, and to augment the opulence of the see of *Rome*, he laboured indefatigably to render the universal church subject to the despotic government and the arbitrary power of the pontiff alone, to dissolve the jurisdiction which kings and emperors had hitherto exercised over the various orders of the clergy, and to exclude them from all part in the management or distribution of the revenues of the church. Nay, this outrageous pontiff went still further, and impiously attempted to submit to his jurisdiction the emperors, kings, and princes of the earth, and to render their dominions tributary to the see of *Rome*. Such were the *pious* and *apostolic* exploits that employed the activity of GREGORY VII. during his whole life, and which render his pontificate a continual scene of tumult and bloodshed. Were it necessary to bring any further proofs of his tyranny and arrogance, his fierce impetuosity and boundless ambition, we might appeal to those famous *sentences*, which are generally called, after him, the *dictates* of HILDEBRAND, and which shew, in a lively manner, the spirit and character of this restless pontiff.

Under the pontificate of HILDEBRAND, the face of the Latin church was entirely changed, its government subverted, and the most important and valuable of those rights and privileges that had been formerly vested in its councils, bishops, and sacred colleges, were usurped by the greedy pontiff. It is, however, to be observed, that the weight of this tyrannic usurp-

ation did not fall equally upon all the European provinces; several of these provinces preserved some remains of their ancient liberty and independence, in the possession of which a variety of circumstances happily concurred to maintain them.

But, as we insinuated above, the views of HILDEBRAND were not confined to the erection of an absolute and universal monarchy in the church; they aimed also at the establishment of a civil monarchy equally extensive and despotic; and this aspiring pontiff, after having drawn up a system of ecclesiastical canons for the government of the church, would have introduced also a new code of political laws, had he been permitted to execute the plan he had formed. His purpose was to engage in the bonds of fidelity and allegiance to St. PETER, *i. e.* to the Roman pontiffs, all the kings and princes of the earth, and to establish at *Rome* an annual assembly of bishops, by whom the contests that might arise between kingdoms or sovereign states were to be decided, the rights and pretensions of princes to be examined, and the fate of nations and empires to be determined. This ambitious project met, however, with the warmest opposition, particularly from the vigilance and resolution of the emperors, and also from the British and French monarchs.

That HILDEBRAND laid this audacious plan is undoubtedly evident, both from his own epistles, and also from other authentic records of antiquity. The nature of the oath which he drew up for the king or emperor of the Romans, from whom he demanded a profession of subjection and allegiance, shews abundantly the arrogance of his pretensions. But his conduct towards the kingdom of *France* is worthy of

particular notice. It is well known, that whatever dignity and dominion the popes enjoyed was originally derived from the kingdom of *France*, or, which is the same thing, from the princes of that nation; and yet HILDEBRAND, or (as we shall hereafter entitle him) GREGORY VII. pretended that the kingdom of *France* was tributary to the see of *Rome*, and commanded his legates to demand yearly, in the most solemn manner, the payment of that tribute; their demands, however, were treated with contempt, and the tribute was never either acknowledged or offered. Nothing can be more insolent than the language in which GREGORY addressed himself to PHILIP I. king of *France*, to whom he recommends an humble and obliging carriage, from this consideration, that both his *kingdom and his soul were under the dominion of St. PETER*, (*i.e.* his vicar the Roman pontiff,) who had *the power to BIND and to LOOSE him, both in heaven and upon earth.* Nothing escaped the all-grasping ambition of GREGORY; he pretended that *Saxony* was a feudal tenure held in subjection to the see of *Rome*, to which it had been formerly yielded by CHARLEMAGNE as a pious offering to St. PETER. He extended also his pretensions to the kingdom of *Spain*, maintaining, in one of his letters, that it was the property of the apostolic see from the earliest times of the church, yet acknowledging in another, that the transaction by which the successors of St. PETER had acquired this property, had been lost among other ancient records. His claims, however, were more respected in *Spain* than they had been in *France*; for it is proved most evidently by authentic records, that the king of *Arragon*, and BERNHARD, count of *Besalu*, gave a favorable answer to the demands of GREGORY, and paid him regularly an

annual tribute; and their example was followed by other Spanish princes, as we could show, were it necessary, by a variety of arguments. The despotic views of this lordly pontiff were attended with less success in *England*, than in any other country. WILLIAM the Conqueror was a prince of great spirit and resolution, extremely jealous of his rights, and tenacious of the prerogatives he enjoyed as a sovereign and independent monarch; and accordingly, when GREGORY wrote him a letter demanding the arrears of the *Peter-pence*, and at the same time summoning him to do homage for the kingdom of *England* as a fief of the apostolic see, WILLIAM granted the former, but refused the latter with a noble obstinacy, declaring that he held his kingdom of God only and his own sword. Obligated to yield to the obstinacy of the English monarch, whose name struck terror into the boldest hearts, the restless pontiff addressed his imperious mandates where he imagined they would be received with more facility. He wrote circular letters to all the most powerful German princes, to GEUSA, king of *Hungary*, and SUENO or SWEIN, king of *Denmark*, soliciting them to make a solemn grant of their kingdoms and territories to the prince of the apostles, and to hold them under the jurisdiction of his vicar at *Rome*, as fiefs of the apostolic see. What success attended his demands upon these princes, we cannot say; but certain it is, that in several places his efforts were effectual, and his *modest* proposals were received with the utmost docility and zeal. The son of DEMETRIUS, king of the *Russians*, set out for *Rome* in consequence of the pontiff's letter, in order to obtain as a gift from St. PETER, by the hands of GREGORY, after professing his subjection and allegiance to the

prince of the apostles, the kingdom which was to devolve to him upon the death of his father; and his *pious request* was readily granted by the officious pope who was extremely liberal of what did not belong to him. DEMETRIUS SUINIMER, duke of *Croatia* and *Dalmatia*, was raised to the rank and prerogatives of royalty by the same pontiff in the year 1076, and solemnly proclaimed king by his legate at *Salona*, upon condition that he should pay an annual tribute of two hundred pieces of gold to St. PETER, at every Easter festival. This bold step was injurious to the authority of the emperors of *Constantinople*, who, before this time, comprehended the province of *Croatia* within the limits of their sovereignty. The kingdom of *Poland* became also the object of GREGORY'S ambition, and a favourable occasion was offered for the execution of his iniquitous views; for BASILAUS II. having assassinated STANISLAUS, bishop of *Cracow*, the pontiff not only excommunicated him with all the circumstances of infamy that he could invent, but also pulled him from his throne, dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken, and, by an express and imperious edict, prohibited the nobles and clergy of *Poland* from electing a new king without the consent of the Roman pontiff. Many more examples might be alleged of the phrenetic ambition of GREGORY, but those which have been already mentioned are sufficient to excite the indignation of every impartial reader. Had the success of that pontiff been equal to the extent of his insolent views, all the kingdoms of *Europe* would have been this day tributary to the Roman see, and its princes the soldiers or vassals of St. PETER, in the person of his pretended vicar upon earth. But though his most important projects were

ineffectual, yet many of his attempts were crowned with a favorable issue; -for, from the time of his pontificate, the face of *Europe* underwent a considerable change, and the prerogatives of the emperors and other sovereign princes were much diminished. It was, particularly, under the administration of GREGORY, that the emperors were deprived of the privilege of ratifying, by their consent, the election of the Roman pontiff; a privilege of no small importance, and which as yet they have never recovered." Vol. ii. pp. 476-484.

CENTURY XIII.

"The history of the popes presents a lively and horrible picture of the complicated crimes that dishonored the ministers of the church, who were peculiarly obliged, by their sacred office, to exhibit to the world distinguished models of piety and virtue. Such of the Sacerdotal order as were advanced to places of authority in the church, behaved rather like tyrants than rulers, and showed manifestly, in all their conduct, that they aimed at an absolute and unlimited dominion. The popes, more especially, inculcated that pernicious maxim, 'That the bishop of *Rome* is the supreme lord of the universe, and that neither princes nor bishops, civil governors nor ecclesiastical rulers, have any lawful power in church or state, but what they derive from him.' This extravagant maxim, which was considered as the sum and substance of papal jurisprudence, the Roman pontiffs maintained obstinately, and left no means unemploy'd that perfidy or violence could suggest, to give it the force of a universal law. It was in consequence of

this arrogant pretension, that they not only claimed the right of disposing of ecclesiastical *benefices*, as they are commonly called, but also of conferring civil dominion, and of dethroning kings and emperors, according to their good pleasure. It is true, this maxim was far from being universally adopted; many placed the authority of councils above that of the pontiffs, and such of the European kings and princes as were not ingloriously blinded and enslaved by the superstition of the times, asserted their rights with dignity and success, excluded the pontiffs from all concern in their civil transactions, nay, even reserved to themselves the supremacy over the churches that were established in their dominions. In opposing thus the haughty pretensions of the lordly pontiffs, it was, indeed, necessary to proceed with mildness, caution and prudence, on account of the influence which these spiritual tyrants had usurped over the minds of the people, and the power they had of alarming princes, by exciting their subjects to rebellion.

In order to establish their authority, both in civil and ecclesiastical matters, upon the firmest foundations, the Roman pontiffs assumed to themselves the power of disposing of the various offices of the church, whether of a higher or more subordinate nature, and of creating *bishops*, *abbots*, and *canons*, according to their fancy. Thus we see the ghostly heads of the church, who formerly disputed with such ardour against the emperors in favor of the free election of bishops and abbots, overturning now all the laws that related to the election of these spiritual rulers, reserving for themselves the revenues of the richest *benefices*, conferring vacant places upon their clients and their creatures, nay, often deposing bishops that had

been duly and lawfully elected, and substituting, with a high hand, others in their room. The hypocritical pretexts for all these arbitrary proceedings were an ardent zeal for the welfare of the church, and an anxious concern, lest devouring *heretics* should get a footing among the flock of CHRIST. The first of the pontiffs, who usurped such an extravagant extent of authority, was INNOCENT III. whose example was followed by HONORIUS III. GREGORY IX. and several of their successors. But it was keenly opposed by the bishops, who had hitherto enjoyed the privilege of nominating to the smaller benefices, and still more effectually by the kings of *England* and *France*, who employed the force of warm remonstrances and vigorous edicts to stop the progress of this new jurisprudence. LEWIS IX. king of *France*, and now the tutelar saint of that nation, distinguished himself by the noble opposition he made to these papal encroachments. In the year 1268, before he set out for the Holy Land, he secured the rights of the Gallican church against the insidious attempts of the Roman pontiffs, by that famous edict known in *France* by the name of the *pragmatic sanction*. This resolute and prudent measure rendered the pontiffs more cautious and slow in their proceedings, but did not terrify them from the prosecution of their purpose. For BONIFACE VIII. maintained, in the most express and impudent terms, that the universal church was under the dominion of the pontiffs, and that princes and lay-patrons, councils and chapters, had no more power in spiritual things, than what they derived from CHRIST'S vicar upon earth." Vol. iii. pp. 160-163.

BENEDICT CAJETAN, who had persuaded the good pontiff now mentioned to resign his place, succeeded

him in it in the year 1294, and took the name of BONIFACE VIII. We may say, with truth, of this unworthy prelate, that he was born to be a plague both to church and state, a disturber of the repose of nations, and that his attempts to extend and confirm the despotism of the Roman pontiffs, were carried to a length that approached to frenzy. From the moment that he entered upon his new dignity, he laid claim to a supreme and irresistible dominion over all the powers of the earth, both spiritual and temporal, terrified kingdoms and empires with the thunder of his bulls, called princes and sovereign states before his tribunal to decide their quarrels, augmented the papal jurisprudence with a new body of laws, which was entitled, *The Sixth Book of the Decretals*, declared war against the illustrious family of *Colonna*, who disputed his title to the pontificate; in a word, exhibited to the church and to *Europe*, a lively image of the tyrannical administration of GREGORY VII. whom he perhaps surpassed in arrogance. It was this pontiff that, in the year 1300, instituted the famous jubilee, which, since that time, has been regularly celebrated in the Roman church, at certain fixed periods, But the consideration of this institution, which was so favorable to the progress of licentiousness and corruption, as also the other exploits of BONIFACE, and his deplorable end, belong to the history of the following century." Vol. iii. pp. 181, 182.

CHAPTER V.

AMAZING CONTRAST.

Let the reader compare the paragraph in Professor SCHAF's pamphlet with the extracts taken from the historian, MOSEHEIM, and behold the amazing contrast! Professors SCHAF and NEVIN have made assertions in regard to the *middle ages*, that are utterly at variance with historical truth!

Those Ages, instead of being enlightened by the pure gospel of Christ, were exceedingly ignorant of evangelical truth. They were covered with gross darkness. Instead of piety prevailing among the clergy and people, both were debased and stained by ruinous superstitious and gross immoralities.

In further confirmation of the mournful destitution of piety, and the gross immorality of the *middle ages*, we refer to Dr. EDGAR's chapter on THE CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY. There he has traced the rise and progress, and the dreadful consequences of this papal Institution. He has shown, that, in the *middle ages*, so lauded by Professor SCHAF, for the prevalence of religion and consequently of *moral purity*, the clergy of every grade, *priests, bishops and Pontiffs*, were become infamous for their want of continence, and their licentious practices; that princes, kings and emperors, to stem the torrent of pollution, importuned the Popes to restore the lawfulness of the *marriage relation*, which they had dared to prohibit; but in vain, *because it did not accord with their assumed authority, and might impair their influence over the Church and the State.*

We give two short paragraphs at the close of this chapter;

“General councils, as well as Romish pontiffs and popish priests, outraged the laws, not indeed of celibacy, but of abstinence. This was exemplified in the universal councils of Lyons, Constance, and Basil. The council of Lyons demoralized the city in which it was convened. Cardinal Hugo, in a speech to the citizens immediately after the dissolution of the sacred synod, boasted that Lyons, at the meeting of the assembly contained two or three stews, but, at its departure, comprehended only one; which, however, extended without interruption from the eastern to the western gate. The sacred convention, by the perpetration of licentiousness, converted the whole city into one vast, fermenting, pestilential, overflowing sink of accumulated pollution. The holy fathers, it appears, were men of business and industry, and did not confine their valuable labours to the study of musty theology.”

“The general council of *Constance* imitated the incontinence practised at Lyons.” Omitting, for brevity sake, what follows about the conduct of this council, we submit his next paragraph:

“The general council of *Basil* taught the theory of *filthiness*, as those of Lyons and Constance had displayed the practice. Carlery, the champion of Catholicism in this assembly against Nicholas the Bohemian heretic, advocated the propriety of permitting brothels in a city. The speculation, the hero of the faith maintained by the authority of the sainted Jerome, Augustine, Thomas, and Gregory. Simple fornication, the sage and precious divine discovered, does not disturb the commonwealth; and the populace,

addicted to voluptuousness and pleasure, are unwilling to abstain. He concluded, therefore, by the most logical deduction, that stews are to be tolerated in a city. This theory the holy fathers heard with silent approbation. The vile atrocity therefore was sanctioned by the holy, unerring, apostolic, Roman council." pp. 573-574.

Such deplorable consequences have resulted from the popish Institution, which outraged the constitution of human nature and the design of the Creator in forming the two sexes, and impiously dared to contradict His solemn declaration: "Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers, God will judge."



CHAPTER VI.

GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

The government of the church in the *middle ages*, so much lauded by two *Protestant Professors*, was established by *fraud* and *violence*; as manifestly appears from the preceding quotations from MOSHEIM, and was utterly at variance with the rules given by our blessed Saviour to his apostles and ministers.

Look at the ambition of the Roman pontiffs as described by ecclesiastical historians; and then read what is written in Mark:—"And he came to Capernaum: and being in the house, he asked them, What

was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way? But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves who *should be* the greatest. And he sat down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, if any man desire to be first, *the same* shall be last of all, and servant of all. And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me." MARK ix. 33-37.

Read also what is recorded in Mark x. 35-45:—
“ And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldst do for us whatsoever we shall desire. And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory. But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And they said unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized: But to sit on my right hand and on my left hand, is not mine to give; but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared. .And when the *ten* heard it, they began to be much displeased with James and John. But Jesus called them *to him*, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles, exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But

so shall it not be among you : but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister : And whosoever of you will be the chiefest shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

CHAPTER VII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Professor SCHAF is most unfortunate in praising the painters and poets of the *middle ages*, as influenced by truly religious motives of action. Were such their motives when they painted "madonnas and images of the saints," that the ignorant and superstitious people might worship them ; and thus violate the second commandment of the law of God ?

In his Biographical Dictionary, sketching the character of MICHAEL ANGELO, LEMPRIERE says : "It is perhaps to be lamented, that the artist's REVENGE had been *cruelly* immortalized, by his representation of a cardinal who was *his enemy*, in the number of the damned." What a heavenly motive actuated the painter !

Of PERUGINO the same writer says, "He was remarkably fond of money, and the loss of his treasure, which he always carried about him, and of which he was robbed, caused his death in 1594, in his 78th year." What a heavenly minded painter truly !

But perhaps Professor SCHAF is more fortunate in bringing forward the poet DANTE, whom he styles the greatest poet of the Middle Ages; "Who, he says, has left behind him in his 'Divine Comedy' an image simply of the religious spirit and theological wisdom of the age, as occupied with eternity itself and all its dread realities."

But was DANTE worthy of such high commendation? What says LEMPRIERE of this poet, who, in the opinion of Professor SCHAF, so remarkably exemplified the religious spirit? He represents him as full of worldly ambition, and so much so, that an insult offered to him by the Magistrates of Venice, who treated him, the ambassador of the prince of Ravenna, with contempt, by refusing to admit him within their walls; preyed so on his spirit that he could "not survive the affront." "He died July 1321, aged 57."

LEMPRIERE speaks indeed very highly of his genius and poetical talents. Of his "Divine Comedy," he says: "His triple poem, of paradise, purgatory, and hell, displays astonishing powers of genius, and at once exhibits the sweetness and grace of poetry with the *bitterness of insatiable enmity.*" He adds, "The reputation and the usurped power of the Pope, BONIFACE VIII., the pedigree of the French king, and the prostituted venality of Florence, that den of thieves, are the subjects that engage and enflame the *virulence* of the poet." What evidences of his being a heavenly minded man! Surely he derived all his motives from above, and was "suffused with magic influence from the unseen world!"

Has Professor SCHAF described the church as it really existed in the *Middle Ages*, or an *imaginary*

church? He utters indeed a portion of historic truth, when he writes: "Before the pope, as the head and representative of Christendom, all states bowed themselves with reverent homage; and even the German emperor himself could not feel secure in his place, save as formally acknowledged by the chief bishop of the church. (This, however, will not apply to OTHO the great and other emperors.) "Princes and people arose at his bidding, forsook country and friends, submitted to the most severe privations, to kneel at the Saviour's tomb, and water it with thankful tears. According to the reigning idea, the State stood related to the Church like the moon to the sun, from which it borrows all its light." How well such a church corresponds with the church as described by our Saviour!! What a delightful condition of the church for *worldly minded* bishops and priests!

What follows in the paragraph seems to have been dictated by a like spirit in the writer. It is more an external and worldly, than a spiritual church. Such a gorgeous church may serve to dazzle the imaginations of ignorant and unregenerated men; but it will fail in its great end to honor Christ, and to glorify God.*

Professors SCHAF and NEVIN may be willing to exalt the Roman pontiff, and submit to his lordly reign; but we beg to be excused from imitating their example. If they are inclined to make a pilgrimage to Rome, for the purpose of worshipping "madonnas and saints," we feel inclined to remain at home and worship the alone true object of worship who will not give his glory to another. If they

* See Schaf's paragraph printed at the beginning, pp. 17-19.

imagine that "cathedrals,—visited never by the light of natural day, but only by mystic irradiations poured through stained glass," are so favorable to true devotion, we beg leave to differ in opinion, and to be permitted to frequent the less imposing edifices erected at home, in which to worship God in spirit and in truth.

We desire to remember what is written in the scriptures of truth: "And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power: and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues: For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." Rev. xviii. 1-5.

PART II.

ANTIDOTE

TO THE

POISON OF POPERY,

IN THE PUBLICATIONS OF

PROFESSOR SCHAF,

First in his Essay and then in his History.

PAMPHLET FORM GREATLY ENLARGED, WITH ADDITIONAL
MATTER, AND MANY NEW CHAPTERS.

INTRODUCTION.

In the introduction, may, I think, with propriety, be stated particular facts, in regard to myself and my *contrast* that have induced me to prepare and publish this *Antidote* to the *poison of Popery* in Professor Schaf's publications.

Previously to the Professor's arrival in this country, Rev. Dr. Wolff of Easton, Penn., came to my house at two different times. The object of his visits was, by representing the favorable aspect of the German Reformed Church, to which he belonged, in regard to evangelical religion and correct church order, to solicit aid in their poverty. His representations induced me to promise to take the application into consideration.

A letter, dated Sept. 6, 1844, from the Cor. Sec. of the "Diagnothian Literary Society" of Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pa., was received, informing me that I had been unanimously elected an Honorary Member of the Society; and of the efforts made for the erection of a Hall for the use of the Society. I sent the young gentlemen *ten* dollars; and on the receipt of a second letter in 1846, *ten* dollars more.

Doctor Wolff wrote me a long letter, dated Easton, Oct. 24, 1844; in which he reminded me of my promise "to consider the claims of the Institutions at Mercersburg." He represented the College as doing well, with a large fund subscribed for its endowment; the students increasing in number, and animated with a noble spirit; the faculty as able and efficient, of one heart and mind. Of Dr. Nevin and Dr. Schaf, he spoke in high terms. Willing to help on the cause of truth and evangelical piety, I was induced, by these representations; to send a draft on the State Bank, N. B. for \$50 to be applied to the salary of Dr. Schaf. In a letter, dated Jan. 9, 1845, Dr. W. acknowledged, with thanks, the receipt of the draft, on the evening before.

Having read Dr. Schaf's Essay, in which he divulged his erroneous views, on the receipt of another letter from Mercersburg, I replied to this effect, "Young gentlemen, I fear you are under the conduct of bad leaders." Hers terminated all correspondence with Mercersburg.

In the "Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," for October, 1852,

was published an able article, entitled "Remarks on the History, Structure, and Theories of the Apostle's Creed:" as a reply to articles in the "Mercersburg Review."

To the writer of the above articles, I suggested how easily that most erroneous passage in Schaf's Essay, on pp. 137, 138, might be answered. He seemed unwilling to undertake it. I, therefore, determined to break off from my course of study, and engage in preparing for publication "A Contrast between the Erroneous Assertions of Professor Schaf, and the testimony of Credible Ecclesiastical Historians, &c."*

Some pains were taken to circulate the Contrast among the German Reformed Churches. I sent a copy to the Rev. Dr. Wolff, and one to the Hon. James Buchanan, with whom I was personally acquainted, as coming from the author.

About the time of the publication of Schaf's history, it was intimated to me, that some one had told a wealthy and liberal gentleman of New York, that the extract in the Contrast was not Dr. Schaf's; and when the question was proposed to the gentleman, whom I afterwards met at Princeton; whether such a representation had been made to him, he answered in the affirmative. I then stated to him some of the facts recited above; and, without inquiring the name of the person making such a representation, I observed to him, that if he were to cast his eye over the first page of the Contrast, he would be convinced the extract belonged to Schaf; and added, I will hold him responsible for it. The object of this gross misrepresentation may be easily discerned, by any one who considers the *wealth* and *liberality* of the gentleman.

Copies of the history were soon seen by individuals living in New Brunswick, who told me the *poison* of *Popery* was artfully diffused through the volume. Going to New York, the next *Monday*, I purchased a copy. On my return home, no long time was required to see what they had seen. On Tuesday, while examining the work, the publisher of the "Historical Commentaries of the state of Christianity during the first three hundred and twenty-five years from the Christian era, by *Mosheim*," came into my study, and offered it for sale. Coming, as it

*The Contrast was favorably reviewed, in the Presbyterian Magazine, for Nov. 1852, p. 523; and a brief notice of it may be found in the Biblical Repertory and "Princeton Review," (page 137, Jan. number.)

The Rev. Dr. Sprague of Albany, wrote to the Author under date Jan. 24, 1853, thus: "I was greatly interested in your homily written for the benefit of Dr. Nevins, and other travellers towards the dark ages. I wrote a brief notice of it for the Puritan Recorder."

did, just at the time Dr. Schaf's history made its appearance, I could not hesitate to purchase it.

Looking among my papers, and finding I had written, nearly *two years ago*, a number of pages against the claims of the Romish Church, founded on the supposed Primacy of Peter among the Apostles, I saw it would not require much labor to prepare, in a reasonable time, an *Antidote* to Schaf's poison in a *pamphlet form* of moderate size; I determined to write one.

The plan for preparing this Antidote is :

1. To expose the first *development* of Schaf's historical views, in the Extract that formed the basis of my "Contrast;"
2. To exhibit the Scriptural argument against the Primacy of Peter, assumed by the Romish Church, in support of her unbounded and anti-christian usurpations; and
3. To expose the second and very different, if not opposite, *development* of Schaf's historical views in his recent history.

ANTIDOTE, &c.



CHAPTER I.

THE FALSE CLAIMS OF PROF. SCHAF IN FAVOR OF THE
PAPACY, IN THE MIDDLE AGES, EXPOSED.

Having carefully examined the English translation of Prof. Schaf's history, I proceed now to expose the *poison of Popery* apparent in his published views of history, since his residence in this country.

Let the reader, however, remember what is stated in the *Introduction*, that I am writing, not an extended review of his history, but only what may be comprised in a pamphlet.

The culling of flowers of rhetoric, beauties of style and sentiment, to be found in his history, I leave to others. My aim is at a more important object. I wish to guard such against a fatal sting that may be concealed in those flowers; and to beware lest, while they admire beauties of style, or even beauties of sentiment, they drink in the *poison of Popery*.

In exposing his views in the history, frequent occasions may offer to refer to my *contrast*; and as I intend to write remarks, which, in preparing it, were purposely avoided, in order to confront his erroneous assertions, not with my assertions, but with the testimony of credible historians; the *extract* from his Essay shall be reprinted here, for the accommodation

of readers who do not possess the Contrast. This will be done the more readily, that Prof. Schaf's own published views in his history, may be seen in a clearer light to be *entirely opposite*.

Note.—What is here omitted, may be found in Part I. pp. 17–19.

Does this contain historical truth? Was religion in such a desirable and flourishing state during the *middle ages*? Did true scriptural knowledge so prevail in the Church, and bring forth such rich fruits in the lives of professing christians, as this statement imports? Was the government of the Church in relation to civil government, as it ought to be; and did it accord with the views and instructions of the great FOUNDER and HEAD of the church, our LORD JESUS CHRIST?

So affirm PROFESSORS SCHAF and NEVIN.

Now, we do not intend to set up our affirmation in opposition to their affirmation. We merely design to set their confident statement in contrast with the testimony of CREDIBLE AND FAITHFUL ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIANS.

As the author of the contrast adhered to his plan, as stated above, he will now take the liberty of making a few remarks on this singular extract from the publication of Dr. Schaf's views, in 1845.

But before I make the remarks, it is important to know the character of the man with whom we have to deal.

This we may learn from his own writings, and the pen of Dr. J. A. Alexander, of Princeton.

In a note (p. 132 of his history,) Schaf quotes from an article written by Dr. Alexander in the "Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," for January, 1847, p. 105.

In the pamphlet, we had to refer the reader to the page where it is found. Now we copy it in full from the note in his history.

“Our national tendency,” says this highly-gifted writer, “so far as we have any, is to slight the past and overrate the present. This un-historical peculiarity is constantly betraying itself in various forms, but it is nowhere more conspicuous and more injurious than in our theology. Hence the perpetual resuscitation of absurdities a thousand times exploded, the perpetual renewal of attempts, which have a thousand times been proved abortive. Hence the false position which religion has been forced to assume in reference to various inferior yet important interests, to science, literature, art, and civil government. Hence, too, the barrenness and hardness by which much of our religious literature is distinguished, because cut off from the inexhaustible resources which can only be supplied by history. The influence of this defect upon our preaching is perhaps incalculable. But instead of going on to reckon up the consequences of the evil now in question, let us rather draw attention to the fact that it is not of such a nature as to be corrected by the lapse of time, but must increase with the increase of ignorance and lazy pride, especially when fostered by a paltry national conceit, and flattered by those oracles of human progress, who declare that history is only fit for monks. To counteract this tendency we need some influence *ab extra*, some infusion of strange blood into our veins.”

After the reader has carefully examined this note, I put this question to him. Is not the design of Schaf to impress on his mind a conviction that Dr. Alexander thinks as Schaf does? But, to defeat this design, I observe that the last line and a half begins a new paragraph in Dr. Alexander's article; and I shall transcribe largely from Dr. Alexander, beginning where Dr. Schaf left off:

“On this ground we are much disposed to look for good effects from Dr. Schaf's appearance, and even from the faults which have been charged upon his writings. The grotesque English which occasionally marks his style is not only palliated by the intimation on the title page—“translated from the German”—but may serve, like the jargon of his favourite Carlyle, to make the reader think by making him first stare and laugh. Even the positive dogmatical authoritative tone, which sometimes verges upon flippancy, may serve, by rendering the composition more *piquant*, to make it more effective. Whether any good is likely to result, among intelligent and cultivated readers, from the author's habit of pronouncing just as confidently where he is imperfectly informed as

where he understands his subject, from his supercilious representations of English and American Theology as wholly unproductive, or from the compassionate disdain with which he looks down upon all who are not of the High Dutch breed and breeding—is a question which we leave to be decided by himself. If even these peculiarities, however, which ought long since to have dropped off as the exuviae of the *status popularis*, should, by rousing attention to the valuable truths embodied in his writings, give additional effect to his undoubted talents, eloquence, and learning, the price paid for the benefit is one of which the purchasers at least will have no reason to complain.

The valuable truths of which we speak have, in the present case, no necessary connexion with the author's doctrine as to our participation in the human nature of our Lord, nor even with his doctrine of "organic development."* In some directions we are not prepared to take a step with him; in others we can go as far as he can, for example in maintaining the importance of Historical Theology, as well for its conservative as its progressive influence. We hold, as thoroughly as he can, the necessity of knowing what has been before us, in order to fulfil our own vocation. If he chooses to express this same idea by the figure of organic growth, like that of plants and animals, with all the cognate images of twigs and sap, or food and blood, we do not make the least objection to his pleasing his own taste in the selection of a figurative vehicle for his ideas. But so far is this theory, or rather this poetical conception, of an animal or vegetable growth, from aiding the effect of what it represents upon ourselves, that we would rather look at the plain truth divested of the tropical costume in which the author's eloquence has dressed it up. In this we have been influenced, no doubt, to some extent, by our long familiarity with all kinds of "development," as regular cant phrases in our newspaper vocabulary. The changes rung upon this term and its correlatives have been so endless, that they seem to have lost all their power *ad captandum vulgus*. This would be a very insufficient reason for rejecting any new discovery which happened to have been baptized by this familiar name; but when we come to look more narrowly at Dr. Schaf's principles, apart from the accompanying metaphors, they strike us very much like old acquaintances in masquerade, or we may even say like English and American travellers, fresh from the hands of a German tailor."

These paragraphs Dr. S. doubtless read, and read with no pleasant feelings. Here we see his character drawn by his own pen, and by the pen of one who had read his publications, and the writings of many a German author.

And what lesson should be taken from it? Clearly

*Certainly not; for the first is IMPIOUS—the other, GERMAN NONSENSE. Note by J. J. J.

this: Not to rely on the simple assertion of Dr. S., however confidently uttered; nor to believe a thing to be true, merely because he affirms it; but to demand proof—to scrutinize what he writes—and to set him in opposition to himself, when he pens contradictory statements in the same volume: and to beware of his principles, disguised in *masquerade*, lest, on examination, they be found to be strangers, and not old acquaintances.

The utility of this rule will frequently appear in this "Antidote." It is no conjecture. I know what will follow. It is written already. A new order is now being made; together with such improvement as may be suggested by a review.

The writer is now prepared to make his intended remarks on the *very singular extract*, recited above, written by the pen of one calling himself a PROTESTANT!

In this extract, with one exception, (monastic institutions,) the state of the *Roman Catholic Church*, in the Middle Ages, when it was really in the worst and most corrupt state, is lauded to the skies, by a professed *Protestant!*

Pascal, a Roman Catholic, would not have written what this Protestant blushed not to write.

The Bishops and Priests of France, before the revolution, would have stigmatized this as *ultra montane*. They were jealous for Gallican liberty.

The all-grasping ambition of the Roman Pontiffs is justified:

"Before the Pope, as the head and representative of Christendom, all states bowed themselves with reverent homage." This is admired by him, although utterly inconsistent with the gospel rule; and this wicked eminence obtained by the vilest means!

“And even the German emperor himself could not feel himself secure in his place, save as formally acknowledged by the chief bishop of the church!” And why? because the emperor knew the holy bishop would excite his subjects to rebellion, if he did not do homage to this humble representative of Peter “the fisherman of Galilee!”

All this was beautiful in the eyes of Prof. Schaff! And if the Pope could induce the U. S. A. thus to abase themselves to papal powers, would not this be a sight alike beautiful in the eyes of one who could pen the above extract!

“According to the reigning idea, the state stood related to the Church like the moon to the sun, from which it borrowed all its light!”

Men enlightened by the word and Spirit of God, look through eyes very different from the eyes of Schaf. They regard the Romish church in the Middle Ages, as a *dismal opaque body*, intercepting the rays of the Sun of righteousness; so as to prevent his light and heat, and fertilizing influence from reaching the true church and the earth. She chose to abandon them to darkness and ignorance, and coldness, and barrenness; to render them more submissive and pliant to her domineering will.

Schaf adds:

“The Holy Sacraments ran like threads of gold through the whole texture of life, in all its relations, from infancy to old age.”

No exception is made to the *seven* sacraments of the Romish Church. It would have spoiled the beauty and interrupted the flow of the Professor’s language. Yet he well knew that all Protestants reject five of them as unauthorized by Christ, and allow only two—Baptism and the Lord’s Supper—as divinely insti-

tuted; and the Heidelbergh Catechism, which he acknowledged, when inaugurated as a Professor in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church, in 1844, to be the Confession of his Faith, rejects five; for this Catechism says, in answer to Question 68:

“*How many Sacraments has Christ instituted in the new Covenant, or Testament?*” replies;

“Two, namely, Holy Baptism, and the Holy Supper.”

Professor S. well knew also, at the same time, that the Heidelbergh Catechism contains both a question and an answer relating to the Popish Mass; which I here transcribe:

“Q. 80. *What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish Mass?*”

“A. The Lord's Supper testifies to us that we have a full pardon of all sin, by the only sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that we, by the Holy Ghost, are ingrafted into Christ, who, according to his human nature, is now not on earth, but in heaven, at the right hand of his Father; but the Mass teacheth, that the living and dead have not the pardon of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is also daily offered for them by the priests; and further, that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and therefore is to be worshipped in them; so that the Mass at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry.”

The confession S. made, by this avowal of his faith in 1844, and what he published in 1845, in a book-form, as Dr. Nevin terms it, the germ of which was delivered on the day of his inauguration, I leave to be reconciled by the learned Professor. I cannot. Subscriptions to Confessions, I have always regarded as solemn matters, which no honest man can trifle with. Of this I shall have more to say, when obliged to show the solemn form in which Schaf's pledge was given.

How beautiful the idea to this Professor, when he

wrote, "The cathedral," visited never by the light of the natural day, but only by mystic irradiations poured through stained glass!"

Ah! if the sun could look into those Cathedrals "bearing the soul on high" by "their mysterious devotional gloom;" and see the worship paid to *Madonnas*, and to *Saints*, and to *Images*, instead of being offered to Jehovah and his Son Jesus Christ alone; would he not blush and hide his head, ashamed to witness these abominations of the Romish Church; which she, in violation of the first and second precept of the Decalogue, has set up in the house of God!

Yet, says this singular writer, "Truly a great time, and for one who is prepared to understand it, fraught with the richest spiritual interests. He that has no heart for the excellencies of this period, the beauty that belongs to the Middle Ages, must be wanting in genuine culture, or at least in all right historical feeling."

Excellencies and beauty of the Middle Ages! Alas! Popes were usurpers—the state of the Church was anti-christian—ignorance and error everywhere prevailed, with their accompanying vices and licentiousness—Artists and Poets were not influenced by motives from above, or truly religious. In what, then, consisted the excellencies and beauties of the Middle Ages! They may please the morbid imagination of one whose mind has been perverted, by error, from the love of truth, and carried away by its delusions. But by a mind captivated by the love of religious truth, and under the sanctifying influence of the Spirit of God, no such excellencies and beauty in the Middle Ages can be seen. It will turn away with disgust from this vain attempt of a Protestant to mislead his readers.

That a real Papist, so deluded as to believe the Pope, is divinely entitled to occupy the exalted position as head of Christendom, which he claims,—that the Church ought to control the State,—and that the superstitious and idolatrous worship offered by Romanists, in their magnificent Cathedrals, is true and acceptable worship; that a man so deluded, might, by the aid of a vivid imagination, see and admire the excellencies and beauty of the Middle Ages, is not surprising.

But that a professing Protestant, who knows the Popes to be usurpers, and admits the Romish Church to be corrupt in many doctrines and practices, should, in the relative condition of the Church and State as here described, and in the worship offered in Cathedrals and “their mysterious devotional gloom;” see, and admire excellencies and beauty, and describe them, in glowing terms, that other Protestants may see and admire them; is what I cannot reconcile with truth and honesty.

Crossing the Niagara river, in 1828, just below the falls, with a lady, in a small boat, I bade her see the beauty and grandeur of the falls. Apprehensive of danger, she exclaimed, “Don’t talk to me about beauty and grandeur now!”

A mind smitten with the love of truth and duty, while recollecting the abominations of Papacy, and the corrupt and idolatrous worship of the Romish Church, during the “Middle Ages,” will turn away from the false description of beauty and excellencies, which the pen of *Schaf* has attempted to throw around them, to beguile the ignorant and unwary, with *disgust* and *loathing*.

The Doëtor has read the story of the devils and the

swine. (Matt. viii. 20-34.) Art and design appear evident in the request of the devils.

Their design was, by destroying the swine in the sea, to operate on the depravity of the inhabitants of a city; to prejudice their minds against Jesus, and thus prevent their listening to his heavenly instructions.

Their plan succeeded. The whole city being informed of all that had happened, "came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought him that he would depart out of their coasts." He complied with their request. As these foolish inhabitants of the city loved gain more than godliness, the Redeemer, who knew the state of the desires of their hearts, as well as the design of the devils, was pleased to leave them to the working of their own carnal hearts; and to reap the consequences of their own sinful request, and preference of earthly to heavenly things.

Will the doctor try, by his vivid imagination and glowing rhetoric, how much *beauty* he can extract from this story, for his admirers?

What strange conceptions of truth and perceptions of beauty, and devotional feelings, has this singular man!

Let the reader peruse again what he says, (Part i. p. 18,) about the cathedrals. The sentence begins thus:

"The most magnificent and beautiful buildings of the period, &c."

Here we see the **FIRST DEVELOPMENT** of the German Professor's historical views.

In his published history we shall see how greatly they are changed, and a development very different and nearly opposite.

Thus I had written and published in my pamphlet, and given the Professor more credit than he deserved. Having learned more of the condition of the German Reformed Church, and of the dates of certain occurrences and collated them; and having compared the Doctor's inaugural address as translated by Dr. Nevin and published in 1845, so irreconcilable with the solemn engagement made *just before his address*; I am now constrained to add, that the change in the Professor's historical views does not appear to me as it did when I wrote my pamphlet. This, however, reflects no honor on the Doctor, and confirms me in the *belief* that he is not a protestant, and more than a semi-papist, as I called him.

If I have erred in regard to the *amount* of the change in the development of Dr. Schaf's *historical views*, I cannot err when I say, he has exhibited a strange and wonderful development of *mind*!



CHAPTER II.

SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE CLAIMS OF ROMANISTS,
FOR THE PRIMACY OF PETER.

Romanists contend that Peter was the chief Apostle, the *Primate* or *Prince* in the Apostolic College.

In support of this assertion they urge as proof:

First, That Jesus Christ promised to build on him, the *rock*, his church; against which the gates of hell shall never prevail:

Second, That to him were given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the power of binding and loosing, both in heaven and on the earth. See Matthew xvi. 18-19.

But the claim to his primacy is *mere assumption*; and the proofs urged in its support are destitute of force

Peter, it is cheerfully admitted, was highly honored by his master, on two occasions:

1. He was selected with James and John, and conducted up into a high mountain, to witness our Redeemer's transfiguration; but Peter was not more highly honored than James or John; for they too were witnesses of the wonderful scene, and heard as well as Peter, the testimony which the Father bore to his Son. (See Matt. xvii. 1-8.)

2. Jesus selected Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee, to witness his agony in the garden of Gethsemane. In this honor James and John shared equally with Peter. But, on this occasion, Peter brought on himself especially a rebuke for sleeping. All indeed, ere criminal for sleeping, while their Master was overwhelmed with unutterable and mysterious agony; so that his soul was exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death. Had they felt that fervent love for Jesus which they ought to have felt, they would have watched one hour. The disciples when warned by their Master; "All ye shall be offended because of me this night;" Peter replied; "Though all men should be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended." And when told that he would deny him thrice, he confidently affirmed, "Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee. Likewise said all the disciples."

Hence, when Jesus rebuked his three disciples for sleeping, he singled out Peter, saying: "Peter, what could ye not watch with me one hour?" (Matt. xxvi. 31-46.)

On these two occasions, it is manifest, that Peter had no preeminence in honor above his fellow disciples.

Peter was naturally warm, ardent, and zealous: and the warmth of his feelings betrayed him sometimes into serious faults, and once brought on him a severe rebuke from his Master. "From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day."

"Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee Lord: This shall not be unto thee." What impertinence! What opposition to the appointment of infinite wisdom! No blind attachment to his master could excuse such improper boldness. What followed? "But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence to me; for thou savourest not of the things that be of God, but of the things that be of men." (Matt. xvi. 21-23.)

How humiliating the rebuke!

This rebuke was followed by a statement of the terms of discipleship, and the glorious reward that awaited the faithful disciples. (vs. 24-28.)

Again: how faulty the conduct of Peter, the night in which our blessed Redeemer was betrayed and apprehended? Peter drew his sword, and without waiting for an answer to the question, "Lord, shall we smite with the sword? Smote the high priest's

servant, and cut off his right ear.”—“But Jesus touched his ear, and healed him.” (Luke xxii. 49–51. John xviii. 10.)

On that dreadful night all his disciples forsook him and fled; and Peter too, who had solemnly promised to be faithful, though at the cost of his life.

John soon recovered his courage, and followed the Band, who conducted the Redeemer to the palace of the high priest; and, although “known to the high priest, boldly went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest.”

Knowing that Peter was at the door, John went out, and spoke to the damsel that kept the door, and had it opened for his admission. (John xviii, 15–16.)

The awful scene that followed, so degrading to Peter, whom Romanists and those who sympathize with them, pretend to be the prince of the Apostles, is well known.

Thrice Peter denied his suffering Master; first, with a solemn declaration, “I know not what thou sayest.” (Matt. xxvi. 70;) *second*, “he denied his Master with an *oath*, I do not know the man;” (verse 72;) *third*, when charged with being a disciple of Jesus, he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew. (verse 74.)

“And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter.”

What a piercing look! It went to the heart of this apostate!

“Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice.”

“And Peter went out, and wept bitterly.” (Luke xxii. 60–62.)

Behold in this degraded, though penitent apostate

sinner, your pretended prince of the apostles, ye Romanists and sympathizers in Romish errors!

Compare him with *John*, that loving disciple, who boldly went into the high priest's palace, although known to him. He did not deny his Master. He outlived Peter; and was favored with most extraordinary revelations, for the benefit and consolations of the Church. After Peter, penitent, and restored, and forgiven, had finished his course, and gone, with a crown of martyrdom to heaven; revelations (that imprint on *Rome*, on her forehead, the indelible and infamous stigma, recorded where it cannot be obliterated,) were given to John. (Rev. xvii. 5-16.)

Compare Peter and John, in regard to love to Jesus, courage, and faithfulness in the service of their Master. Who should be esteemed first?

But Jesus would have no *prince* among his apostles, to exercise his authority over them. (See Mark x. 31-45.)

Let us now examine the first argument by which Romanists endeavoured to establish the princely authority of Peter.

They bring forward this portion of the word of God:

"When Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the son of man am?"

"And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.

"He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am?"

"And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

"And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed

art thou, Simon, Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my father which is in heaven."

"And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

"And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. xvi. 13-19.)

"This passage we distribute into three divisions; and shall consider

First, The confession of Peter;

Second, The promise relating to the building of the church;

Third, The power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

I. We shall consider Peter's Confession.

It was a noble confession. It came from above. He spake under the inspiration of God.

But alas! how ignorant was this prince of the apostles, as Romanists, not understanding the Scriptures, foolishly call him!

Let it be distinctly remarked, It is immediately after recorded in this chapter, that Peter acted so impertinently, and with such ignorance of the design of the Saviour's incarnation and mission into the world; a design on which his heart had been so set from the beginning, (Ps. xl. 7. Heb. x. 9,) as to bring upon him from his indulgent Master that severe indignant rebuke and reproachful name, "Get thee behind me *Satan*; thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men. (vs. 22-23.)

This Confession had, a year or more before, been made by Peter, in the name of his fellow disciples, although one proved to be a traitor.

“Then said Jesus to the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall *we* go? thou hast the words of eternal life.

“And *we* believe and are sure, that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God. (John vi. 67-70.)

Nathaniel made a like confession, at the very commencement of the Redeemer's ministry; and it stands recorded to his honour, by John, in the first chapter of his gospel; “Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the king of Israel.” (Chap. i. 49.)

Indeed we are taught by John, that it was the privilege and the happiness of all true believers to know the fundamental truth contained in this great confession; “The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.” (v. 14.)

From the above induction of recorded facts, it is manifest *Peter* was *neither the first to DISCOVER, nor the first to UTTER, this most interesting and all-important confession.*

II. We are to consider the meaning of our Lord, when He said, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

That our Master intended by these words to teach us, that his church was indestructible, and would be sustained to the end of time, it is unnecessary to go into an argument to prove.

It has already been preserved, more than eighteen

hundred years against assaults of every kind, by Jews and Gentiles, and preserved through persecution in every form; by imprisonment, by the sword, and by fire. Her members have been deprived of their goods, shut up in filthy dungeons, driven into the wilderness, or slain with the sword, or burnt at the stake.

By pretended followers of Christ, they have been dragooned into their corrupt faith, or banished, in multitudes, from their native country; they have been deprived of the Sacred Scriptures, which Jesus Christ commanded them to search, that they might find eternal life.

Pagan Rome has passed away, and Papal Rome is tottering on its base.

Still the Church of Christ lives, and will live, through whatever trials may await her in coming time, till her redemption draws nigh and she enters on her millenian rest.

But what did our Saviour mean? when he said, "Thou art Peter, and on his rock I will build my church."

Here was doubtless a reference to what is written, (John i. 42,) where we are informed, that when *Andrew* brought his brother *Simon* to Jesus, he was addressed thus: "Thou art Simon the Son of Jona: thou shalt be called *Cephas*, which is by interpretation, A stone."

But did our Lord intend, by his address to Peter, when he made his noble confession, to teach that the church was to be built on *Peter*, the rock? So say Papists.

Let it not be forgotten, that we have shown that Peter had before this made the same confession, in

behalf of his fellow disciples, and that *Nathanael* had made the same confession, two years before.

To ascertain our Master's true meaning, let us endeavour to discover it, by the apostolic rule; comparing Scripture with Scripture.

Hear then the Prophet *Isaiah*, [xxviii. 16.] "Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste."

Hear the *Psalmist*, [cxviii. 22, 23.] "The stone which the builders rejected is become the head stone of the corner. This is the LORD'S doing; it is marvellous in our eyes."

Hear *Paul*, [1 Cor. iii. 10, 11:] "As a wise master builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, *which is JESUS CHRIST.*"

Hear *Paul* again: [Ephes. ii. 20-22:] "And are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and the Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone: in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the spirit."

Now, hear how Peter harmonises with *Isaiah*, and the *Psalmist*, and with *Paul*: [1 Pet. ii. 4-9:] "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, ye also as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the Scriptures, Behold, I lay in Sion a

chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him, shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore, which believe, he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed. But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light."

Hear now the MASTER: [Matt. xxi. 42:] To the chief priests and the elders, inquiring of him in the temple, by what authority he acted, among other things he said: "Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?"

Now, in view of these texts compared together, is it not apparent how untenable and unreasonable is the construction put by Romanists on our Saviour's address to Peter? when he said, "Thou art Peter; and on this rock, I will build my church."

By turning to Dr. Doddridge's paraphrase on Matt. xvi, page 484, vol. 1, note ^c, the reader may see by what a host of Protestant writers, such as *Grotius, Le Clerk, Dr. Whitby, Dr. Clark, L' Enfant, Bishop Burnet, Calvin, Dr. Barrow, Dr. Patrick, &c.*: the wild interpretation of *Romanists*, is rejected.

Doddridge too, and other writers, "look upon this as one of those scriptures, the sense of which might be most certainly fixed by the particular *tone of voice* and *gesture* with which it was spoken. If *our*

Lord altered his accent, and laid his hand on his breast, it would show that he spoke, not of the person but of the *confession* of Peter, [as most *Protestant* writers have understood it,] and meant to point out himself as the *great Foundation*. But if he turned to the *other Apostles*, and pointed to *Peter*, he meant to intimate the honor he would do him, in making him an eminent support to his church."

This supposition, in the writer's view, will receive support by referring to John ii, 18-22.

Our Lord, in an early part of his ministry, indignant at the gross profanation of the temple, by converting it into a place of merchandise, having "made a scourge of small cords," expelled all out, who were thus profaning God's house of worship. Offended at his conduct, the Jews demanded of him a sign to prove he was duly commissioned to exercise the authority he assumed. He replied, "Destroy this temple, and in three days, I will raise it again."

Astonished at his declaration, the Jews exclaimed, "Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days?"

The meaning put on our Saviour's words, by the Jews, seemed natural; and it is probable his disciples also so understood him, by not attending properly, at the time, to the tone of voice or gesture used to convey his true meaning. But after his resurrection, by recalling to mind, not only the words of Christ, but the attending circumstances, they apprehended, as the Evangelist says, "He spake of the temple his body," as the original may be rendered* (according to Knapp's edition.) Unless something of this kind

*No Greek type in the office.

had occurred, how could John write? "When, therefore, he was raised from the dead, his disciples *remembered* that he had said this unto them; and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said unto them."

CHAPTER III.

SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

III. The true meaning of the *keys* given to Peter, must now be determined. "I will give unto thee the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven, &c."

Where is the evidence for the interpretation of the Romanists to be found?

Not in the first commission given to the *twelve* to go and preach the gospel to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, in their cities and towns. The commission, with the accompanying directions, counsels, and exhortations, was given to the *twelve*, without distinction. (Matt. x.) All were authorized "to preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." (v. 7.) All were empowered to work miracles. (v. 8.) If Peter is named first, it is because he was older than his brother Andrew, who went with him in executing the commission.

This commission seems to look to events that occurred, when they went to execute the commission given to them after our Lord's resurrection from the dead. (See vs. 16-23.)

It is not to be found in the subsequent commission given to the eleven by Christ, before his ascension into heaven.

That commission prefaced by these words: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth;" was addressed to the *eleven*. It spread the world before them as the field of labor. It commanded them to evangelize all nations; to administer baptism; and to preach the gospel, by teaching them to observe all things whatsoever the Redeemer had commanded them. And it was followed by a promise of ample assistance and support, couched in words that extended the commission to all their successors in the ministry, through all successive ages: "And lo, I am with you always, *even* unto the end of the world. Amen." (Matt. xxviii. 16-20.)

Let the Master explain his own meaning. "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?"

This question makes it evident that neither Peter nor the other disciples supposed, at this time, any *primacy* had been settled.

Hear what follows:

"And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily, I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven, &c." (Matt. xviii. 1-6.)

Again: In the same chapter, he said, "And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."

“ Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven ; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.” (vs. 15-18.)

The same lesson is inculcated in the following passage. “ And he came to Capernaum : and being in the house he asked them, What was it that ye disputed by the way ? But they held their peace : for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who *should* be greatest. And he set down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, “ If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last, and servant of all. And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them ; and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me : and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.” (Mark ix. 33-37.)

In view of these passages where is Peter's *Primacy* ?

Again : “ Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children, with her sons, worshipping him, and desiring a certain thing of him. And he said unto her, What wilt thou ? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left, in thy kingdom. But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with ? They say unto him, We are able. And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with ; but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give ; but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father. And when

the ten heard *it*, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. But Jesus called them *unto him*, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; And whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant; Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Matt. xx. 20-28.)

Where is the primacy?

In Mark x. 41, it is added: "And when the *ten* heard it, they began to be much displeased with James and John."

"But Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles, exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister. And whosoever of you will be chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Mark x. 42-45.)

Hear again the Master. "But be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." (Matt. xxiii. 8-12.)

Thus, while yet upon the earth, and before his death, he explained his own meaning, and taught us how to understand the words addressed to Peter, and through him to all his apostles.

In like manner did he address his disciples, when assembled with closed doors, for fear of the Jews. On the evening of the first day of the week, "came Jesus and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you : as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost : Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John xx. 19-23.)

Thomas, who had been absent from this meeting of the disciples, and was unbelieving when they told him, they had seen the Lord ; being present when his Master appeared again to his disciples, eight days after, was addressed by him ; and being fully convinced, exclaimed, " My Lord and my God." (vs. 26-29.)

So far it is plain the disciples had no knowledge of any thing like *primacy* being given to Peter ; nor is there any scriptural evidence that Peter himself entertained any such impression on his mind ; although, like his fellow apostles, while mistaking the nature of Christ's kingdom, he may have felt the working of unholy and carnal ambition of preeminence in authority.

And if our Lord had really settled the question, at so early a period as Romanists assume, would he not, when the question arose, at two different times, after-

wards among his disciples, have put an end to their disputes, by telling them he had assigned the *primacy* to Peter? But how differently did he treat their ambitious disputes! He told them plainly that the way to exalt themselves in his kingdom, was to humble themselves, after the example He their Lord and Master had set them.

In view of all these passages of Scripture compared together, are we not taught, that our blessed Lord had not assigned any *primacy to Peter*, and that he had no design of giving such preeminence to any apostle?

CHAPTER IV.

THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PETER'S PRIMACY, CONFIRMED BY THE CASE AND TESTIMONY OF PAUL.

Let us now turn our attention to the case of the great apostle, and see what additional light can be fairly drawn from it against the assumption of Romanists, of *Peter's primacy*.

That Paul was a man of great genius, possessing mental endowments of high order; a mind diligently cultivated and enriched with stores of learning. That he sat at the feet of Gamaliel, a celebrated Jewish doctor, and profited in the Jews' religion above many his equals; is well known. In these respects he was far superior to Peter.

Peter had been highly honored in being chosen by our Lord as one of the twelve who attended on him

during the whole of his ministry on earth, and enjoyed the benefit of his divine instructions. But Paul was honored with the appearance of our Lord from heaven, who threw around him a light brighter than that of the noonday sun, and announced to him, that He had chosen him to be a minister to the Gentiles. "Whereupon, said he, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision: but shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance." (Acts xxvi. 13-20.)

Peter furnished two inspired epistles to the Canon of the Scripture; Paul, fourteen, constituting one-half or more of the New Testament.

Peter labored diligently and successfully among the Jews, being an apostle to the circumcision, and in some degree among the Gentiles. Paul's labors were far more and abundant and successful, and through a great region of country. "I will not dare," says this great man to the Romans, "to speak of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ. Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation; but as it is written, To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see; and they that have not heard shall understand. For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming unto you. But now having no more place in these

parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you; whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come unto you; for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherwards by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company," &c. (Rom. xv. 18-33.)

A signal honor was conferred on Paul, in which Peter never participated. "He was caught up to the third heaven;" whether in the body or out of the body he could not tell: "he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is unlawful for man to utter." With what delicacy he touches this matter, speaking in the third person! (2 Cor. xii, 2-4.)

Does the reader wish to know more of this great apostle? He is referred to 2 Cor. xi. 13-33. *Such was PAUL.*

II. We assume it will be conceded by all fair reasoners, that if our Lord had really constituted Peter *Primate* or *Prince* of the apostolic College, the fact would have been made known to Paul, and acknowledged by him.

If, therefore, it can be proved that Paul neither knew, nor acknowledged the fact, it will follow *conclusively*, that the pretensions of Romanists in regard to Peter's *primacy* must be destitute of truth.

This can be proved from the vindication of himself in his epistle to the Galatians,—from the proceedings of the council at Jerusalem,—and from the vindication of his apostolical authority, in his second epistle to the Corinthians.

1. *From the vindication of himself in his epistle to the Galatians.*

To bring back that Church to the faith of the gos-

pel, which he had preached among them, and from which, through Judaizing teachers, they were in danger of falling, he makes this solemn declaration: "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me, is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." (chap. i. 11, 12.)

In proof of this he states that as soon as God had revealed to him his Son Jesus Christ, he conferred not with flesh and blood; nor did he go up to Jerusalem to receive either instruction or authority; but commenced preaching the gospel at Damascus. He then went into Arabia, and returned to Damascus.

Three years elapsed before Paul went up to Jerusalem to visit Peter. He abode with him fifteen days. During his stay in that city, he saw no other apostle, but James, the Lord's brother. To this he solemnly deposes. (vs. 15-20.)

"Afterwards," he says, "I came into Syria and Cilicia; but was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea, which were in Christ; but they had heard only, That he which persecuted us, in times past, now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed. And they glorified God in me." (vs. 21-24.)

2. *From the proceedings of the council held at Jerusalem.* (Acts xv.)

It was *fourteen years* after his first visit to Peter mentioned above, that Paul went again to Jerusalem to attend that council to settle a most important question. It related to the circumcision of Gentile believers, and their obligation to observe the law of Moses. He knew they were under no obligation to keep that law, nor to be circumcised. So he taught wherever he preached the gospel; and when he and

Barnabas, guided by revelation, went to Jerusalem, for the purpose of attending the council; they refused to allow *Titus*, a *Greek*, who accompanied them, to be circumcised, to gratify Jewish prejudices; and thus maintained the liberty which Christ had granted to his church by freeing them from that heavy yoke that God had, for wise reasons, imposed on his ancient people. (Gal. ii. 1-5.)

As "they passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles, they caused great joy to all the brethren." And when they reached Jerusalem, "they were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders; and they declared all things that God had done with them." (Acts xv. 2-4)

The apostles and elders being assembled in council to deliberate on the question submitted, and much disputing having occurred, *Peter* rose up and addressed the council thus: "Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as *he did* unto us: And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved, even as they." (vs. 7-11.)

Peter having taken his seat, "the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." (v. 12.)

James, who appeared to act as Moderator, then addressed the council; and, in the close of his address, gave his opinion what should be done. (See vs. 19-21.)

It was approved by the whole assembly; and chosen men of their own company were sent with Paul and Barnabas to Antioch; bearing letters in which they unanimously condemned the conduct of those Judaizing teachers, who had troubled the church at Antioch, and sustained the doctrine and practice of Paul and Barnabas.

The epistle being read to the church at Antioch, "they rejoiced for the consolation." (vs. 30, 31.)

In the proceedings of this council there is not the slightest appearance of any superiority of Peter in authority or honor; and Paul tells us, that he neither saw nor acknowledged any. See his statement of the result of the council. "And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." (Gal. ii. 6-10.)

3. *From the vindication of his apostolic authority, in his second epistle to the Corinthians.*

Paul had been defamed and traduced, by false apostles, ministers of Satan, who endeavored to undermine and destroy his influence at Corinth; and thus to enable them, with greater facility, to accomplish their wicked design of subverting the truth of the gospel, which he had so successfully preached in that opulent and luxurious city.

In these circumstances he felt it a duty to endeavor to counteract their sinister design, by vindicating and

maintaining the authority he had received from the Lord Jesus Christ; who had commissioned him as his apostle to the Gentiles; and enabled him to be faithful in discharging his multiplied duties, and sustained him under his severe labors, and painful trials and sufferings.

The vindication of himself is commenced in the *tenth* chapter, and is carried on, through the following chapters, to the end of this epistle.

He speaks of the spiritual power imparted to him, for edification, and not for destruction, which he could exert, when present with the Corinthians, as well as in his letters, when absent;—of his rule to preach the gospel where it had not been preached, and not to build on another man's foundation;—of his success at Corinth, and of his anxiety, lest Satan, by the agency of false teachers, should corrupt their minds and draw them from the simplicity of the gospel of Christ;—of his labors among them, being free from any charge to them, and his determination to continue thus to labor in the regions of Achaia, to counteract the boasting of false teachers;—of his Hebrew descent;—of his abundant labors, great sufferings from stripes above measure, frequent imprisonment, and exposure to death;—of his manifold dangers, by land and water, from robbers, from his own countrymen, and the heathen, and false brethren;—and of his sufferings from weariness, watchings, hunger and thirst, frequent fastings, cold and nakedness;—and especially from incessant and daily care of all the churches.

He speaks of the abundant visions and revelations he had been favored with from the Lord;—of his rapture into the third heavens already noticed;—and of

the thorn in the flesh, the messenger from Satan to buffet him, lest, through the abundant revelations, he should be exalted above measure.

Thrice, he says, he besought the Lord to remove this thorn; yet it was not taken away. But his gracious Lord granted what he prized more highly, His assurance: "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness."

Fully confiding in the faithfulness of his Master the apostle exclaimed: "Most gladly, therefore, will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong."

After this general sketch of Paul's vindication of his apostolical character, it is proper to quote, in his own words, two passages to prove that he felt himself to stand on ground of equality with any and every apostle.

In chapter xi. 5, he says, "For I suppose I was not *a whit behind* the very chiefest apostle."

And in chapter xii, after having spoken of the abundant visions and revelations of the Lord to him he says, (verse 11-19,) "I am become a fool in glorying: ye have compelled me: for I ought to have been commended of you: for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing. Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds. For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? Forgive me this wrong."

Now mark the love of this glorious apostle! "Be

hold, the third time I am coming to you; and I will not be burdensome to you: for I seek not your's but you: for the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children. And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you: though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved."

What devotion to his Master's service! What love to the souls of men! What forgetfulness of himself, when fidelity to the honor of his apostolic office did not forbid it!

One incident in the history of this great apostle must not be omitted.

Subsequently to the delivery of the decree of the council at Jerusalem to the church in Antioch, Peter came down to that city. And while there, knowing the ceremonial law had lost its binding authority, and that Jewish believers might associate with Gentile christians, "he did eat with the Gentiles;" but when "certain came from James," fearing to incur censure from those circumcised brethren, "he withdrew and separated himself," and no longer ate with Gentile believers. "The example became contagious. The other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation."

Paul felt his noble soul grieved at such unchristian conduct, so inconsistent with the recent decree of the council, and determined to maintain the liberty which Christ had bestowed on his Church. He was much younger in the apostleship and in age than Peter; but knowing his official authority from Christ to be entirely equal to that of his elder brother, he felt it to be his duty to do what he could, to arrest the growing evil. He determined, therefore, to give Peter a

public rebuke. Accordingly he embraced an opportunity for uttering "before them all" that faithful and pungent reproof, which is recorded in Gal. i 14-21.

Here we might exult and say to Romanists and their sympathisers, Behold your ——! No; we would rather take a lesson on the weakness of human nature, though renewed by divine grace, when not upheld by continual supplies of heavenly influence and suggest, that, probably in foresight of the great abuse that would be made of Peter's official character for establishing claims so utterly opposite to scriptural truth, by "that man of sin" that would arise in the Church; and to furnish its friends with spiritual weapons, in contending "for the truth, once delivered to the saints:" his Master was pleased to leave him to himself, as He did once before, in a more humiliating manner.

And we would also admire that grace, by which Peter was again recovered from his scandalous declension.

He felt the truth uttered by Paul, and that his unchristian conduct and base dissimulation merited this public exposure. He, therefore, made no reply, humbly submitted to the chastisement administered, by the hand of his younger and more upright brother.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.

We have now proved, we think,

1. That Paul was, in genius, in natural endowments, and in education, far superior to Peter:
2. That the visions and revelations granted to Paul were more than those vouchsafed to Peter:

3. That the inspired writings, which Paul contributed to the *Canon* of Sacred Scriptures, amounted to one-half of the New Testament; (if not more;) and were of course far greater than the two short epistles of Peter:

4. That in labors, in sufferings, in success in spreading the gospel, in consistency of character, and uniform uprightness of christian conduct, Paul far exceeded Peter:

5. That Paul asserted, *under inspiration*, his EQUALITY with the *very chiefest* apostle.

6. It, therefore follows, that, as he never acknowledged any inferiority to Peter, or to any other apostle, he certainly never knew his inferiority to any one; because, if his Lord and Master had made known to him the Primacy of Peter, he would readily have submitted to His will, and most cheerfully made it known.

In opposition to all this evidence against the assumption of the Romanists, no evidence can be produced, from Scripture, that any of the apostles acknowledged or even 'knew of Peter being advanced in authority above his fellow apostles; but additional evidence to the contrary can be produced; for it is written, "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they *sent* unto them *Peter* and *John*."

If Peter had been the *Prince* of the apostles, they might have requested him to go, but they could not, and would not, have SENT HIM.

Finally: What is the fair conclusion to be drawn from the preceding facts and reasoning?

Is it not this? There is no Scriptural evidence at all, that Peter was appointed by Christ *Prince*, *Pri-*

mate or *Chief* of his apostles, in honor and authority

Any tradition, then, to the contrary, is *worthless* and will receive His indignant and terrible rebuke when He comes to purify His Church, from all error in doctrine, and all assumption of anti-christian authority.

CHAPTER V.

THE GREAT FACT FATAL TO THE CLAIMS OF ROME AND TO
THE REASONING OF HER PROTESTANT ADVOCATE.

That papacy had no existence till the early part of the seventh century, is a truth so firmly established by history, that it cannot be disputed by any one who has read history carefully to ascertain the truth.

Indeed even Professor Schaff, impelled by truth has acknowledged most distinctly that there was no pope during *six centuries*. And yet, after this explicit acknowledgment, he has artfully, but most disingenuously, tried to induce the readers of his history to believe that the papacy began with Peter, the apostle. But he contradicts himself again and again, in the attempt.

This will clearly appear as we proceed in this chapter.

His acknowledgment we here exhibit in his own form :

“FIRST AGE.

“The PRIMITIVE or the GRÆCO-LATIN (Eastern and Western) UNIVERSAL CHURCH, from its foundation on the day of Pentecost to Gregory the Great (A. D. 30-590) ; thus embracing the first six centuries.

- “*First Period*: The *Apostolic* church, from the first Christian Pentecost to the death of the apostles (A. D. 30-100).
 “*Second Period*: The *Persecuted* church (*ecclesia pressa*), to the reign of Constantine (311).
 “*Third Period*: The *established* church of the *Great-Roman empire*, and amidst the barbarian storms, to Gregory the Great (590).” [page 36.]

The Eastern church is here justly placed before the Western; for the church was in part founded in East first, and afterward the church in the West; and it is certain the *Papacy* had no existence during the period assigned to the “*first age*,” by Prof. Schaf.

Could this German doctor have presented his acknowledgment in a more distinct form?

And why did he so exhibit the fact? Did he not sincerely believe what he wrote to be the truth, and did he not wish his readers to believe this to be a veritable historical fact? Why then does he try, in different ways, to remove this impression from the readers' mind?

And when afterwards, in a very distant part of his book, he writes differently, had he changed his view of the time when the Papacy began to exist? Why then did he not confess the fact? Or did he write what he wrote on page 36, because he thought it would not be *politic* to write what he has written in a subsequent part of his history, and now wishes his readers to believe?

True, had this German Protestant, in the first part of his history, written that the Papacy began as early as the time when Peter was (as he says) at Rome; and that “the Church of Rome has inherited the prerogatives and gifts of Peter;” (p. 377,) it would have awakened the suspicions of the German Reformed Church, that he was not what he was reported to be, and professed himself to be, a *Protestant*, but a *Roman Catholic*.

He has really placed himself in an awkward condition, so as to compel himself to write very contradictory statements. Who can reconcile the first and the subsequent part of his history?

Truth and honesty are lovely and consistent; but the opposite qualities will always plunge a person into embarrassments and difficulties.

It is idle in Professor S. to indulge the hope of being able to recall what he has written about the commencement of Popery, on page 36, by mere assertions, unsupported by facts. When he wrote what appears at the beginning of the chapter about the "*first age*," he wrote what is *substantially*, but not *exactly* true.

The historical fact acknowledged by S. to be true, sweeps away more than *sixty* bishops of Rome, denominated *Popes* by *Roman Catholic writers*.

Peter was no pope, but an apostle. His field of labour was the world, and not the narrow limits of a city, though an imperial one. Schaff himself agrees with what I have just written. On page 372, he writes thus:

"That Peter, as long as he was in Rome," (it is uncertain whether he was ever there,) "was associated with Paul at the head of the church, and exercised a leading influence, needs no proof. But he was not the *first* bishop of Rome in the *later* sense of the term; for the apostolic office was not confined to a particular diocese, but implies a commission to the whole world; nor was he *pope* in the *Roman* sense; for this contradicts the independent dignity of Paul, as we learn it from all his epistles, as well as from the Acts of the Apostles."

"This erroneous view meets us first in the Ebionistic Clementine Homilies, from which, as afterwards, wrought into the more orthodox Recognitions, it passed into the Catholic Church." [Quere, Roman Catholic Church?]

"*Clement* himself, the third bishop of Rome, knows nothing of it; and from his glowing description of Paul in his fifth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, it is pretty evident that he ascribes greater importance for the Roman church to this apostle, than to Peter of whom he has much less to say."

And had not CLEMENT access to the best sources of correct information in regard to the facts of the case? If he be regarded as the *third* bishop of Rome, only *twenty-four* years had passed away from the death of Peter, in A. D. 67; but if he was the *first* bishop of Rome, as Schaff believes, after Peter's decease, he certainly had the best means of knowing the fact. In either case, we may rely on his testimony. See Bower's history of the Popes, vol. i., pp. 4-7.

"Irenaeus and Eusebius," adds S., "rather name Linus (other fathers Clement) as *first* bishop of Rome; and even Epiphanius plainly makes a distinction between the apostolic and the episcopal offices."

And should not every correct thinker, who governs himself by the teachings of the Holy Scriptures, and rejects delusive traditions, accept a distinction so manifestly just and scriptural?

Certainly the acknowledgment of Professor S. about the time when the papacy appeared, on page 36 of his history, is fully confirmed by the above quotations.

But this German Professor cannot abandon his beloved Papacy; and in his long note which we shall presently notice and characterize, he begins his unholy work of upholding this monstrous evil, this *curse* to the church and to the world; and struggles hard to palliate its wickedness, and to save it from merited reprobation.

CHAPTER VI.

THE POISON OF PÖPERY IN SCHAF'S HISTORY EXPOSED.

Having in the preceding chapters exposed the *Poison of Popery*, in the Extract from Dr. Schaff's Essay, and presented, at large, the *Scriptural argument* against the claims of the Romish church for Peter's *Primacy*, and proved them, as we think, to be groundless;—we proceed to expose the *poison of Popery* in his recently published history in the English language.

The poison of Popery will be seen clearly, by an attentive examination of a long note, compared with other parts of his history.

It begins near the middle of page 374, covers the two next pages and almost page 377.

A singular note indeed! containing contradictions, chronological errors,—misrepresentations,—artful arrangements,—unfounded facts,—bold assertions,—and sophistical reasoning!

This note we shall analyze, and answer its various portions.

Thus it begins:

“NOTE.—The vast importance of the subject calls upon us, before taking leave of Peter, to add a few remarks on *the claims of papacy*, which are well known to centre here.”

Centre where? What has Peter to do with the papacy? Had not Schaff denied again and again that Peter was a pope, and given up his primacy among the apostles? Had he not explicitly acknowledged that *six hundred years* of the Christian era had

passed away before the papacy appeared? Does he now intend to claim Peter as the first Pope, contrary to his own acknowledgment and *all true history*? Let us hear what he has further to say.

“ These claims, however, by no means rest entirely on the memorable words of Matt. xvi. 18, which are now admitted by the best Protestant commentators (such as Dr. S. likes) to refer to Peter, and upon the actual superiority of this apostle. as it appears clear as the sun in the gospel and in the first part of the Acts.”

What a specimen of bold, dogmatic and unfounded assertions, this rash man is accustomed to utter!

When he penned it, could Dr. S. have forgotten what he had written on p. 259, at the close of the first paragraph?

“ Then again, from the conduct of Paul we may learn, not only the right and duty of combatting the errors of the most distinguished servants of Christ, but also the *equality* of the apostles, in opposition to an *undue exaltation* of Peter above his colleagues.”

Can any one reconcile these statements? Are they not *really contradictory*? Can S. himself look at them and not blush? Did he suppose that, by a bold assertion, he could conceal the contradiction, and escape detection?

The reader is referred to the Scriptural arguments in our chapters ii, iii, and iv. ; where, we think it to be clearly proved, that Peter had no superiority assigned to him over the other apostles, by our Lord; and that Paul claimed rank equal to the *very chiefest* apostle.

What, then, is this bold assertion of this singular writer worth, in opposition to the testimony of Sacred Scriptures; and even to his own declaration, made when reading the Scriptures, and reasoning on the rebuke, which Paul administered publicly to Peter, for his base dissimulation, at Antioch?

Who are these best Protestant commentators, of whom S. speaks? Not one is named.

Commentators will certainly admit that these memorable words refer to Peter, because they were addressed to Peter. But no Protestant commentator (except such as S., who profess to be Protestants, while in fact they are Papists) admits that these words teach the *actual superiority of Peter*.

I readily grant that these memorable words refer to Peter; but I deny that they teach the actual superiority of Peter, and also that his superiority can be proved either from the gospels, or from the Acts.

Peter was not primate in the apostolic college. This fact has been fully established in our chapters ii, iii, and iv.

In Matt. xviii. 18, the powers of the *keys* were given by our Lord and Master to all the apostles; for, addressing them, He said, "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

Moreover, Schaf himself has, in a previous part of his book (page 259) abandoned Peter's primacy; for there he writes thus:

"Then again, from the conduct of Paul, &c,"

as already quoted. (See page 107.) Besides we shall presently see in a subsequent part of his note he is compelled to abandon it a second time.

Now, after such a boast of Peter's primacy, uttered in such strong language, who could expect the paragraph to end in the following words:

"They (claims of the papacy) are built also upon **TWO OTHER assumptions**, which can not be proved, at least directly, from the New Testament, and must, therefore, maintain themselves on historical and dogmatic ground.*

* NOTE.—The italics and capitals are mine.

On this we remark :

1. The primacy of Peter is justly admitted by Schaff to be an *assumption*, as well as the two of which he immediately after proceeds to speak ; for the primacy of Peter can find no more proof in the New Testament, than the two other assumptions by "Roman Catholic theologians" can.

2. How plainly does the end of this paragraph contradict and put to shame the boastful and dogmatic language in which the preceding part is uttered.

3. To show that this German philosopher contradicts himself, it is not necessary to bring into comparison distant parts of his book ; (as we have properly done ;) it is sufficient to analyze a single paragraph to put him in opposition to himself.

The claims of the papacy, then, rest, by Schaff's own confession, not on *two*, but *three* ASSUMPTIONS ; and yet this inconsistent writer has the hardihood to assert that "the actual superiority" of Peter is admitted by the "best Protestant commentators;" and that it is as "clear as the sun in the gospels and in the first part of the Acts."

Here Dr. S. confesses the truth. The claims of the papacy rest on THREE ROMAN CATHOLIC ASSUMPTIONS : that is, on *three rotten pillars*, which will fall to the ground, and leave the papacy a tremendous wreck, in the appointed and awful day, when that fearful prediction (2 Thess. ii. 2-12) shall receive its full accomplishment.

In regard to these three assumptions, so strangely arranged and numbered, perhaps intentionally, that unskilful readers might not notice the *fact*, that there are really *three assumptions* "by Roman Catholic theologians," to sustain their false dogma of Peter's pri-

macy; it will be sufficient to remark, that if the Scriptures furnish no evidence in its favor, but really furnish conclusive evidence, that the divine Head of the church placed all his apostles in the same class, *on a level as to authority*; then it will *logically* follow, that these assumptions are *worthless*, and *impiously* set up in direct opposition to his *supreme and published WILL*.

This, we believe, our *three chapters*, in which the unscriptural claims of the Romish church have been discussed, fully establish; and that Peter never did, nor could, transfer to the bishop of Rome, what did not belong to him to transfer to any bishop whatever.

Here we might rest the question; but as Schaff is very desirous to uphold the Romish Church, we shall quote in full what he has written on the two assumptions:

“1. The first assumption is, that this primacy of Peter is *transferable*. This is based by Roman Catholic theologians partly on the general ground of the nature and wants of the church, partly on the special promise of her indestructibility immediately added by the Lord to his words respecting Peter, Matt. 16: 18; whereas the older Protestant controversialists commonly regard the pre-eminence in question as simply affecting Peter *personally*, as in the case of the surnames given to other apostles and referring to corresponding personal gifts and relations,—“sons of thunder,” for example, applied to the sons of Zebedee (Mark 3: 17); “Zelotes,” to Simon (Luke 6: 15. Acts 1: 13); “traitor,” to Judas Iscariot (Luke 6: 16).

“2. The second assumption is, that Peter *did actually transfer* his primacy; and that, not to the bishop of Jerusalem, nor of Antioch, where he resided at any rate a considerable time, but to the bishop of *Rome*. The truth of this turns primarily on historical inquiry respecting Peter’s residence and martyrdom in Rome. These two points we have conceded in this section and the preceding, with almost all the leading Protestant historians, as strongly attested and well grounded facts; admitting, that without such historical foundation the eighteen hundred years’ history of the papacy would be to us absolutely unaccountable.”

What does S. mean by Peter’s *residence* at Rome? May not his meaning be ascertained from what he

says in a previous quotation from page 372? where he writes :

“That Peter, as long as he was in Rome, was associated with Paul at the head of the church, and exerted a leading influence, needs no proof.”

Manifestly, this imports, that both apostles were, at the same time, actively, and without hinderance, labouring and preaching together in that great imperial city of *heathendom*. Such an interesting and important fact surely needs proof. None is given.

Paul met Peter at Jerusalem three years after his conversion and commission to the apostleship, and abode with him *fifteen* days. Then, fourteen years afterwards, he saw him again in the same city, whither he had gone by divine direction to appear in the council of the apostles, to deliberate and decide on an important practical question of great interest to the Church.

And a third time they met at Antioch; where Paul administered to Peter publicly a severe but merited rebuke, for his cowardice and base dissimulation.

All these meetings of these two apostles are distinctly recorded in the epistles of Paul or in the Acts.

If, then, Peter and Paul had met, as S. supposes in Rome, and laboured and preached together in that pagan city, certainly a record of so important a fact would have been written by the hand of Paul, or by his attached and faithful friend and companion, *Luke*.

But not a hint of such active associated labours in Rome, is any where to be found, either in the epistles of Paul or in the Acts written by Luke.

Does not the absence of a bare hint of such an interesting event, especially when viewed in connexion with what has been said about CLEMENT, (page 105,) render it not only improbable, but *certain* that

it never occurred? How absurd to suppose that Clement should succeed Pope Peter, in the papacy, whether as the *first*, *second* or *third*, and not know that he was sitting in Peter's papal chair!

Yet this liberal German Protestant does not hesitate to write thus:

"These two points we have conceded in this section and the preceding, with almost all the leading Protestant historians, as strongly attested and well-grounded facts."

This we shall number as the **FOURTH** *assumption* of Roman Catholic theologians; the *fourth rotten pillar* to prop up the throne of his holiness, the pope, who claims to be the vicar of Christ, and successor of St. Peter, that abused apostle!

So confidently speaks a German philosopher of an event, the residence of Peter in Rome, and his active labours and preaching with Paul, in that city; although destitute of all credible testimony. What a philosopher! How kind in his contributions to the Romish church!

As to the "leading Protestant historians of whom he speaks, but does not name, I make no inquiry for two reasons.

The first relates to himself. I have seen so much of his habit of making hasty assertions, that I must be allowed to say I do not credit his statement, because it is his.

The second reason relates to him and the leading Protestant historians; for he has involved them and himself in the egregious blunder of attributing to the papacy an "historical foundation of eighteen hundred years."

What a blunder for a man who prides himself on his knowledge of history! Does he not know that, for

six centuries at least, the Papacy had no existence? This he has expressly admitted. (p. 36.)

Surely he knows enough of arithmetic to be sure, that, if, from 1853, the year in which his history was published, 600 be deducted, 1800 years cannot remain for the *Papacy*. Was their no design in this misstatement?

“Paul dwelt (before his martyrdom) two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him; preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him.” (Acts xviii. 30, 31.)

Where can a like scriptural testimony be found, in support of Peter's preaching in Rome?

It is doubted by historians whether Peter was ever in that city; and even Prof. S., after all his pains to prove that he was, is compelled to say, (p. 371 bottom,)

“We can hardly extend his sojourn there beyond a year.”

And is it not probable, that he was carried a prisoner to Rome (if there) to suffer martyrdom? Yet Prof. S. strives with great earnestness to assist Roman Catholic writers in proving Peter the *apostle to the circumcision*, was bishop of Rome, at the very time Paul the *apostle of the Gentiles*, was preaching there in the *region divinely assigned to him!* Does not this carry absurdity on its face?*

* BOWERS, who wrote a history of the popes was a converted *Jesuit*; and, among other offices he had held in the Romish Church, was that of COUNSELLOR OF THE INQUISITION IN MASERATA.

He has carefully written on the question of Peter being at Rome. He repudiates the traditions on which Romanists rely, and shows they are not worthy of credit; and after a full and able discussion, he writes:

SCHAFF STULTIFIES HIMSELF.

“This concession, however, is not enough to establish a continued primacy of the Roman See, much less an actual supremacy of jurisdiction. For Paul was likewise in Rome and suffered martyrdom there; nor are we anywhere informed, that he was at all subject to the authority of Peter. Besides, there is no document whatever to be found respecting any actual transfer of the primacy to Linus or Clement; and it is not even certain which of these two was the first hishop of Rome, as the statements of the church fathers differ here.

“For the point in hand, therefore, no proper historical or diplomatic evidence can be brought, and the only resort is the general philosophical argument, that the successor in office is, in the nature of the case by regular ordination, heir to the prerogatives of his predecessor. This is undoubtedly true with the limitation: so far as these prerogatives are inseparable from the office itself. Thus we are thrown back upon the first proposition, and all turns at last on the question, whether the Lord, in that prophetic passage, instituted a permanent, or only a temporary primacy, for the superintendence of the Christian Church.”

Now, let the reader be reminded, that Dr. S. came to this country, professing to be a real Protestant of the German Reformed Church, and, at his induction into office, adopted the Heidelberg Catechism as the confession of his faith; and, of course, that he believed in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and in all their fundamental doctrines. Let him recollect, also, that in his history (page 36) he writes, that the papacy had no existence for 600 years, and that (on p. 107) he abandoned the primacy of Peter; that I have convicted him of contradicting himself again and again.

“To conclude, St. Peter was, perhaps, hishop *at* Rome, not *of* Rome. He was hishop at Rome, if he ever was there, being, in virtue of his apostleship, empowered to discharge, at Rome, and everywhere else, all episcopal functions; but was not specially Bishop of Rome, or any other place; that is, he did not take upon him the charge of any particular hishop, the administration of any particular bishopric, that being inconsistent both with the dignity and office of an apostle or universal hishop.” See vol. 1, page 4.

And let the reader remember likewise, that, in this long note, he has been struggling hard to sustain the primacy of Peter; and that, in the part just preceding the last quotation, he had conceded the two Roman Catholic assumptions in favor of the primacy of Peter, and that "his actual superiority was as clear as the sun."

What does this Protestant professor and historian say in this last quotation?

Does he not give up all his "concessions"—his "strongly attested and well-founded facts"—and say

"Thus are we thrown back upon the first proposition, and all turns at last on the question, whether the Lord, in that prophetic passage, instituted a permanent, or only a temporary primacy for the superintendence of the Christian Church."(?)

Do I err in saying that Professor Schaff, in such contradictory statements, has *stultified himself*; and consequently is certainly a most unsafe guide?

Were this German doctor to confide in the teachings of the Holy Scriptures more, and in traditions less, he would be saved from such dishonorable *vacillations* in his views; and learn that Jesus Christ, *the true Head of His visible church on earth, and church in heaven*, will, when he comes to purify his church on earth, not only prostrate the Pope from his impious throne, but rebuke all civil rulers for daring to place themselves at its head, in their respective countries, and also that he has not left the *modelling* of its government to *German philosophers*, whether papal or self styled Protestants.

CHAPTER VII.

THE POISON OF POPYERY IN SCHAFF'S HISTORY FURTHER EXPOSED.

After the quotations already given in the preceding chapter, follows a long paragraph, covering the remainder of page 375, containing twenty-six lines in small type.

It is a tissue of artful misrepresentations and sophistical reasoning, designed to suit the writer's own purposes.

As we have done in regard to the preceding parts of this long note, we shall distribute it into separate portions, with our several answers.

Schaff, in his papistical strain, writes,

"The ultra-Protestant view decidedly repudiates the idea of the permanent primacy, and denies the papacy the least scriptural ground or divine right."

Answer: Were S. an honest Protestant he certainly would not have written "The ultra-Protestant view," and thus shown himself to be a real papist. He would have acknowledged this to be the true scriptural view, and embraced it as his own view. That it is correct, we refer him and our readers to our three preceding chapters, in which the question of Peter's primacy has been amply discussed; and, as we think, correctly decided against the Romish claims. (pp.)

And will Schaff himself pretend the Papacy had any Scriptural ground for assuming "a supremacy of jurisdiction?" This he denies to it in the second and third line of the next paragraph, (p. 376,) and reduces it to "*a primacy of honor and influence (primus inter pares).*"

Protestants and Reformers of the sixteenth and subsequent centuries, regarded Popery as the "Man of Sin;" as "the Son of Perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God," &c.; foretold by Paul, as about to arise in the Church. (2 Thess. ii. 3-12.)

And for avowing this to be their belief, and that Popery was ANTI-CHRIST, they were slain and burnt at the stake.

In England, under the reign of that unhappy queen, called "Bloody Mary," many Protestants perished. Bishops Latimer and Ridley, as well as Archbishop Cranmer, were burnt at the stake.

Cranmer had been very influential under HENRY VIII, in bringing about the Reformation.

Unhappily, however, Cranmer, when *Mary* ascended the throne, being left to himself, through fear of death, renounced the true faith, and relapsed into *Popery*. Tormented by his conscience for his shameful apostasy, he found no rest; and deeply humbled before God, on account of his great sin, he longed for the stake, that he might testify publicly his deep repentance in the presence of his friends and enemies, and to the world.

Chained to the stake, he, before the flame had reached his vital parts, to punish his right hand for signing his recantation, stretched it forth to be consumed by the fire, and held it there till the flames approached his body and extinguished his life. See

NOTE.—I quote from an edition of Fox, in my library, in two quarto vols. pp. 1608, published by *W. Durell*, N.-Y., in 1794, with numerous plates. A sketch of his life may be found in *Lempriere's Bio. Dict.* vol. i.

Fox's Book of Martyrs, vol. ii. page 219, and his letters to Queen Mary and others, (pp. 220-228,) and his life (pp. 158-219).

He was, on the whole, a truly learned and a pious man.

But Dr. Schaff says,

“To this extreme view, however, we cannot at all agree;”

And then assigns his reasons.

“It not only turns all history, before the Reformation, into an inextricable labyrinth, but gives the lie to the Lord's precious promise to be, and rule in his church continually—for it is an absolute impossibility to make out an unbroken perpetuity of Christianity without the Catholic Church—nay, it plays mightily in its results, without willing or knowing it, into the hands of skepticism and infidelity.”

To the above answer we add the following particulars:

First: Able, learned and true Protestants have indeed denounced the Papacy, as this writer states, and grounded their denunciation on the passages of the New Testament to which Prof. S. refers.

Second: In a subsequent chapter, under the heading, “THE CHARACTER OF THE PAPACY OR ROMISH CHURCH, drawn by the pen of inspiration, it will be shown that such a denunciation is perfectly just and scriptural.

Third: Prof. Schaff associates himself with Papists, Roman Catholic writers, who say the same thing; because they reject the teachings of the Holy Scriptures; and having closed this blessed volume, and adopted a creed prescribed by the Papacy, they are given up to “believe a lie.” (2 Thess. ii. 11.)

Here we see the *man*. How bold, and dogmatical, and artful! Certainly here the Doctor is pleading for the Papal Church; and this he calls “the Catholic

Church. He certainly knew that, for six hundred years at least, the Papal Church had no existence. During six centuries, there was no Pope; although aspiring bishops may have coveted to be exalted, as the head of Christendom. It cannot be doubted he had read of the Greek Church, of the African Church, of the British Church, &c.

There was likewise in the valleys of Piedmont that noble Church of the Waldenses, which retired from the corruptions creeping into the Church of Rome, and which so soon began to bear its testimony against them; and when the Papacy came into existence, it protested firmly against its errors and its jurisdiction. This noble protest it maintained through many centuries of persecution, by fire and sword, down to the present day; holding a true faith and a scriptural form of ecclesiastical government.

But for this Church the Professor seems to have no love. As far as I can find he has entirely overlooked that people so signally honored by the Master.

How easily could this historian, (had not his eyes been beclouded by his attachment to Popery,) have traced an unbroken perpetuity of Christianity through these different Churches; and discovered the fulfilment of "the Lord's precious promise to be and rule in his Church continually!" And, among these Churches, scattered as they were over different parts of the world, he might have seen, for six hundred years, a *true visible, Catholic Church*.

We add as a further answer, who ever thought of exhibiting an unbroken history of Christianity *without the CATHOLIC Church?* This would be indeed an impossibility, which no *sane* man would attempt.

The corruptions in *doctrine*, and in *practice*, and in

worship, introduced into the Church of Christ, *by* the *Papacy*, which even Schaff is compelled to acknowledge;—which deplorable evils led, in the providence of God, to the glorious and blessed Reformation; really produced a *labyrinth*, which none but men of genius, industry, true piety, learning and hearty attachment to scriptural truth, can pass through. But difficult as it certainly is, it is not “an absolute impossibility to exhibit an unbroken Christianity in the *Catholic Church*.”

Such an exhibition in the ROMAN CATHOLIC Church is indeed an absolute impossibility; but not in the CATHOLIC Church.

It has been done by “the father of Church history,” as Schaff says he is styled, *Mosheim*; and in general very correctly.

He has written “an ecclesiastical history, ancient and modern, from the birth of Christ to present, &c.,” in *six* volumes;—and also “Historical Commentaries on the state of Christianity during the first three hundred and twenty-five years.”

In his history in six volumes, are found, *first*, a history of the CATHOLIC Church;—*secondly*, a history of the ROMAN *Catholic* or *Papistical* church, with all its corruptions of the truth and abominations exposed to view, and not disguised as in Schaff’s history;—and *thirdly*, a history of the REFORMATION or the PROTESTANT Church, both *Lutheran* and *Reformed*.

“*Skepticism and Infidelity*,” we affirm to be the *genuine offspring*, not of the Catholic, but of the *Roman Catholic Church*. Had the Church of Rome, so highly praised by Paul, (Rom. i. 8,) maintained her primitive purity of character, and not, by forgetting his solemn warning, (ch. xi. 17–21,) become corrupt in doctrine,

idolatrous in worship, and apostate, Europe would not have been filled with skeptics and infidels.

In the next sentence to the one on which we have made our remarks, the Professor says :

“ No ! In the face of a history of *eighteen hundred years*, during which the papacy has really evinced something of a rock-like character.”

Answer : Thus he confounds the Catholic with the Roman Catholic Church, and ascribes to the Papacy an existence of 1800 years. See chap. v., p. 102, where this egregious blunder has been exposed and corrected.

Here he repeats the blunder noted already. He certainly knew that the papacy had not an existence for eighteen hundred years ; and that, as it was not born till the seventh century, there must, in calculating its age, at present, be a large deduction.

What, then, is to be thought of the repetition of this blunder, a *second time*, on the *same page* ! Does he calculate so much on our ignorance, (poor Americans !) as to imagine, that, by his art, and rhetoric, and dogmatism, he can make us believe a FALSEHOOD to be a *truth* ; because a great *German* professor chooses to assert it once and again ?

Had he stated the fact, and been inclined to use a fair comparison, he might have said :

The history of nearly twelve hundred years proves the papacy to be like a *coral rock*, unseen at first, but constantly growing, till it became visible, and at last an immense and dreadful rock ; against which, in a tempest, or at night, many a gallant ship has dashed and foundered and been lost. This would have been a fair comparison.

The comparison of Dr. Schaff emits strongly the odour of Popery.

The advocates of the Romish Church boast of her antiquity. We, therefore, ask him who seems inclined to use this weapon in her defence, (even just before the acknowledgments he is about to make on his next page,) whether length of time can change the nature of error and wickedness, so as to render the one *true* and the other virtuous, or, in other words, convert a *false* into a true religion, because it was originally divine?

Then may *Judaism* set up her claim; for doubtless she is a corruption of a religion truly divine; and she can trace her origin far beyond the Christian religion, up to the time of Abraham, the "*friend of God.*" And she has evinced a *rock-like* character. The Jews have resisted all the attempts of the Romish Church to change their faith, and have, through the bitterest persecutions, for ages, retained the erroneous belief and customs of their fathers.

Nay, even *Gentilism* can boast of a higher claim; for Noah knew, professed, and taught his descendants a religion received from heaven. But they soon corrupted it, and fell into idolatry, like the Roman Catholics; and shall their polytheism, in all their detestable varieties, be admitted as a true religion; because they have, for so many ages, wandered farther from God and truth, till they have plunged themselves into the grossest errors and darkness, and the vilest abominations?

Just as the *Papacy* advanced in age, she advanced in error and superstition; till not a doctrine of Christianity escaped pollution from her defiled hands; and the pure and simple worship of God, instituted by Jesus Christ, was turned into the vilest idolatry! And does Dr. S. imagine he can save her from the

condemnation she so richly deserves, by artfully speaking of her obstinate perseverance in error and wickedness, and by ascribing to her "a rock-like character."

The same strain appears in the next words :

"In the face of the clear testimony of almost all the Church fathers, both Greek and Latin, in favor of a peculiar preeminence of the Roman See, or the continuance of the *cathedra Petri* (chair of Peter) in some form."

Answer: A bold and reckless assertion! Schaff has not, nor can he name a single father of the church, of the first five centuries, that will sustain this shameless boast. See New-Brunswick Review, No. 2.

Here again is a positive assertion, without proof, reaching to the time of Peter's death; as if the Roman See had commenced so early. To destroy the erroneous impression he aims at producing on the reader's mind, I shall present the testimony of *Mosheim*, that profound and impartial historian. (vol. i. p. 103.)

"A bishop, during the first and second century, was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly, which, at that time, was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly, he acted not so much with the authority of a *master*, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful *servant*."

Where was "*the Roman See*," at this early period?

The historian goes on to describe the conduct of a primitive bishop. And then, in sect. xiii, he speaks of the origin of *dioceses* and of *chorepiscopi*, or city and country bishops (vol. i. p. 104.)

In the next section (xiv.) he says :

"The Churches, in those early times, were perfectly independent; none of them subject to foreign jurisdiction, but each governed by its own laws and its own rulers."

After noticing the deference shown to the Churches

founded by the apostles, and denying to them any "sort of supremacy over others," he adds:

Nothing, on the contrary, is more evident than the perfect equality that reigned in the primitive Churches," (page 105.)

Again: What Dr. S. says, immediately after the lines we have just corrected, about "the consistency and tenacity with which the Catholic Church has at all times held fast the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, &c.," is indeed true of the CATHOLIC, but *false* when affirmed of the *Roman Catholic* Church; which has corrupted more or less all the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and substituted in place of that capital article, JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE, a most pernicious dogma, *justification by works and penance*.

This the Professor knows; and he also knows, that the apostate Church of Rome has dealt in that shameful traffic, *the sale of indulgences*; by which the forgiveness of sins committed, and permission to commit sins, might be purchased for stipulated *sums of money*.

And yet he attributes to this Church what belongs to the true Catholic Church; for he is pleading the cause of the Romish Church.

"In view of the consistency and tenacity with which the Catholic Church has, at all times, held fast all the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, the Trinity, the true divinity and humanity of Christ, the inspiration and divine authority of the Bible (all of which anti-Christianity denies)."

Answer: This is true of the *Catholic* Church; but false in regard to the *Roman Catholic* Church, for she has taken away the Holy Scriptures from the people, and substituted her impious dogmas in the place of the Bible. Thus she has given her children "a stone for meat, and a serpent for a fish." (Matt. vii. 9, 10.)

CHAPTER VIII.

MERITS OF THE POPES.

Let us now examine what the learned Professor has to say "of the great merits of the Popes." Any one duly acquainted with ecclesiastical history, will be surprised at hearing these words, "the GREAT MERITS of the *Popes!*"

Dr. Schaff, however, is determined to be *impartial*, and attribute "great merits even to the Popes. It is our privilege, however, to question his impartiality, by examining their merits, in several particulars.

1. *The popes maintained ORTHODOXY.* How astonishing this claim! The history of many centuries stamps on this claim FALSE.

II. "The Popes asserted the unity, freedom and independence of the Church against the assaults of the secular power."

"The *unity* of the Church!" What kind of unity? The unity of *error*, by teaching the people to dishonor Jesus Christ, the alone Mediator, and confide in the mediation of departed saints, and of the virgin Mary. And by what means? By using their usurped power in depriving the people of the Bible, and compelling, with fire and sword, all to believe their anti-christian dogmas, and to do what they commanded, whether right or wrong!

The Popes asserted "the *freedom* and *independence* of the Church against the assaults of the secular powers." Indeed!

Has the Professor never read the history of PEPIN,

Mayor of the Palace of France; who dethroned his Master, and seated himself on the throne, with the concurrence of Pope ZACHARY, who needed the protection of his arms? Has he not read that this impious decision of ZACHARY was solemnly confirmed by STEPHEN II, his successor on the papal throne, and how both were amply rewarded by PEPIN? Has he not read of CHARLEMAGNE, that ambitious son of Pepin, who aspired "to the empire of the west and the government of *Rome*;" and who, by the *concurrence* of Popes, realized his lofty aspirations? Has he not read what great and ample rewards they received, both from the father and the son? Doubtless he has read this portion of history; and if he will read it again, as penned by *Mosheim*, he will, I think, find, in these transactions, no evidence that the Popes asserted the *independence* of the Church; though the Popes rejoiced in the secular donations they obtained; but abundant evidence of unchristian character and great ill desert. (See *Mosheim*, vol. ii. pp. 222-230. Cent. viii.)

III. The Popes upheld "*the sanctity of marriage!*" Amazing assertion! In the face of all history, does Prof. S. make it!!!

Does he not know, that before the Papacy became established, some of the primitive fathers, and particularly Jerome, extolled celibacy, in opposition to Scriptural teaching; and that the Popes soon began to require that bishops and priests should be unmarried men? And afterwards commanded those who were married to put away their wives.

He knows the history of HILDEBRAND, Pope GREGORY VII; how he exerted all his usurped power, as "head Christendom," against the marriage of ecclesi-

astics, and commanded bishops and priests to put away their lawful wives.

To refresh his memory in regard to the *chastity* of this Pope, I recommend to the Professor to reperuse what *Mosheim* says (vol. ii. p. 485) of

“His intimate familiarity with MATHILDA, the daughter of BONIFACE, duke of *Tuscany*, and the most powerful and opulent princess in that country; (who found by experience that neither ambition nor grace had extinguished the tender passions in the heart of GREGORY,) contributed much to this success; for he engaged that princess, after the death of her husband GODFREY, duke of *Lorraine*, and her mother BEATRIX, which happened in the years 1076 and 1077, to settle all her possessions in *Italy* and elsewhere upon the church of *Rome*, and thus to appoint St. PETER and his pretended vicar the heirs of her immense treasures.”

Especially let him recall to mind the arrogant cruelty of this most ambitious Pontiff, towards HENRY of Germany; when he came across the Alps, amidst the rigours of a severe winter, February 1077, and presented himself as a suppliant, “at the fortress of *Canusium*, where the *sanctimonious* pontiff resided at that time with the young MATHILDA, countess of *Tuscany*, the most powerful patroness of the church, and the most *tender* and affectionate of all the spiritual daughters of GREGORY.” (vol. ii. p. 504.)

Here is a specimen of other Popes, to whom Schaff does not blush to ascribe *great merit* in upholding the sanctity of marriage!

CHAPTER IX.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

We have now reviewed and analyzed more than two and a half pages of Schaff's long note in small type; and before we examine the two-fold conclusion of his sophistical and papistical reasoning, at which he arrives on the next page, I will present to the reader a *summary* of established truths, to which our review and analysis have led us.

SUMMARY OF ESTABLISHED TRUTHS.

They are the following:

1. Peter, however conspicuously he may occasionally appear, was never appointed by Jesus Christ, *primate* of the apostolic college.

2. The apostles were all equal in authority; acting under the same commission, and in the same great field, the WORLD.

3. They were extraordinary persons;—amply qualified by their Lord and Master, with gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the power of working miracles, to preach the gospel and organize churches, both in Judea and Galilee, and in the Gentile world; and to inspect and regulate the affairs of churches already established, wherever they were, by the providence of God, sent to labour.

4. As apostles, thus wonderfully endowed for their work, they had no successors; but, by the inspiration.

of the Holy Ghost, they were guided to appoint successors, in the ministry, to preach the gospel, administer the sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, govern the churches, and take care of the poor, under appropriate titles.

Hence the blessed promise annexed to the grand and all comprehending commission: "And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (Matt. xxviii. 20.)

5. All these truths have been acknowledged by S. again and again; and he has again and again contradicted himself repeatedly. And throughout the part of the note, thus far reviewed and analyzed, I have perceived how he has, in a Jesuitical manner, assumed without expressing it, that Peter was primate and the first pope, in contradiction to his own explicit acknowledgment, that during the first six centuries there was no pope; and had renounced Peter's primacy more than once.

SCHAFF'S TWO-FOLD CONCLUSION FROM HIS PAPISTICAL REASONING.

We are now prepared to look at his conclusions. He says:

"In view of all these facts, (called facts by Professor Schaff, who, we have shown, has identified himself with Papists and 'Roman Catholic theologians,') which are coming more and more to be conceded by unprejudiced Protestant historians, (like Schaff,) we cannot possibly question, that the Roman church, however corrupt in many doctrines and practices, belongs to the historical development of Christianity itself, and that it must accordingly have also some ground, even in the Holy Scriptures."

Such is the conclusion which a professed Protestant, in the year 1853, has drawn from his long train

of papistical arguments, so plainly in opposition to the Holy Scriptures themselves. How ridiculous! (We shall expose his development after noticing his next conclusion.)

“Nay, we believe, that even since the Reformation, the pope, as such, that is, in his official character, is not anti-christ, but the legitimate head of the *Roman* church, which, however, is certainly not, as she herself arrogantly asserts, identical with the *catholic* or *universal* church, but simply like Greek and Protestant Christendom, a part of it.”

SCHAFF IN OPPOSITION TO THE WHOLE PROTESTANT WORLD.

In the second conclusion, Professor Schaff has, knowingly, placed himself in opposition to the whole Protestant world!

This is the CLIMAX OF FOLLY!

Now for the proof.

I. *The first proof*—Opposition to LUTHER.

He knows that the Reformation in Germany was commenced by LUTHER, who opposed the sale of indulgences, authorized by LEO X, the Roman pontiff; and conducted by TETZEL, a Dominican friar, in the most indecent, insolent and *impious* manner.

Those who wish to obtain a correct account of its rise and progress, may read *Mosheim*. (vol. iv. chap. ii. pp. 28–47.) It cannot be doubted that S. has read and studied this part of the history.

II. *The second proof*—Opposition to MELANCTHON.

Schaff knows that MELANCTHON became an associate with LUTHER, in conducting the Reformation, and rendered him very material aid.

Doubtless Dr. Schaff has read the character of MELANCTHON, drawn by *Mosheim*. But to refresh his memory, as well as to gratify my readers, and to show

hereafter how S. has misrepresented to the G. R. Church, this great and good man, I shall make some extracts from our historian.

“As this eminent man was one of those, whom this dispute with ECKHUS convinced of the excellence of LUTHER’S cause; as he was, moreover, one of the illustrious and respectable instruments of the Reformation, it may not be improper to give some account here of the talents and virtues that have rendered his name immortal. His greatest enemies have borne testimony to his merits. They have been forced to acknowledge, that the annals of antiquity exhibit very few worthies that may be compared with him; whether we consider the extent of his knowledge in things human and divine, the fertility and elegance of his genius, the facility and quickness of his comprehension, or the uninterrupted industry that attended his learned and theological labors. He rendered to philosophy and the liberal arts the same eminent service that LUTHER had done to religion, by purging them from the dross with which they had been corrupted, and by recommending them in a powerful and persuasive manner, to the study of the Germans. He had the rare talent of discerning truth in all its most intricate connexions and combinations, of comprehending at once the most abstract notions, and expressing them with the utmost perspicuity and ease. And he applied this happy talent in religious disquisitions with such unparalleled success, that it may safely be affirmed, that the cause of true Christianity derived from the learning and genius of MELANCTHON, more signal advantages, and a more effectual support, than it received from any of the other doctors of the age.”

After referring to a defect arising from his natural temper, *Mosheim* goes on to say:

“This spirit of mildness and charity, carried perhaps too far, led him sometimes to make concessions that were neither consistent with prudence, nor advantageous to the cause in which he was engaged. It is however certain, that he gave no quarter to those more dangerous and momentous errors that reigned in the church of *Rome*; but maintained, on the contrary, that their extirpation was essentially necessary, in order to the restoration of true religion. In the natural complexion of this great man there was something soft, timorous and yielding. Hence arose a certain diffidence of himself, that not only made him examine things with the greatest attention and care, before he resolved upon any measure, but also filled him with uneasy apprehensions where there was no danger, and made him fear even things that, in reality, could never happen. And yet, on the other hand, when the hour of real danger approached, when things bore a formidable aspect, and the cause of religion was in imminent peril, then this timorous man was converted,

all at once, into an intrepid hero, looked danger in the face with unshaken constancy, and opposed his adversaries with invincible fortitude. All this shews, that the force of truth and the power of principle, had diminished the weaknesses and defects of MELANCTHON'S natural character, without entirely removing them. Had his fortitude been more uniform and steady, his desire of reconciling all interests and pleasing all parties, less vehement and excessive, his triumph over the superstitions imbibed in his infancy more complete, he must deservedly have been considered as one of the greatest among men.

Urged by the enemies of *Luther*, Pope LEO X, a man utterly unworthy of his high station, issued his bull, June 15, 1520, against his writings, in which he ordered them to be publicly burnt; and in which he was again summoned, on pain of excommunication, within the space of sixty days, to confess and retract his pretended errors and cast himself on the clemency and mercy of the pontiff.

"As soon as the account of this rash sentence, pronounced from the papal chair," says *Mosheim*, "was brought to LUTHER, he thought it was high time to consult both his present defence and his future security; and the first step he took for this purpose, was the renewal of his appeal from the sentence of the Roman pontiff, to the more respectable decision of a general council."

His next step was to withdraw from the papal Church, and renounce the Pope's jurisdiction.

This he did in *Wittemberg*, in the most public and impressive manner.

In that city, "in the presence of a prodigious multitude of people, of all ranks and orders, he committed to the flames both the *bull*, and the decretals and canons relating to the pope's supreme jurisdiction." Thus "he declared to the world, that he was no longer a subject of the Roman pontiff."

"Many Roman Catholics, who were zealous for the maintenance of the liberty of Germany, justified this bold resolution of LUTHER."

The second *bull*, dated Jan. 6. 1521, expelling him from the communion of the church for insulting the majesty, and disowning the supremacy of the Roman

pontiff, came; but Luther, by his noble resolution, had deprived it of its power, and rendered it ridiculous.

“From this time, therefore,” says *Mosheim*, “he applied himself to the pursuit of the truth with still more assiduity and fervour than he had formerly done; nor did he only review with attention, and confirm by new arguments, what he had hitherto taught, but went much beyond it, and made vigorous attacks upon the main stronghold of popery, the power and jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, which he overturned from its very foundation. In this noble undertaking he was seconded by many learned and pious men, in various parts of *Europe*; by those of the professors of the academy of *Wittemberg*, who had adopted his principles; and in a more especial manner by the celebrated *MELANCTHON*. And as the fame of *LUTHER*’s wisdom and *MELANCTHON*’s learning had filled that academy with an incredible number of students, who flocked to it from all parts, this happy circumstance propagated the principles of the Reformation, with an amazing rapidity, through all the countries of *Europe*.”

III. *Third proof*—Opposition to *Zwingle*, and the Reformed Church in Switzerland.

IV. *Fourth proof*—Opposition to *Calvin*, and the Reformed Church of France.

The confession of faith adopted and published, at different times, by that evangelical and glorious church, was written by *Calvin*.

In article xxviii, they say:

“In this belief we protest that where the word of God is not received, and where there is no professed subjection to it, and where there is no use of the Sacraments, if we will speak *properly*, we cannot judge that there is any church. Wherefore we condemn those assemblies of the Papacy; because the pure word of God is banished out of them, and for that in them the Sacraments are corrupted, counterfeited, or utterly abolished, and for that among them all kinds of superstitions and idolatries are in full vogue. We hold, then, that all those who meddle with such actions, and communicate with them, do separate and cut themselves off from the body of Jesus Christ.”

In articles xxxv. and xxxvi, they acknowledge only two sacraments, Baptism and the Holy Supper of our Lord, as common to the whole Church.

Sect. 10, p. xv., shows that it was signed at *Paris* in 1559; again in 1566; and again in 1571, the year before the St. Bartholomew massacre; and most solemnly signed and ratified, in a national Synod, by JANE, Queen of *Navarre*, by two Princes, LOUIS, Count of *Nassau*, and *Sir Gaspard de Colligni*, Lord High Admiral of *France*.

Calvin, in the third vol. of his INSTITUTES, chap. xviii, has an ample discussion of the *Mass* of pp. 457-478.

The caption of the chapter is this:

“*The Papal Mass not only a sacrilegious profanation of the Lord’s Supper, but a total annihilation of it.*”

After a discussion of 17 pages, he says, sect. xiv.:

“Wherefore, I conclude that it is a most criminal insult, an intolerable blasphemy, both against Christ himself, and against the sacrifice which he completed on our behalf, by his death upon the cross, for any man, to repeat any oblation, with a view to procure the pardon of sins, propitiate God, and obtain righteousness.”

Again, p. 478, he says:

“In baptism, how little is seen of that which ought to be the only conspicuous object, I mean baptism itself? And the Lord’s Supper has been completely buried since it has been transformed into the mass; except that it is exhibited once a year, but in a partial and mutilated form.”

Let it be remembered that, in glorifying the Romish Church, in the middle ages, S. has nowhere excepted the Mass; but still regards it as one of the Holy Sacraments, which “ran like threads of gold through the whole texture of life, in all its relation, from infancy to old age.” See his “PRINCIPLES OF PROTESTANTISM.”

V. *Fifth proof*—Opposition to the Synod of Dort.

In this Synod all the Protestant States in Europe were represented, including *Great Britain*; eighteen in number.

In the confession of faith adopted by that Synod, we find, in article xxix, “the *marks* of a *true* and of a *false* church.

Among the marks of the true Church is this :

“Jesus Christ acknowledged as the only Head of the Church.”

How clearly this distinguishes the *true* from the *false* church; which

“Ascribes more power and authority to herself and her ordinances, than to the word of God, and will not submit herself to the *yoke* of CHRIST. Neither does she administer the sacraments as appointed by CHRIST in his word, but adds to, and takes from them, as she thinks proper; she relieth more upon men than upon CHRIST; and persecutes those who live holily according to the word of God, and rebuke her for errors, covetousness and idolatry.”

How clearly the Protestant Church is here described as the *true* church; and the Roman Catholic Church as the *false* church! (See Constitution of the *Refor. Dutch* Church, in U. S. A., pp. 32, 33.)

VI. *Sixth proof*—opposition to the Presbyterian Church in England, Scotland, and in America, who have sincerely adopted the confession of faith of the *Westminster Assembly of Divines*; which says (chap. xxv. of the church):

“SEC. V. The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated, as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan. Nevertheless, there shall be always a church on earth, to worship God according to his will.”

“VI. There is no other head of the church but the LORD JESUS CHRIST. Nor can the *pope* of Rome, in any sense, be the head thereof; but is that *anti-Christ*, that *man of sin*, and *son of perdition*, that exalteth himself in the church, against CHRIST, and all that is called God.”

What a vast number of churches, in England, Scotland, and North America, which have adopted this confession of faith, has Prof. Schaff placed himself, *knowingly*, in opposition to, by his *papistical* conclusion about the Pope being the legitimate head of the *Roman* Church, and not *anti-Christ!!!*

Have I not proved that this same pretended Protestant, has, *knowingly*, set himself in opposition to all Protestants, both in Europe and in America, who have declared the Pope of Rome to be *anti-Christ*?

He, therefore, to say the least, must be a real *papist*, and not a Protestant! Will he tell us what he is?

Does it not *logically* follow, that he cannot be regarded as a Protestant, but as a Papist; and is no more entitled to a seat at the Lord's Supper, even occasionally, than a Roman Catholic?



CHAPTER X.

PROFESSOR SCHAFF'S ART AND DECEPTION.

“In view of the great merits of the popes in maintaining *orthodoxy*, asserting the *unity, freedom* and *independence* of the church against the assaults of the secular power, upholding the sanctity of marriage.”

Answer: On pages 38–40 of Chapter V., the answer is sufficient, except that the reader is requested to compare what we have quoted from *Mosheim*, (vol. ii. p. 504,) in regard to Gregory VII, whom he there denominates the *sanctimonious* pontiff, with what we omitted in our preceding quotation on the same page, (40.) The omission is this:

“Who Mathilda found by experience that neither ambition nor grace had extinguished the tender passions in the heart of GREGORY.” (vol. ii. p. 485.)

These passages compared will make it plain that *Mosheim* intended to impeach the *chastity* of GREGORY,

who, in subsequent times, was imitated by many a pope, and by some in the most shameless manner.

With what art and deception this long and contradictory note is penned!

The art of the Professor consists in confounding the *Catholic* with the *Roman Catholic* Church, which every fair and honest reasoner will distinguish from each other; and in making round and dogmatic assertions without proof. Thus he tries to prepare the way for attributing to the Romish Church the praise of all that has been done by the *catholic* or *universal* church.

And, to accomplish his purpose the better, he does not hesitate to contradict himself, by ascribing to the papacy a duration of *eighteen hundred* years; although he had previously admitted that it had no existence for six hundred years of the Christian era, and that Peter was no pope!

He begins his note with a reckless assertion of the primacy of Peter in a very bold manner, as if it were undeniable; although he had previously given up his primacy, and plainly asserted the *equality* of the apostles, and closes his first paragraph by admitting the primacy of Peter to be one of the three assumptions of the "Roman Catholic Theologians." This, I am aware, is a repetition which I make to secure attention to it, and because he compels me to repeat.

The reader, I hope, will not forget the Professor has ascribed to the *papacy* a duration of *eighteen hundred* years, *twice* in the same paragraph, in contradiction to his own admission, that six hundred years of the Christian era had passed away before it came into existence.

Thus, according to Professor Schaff, the papacy began to *work wonders* before it was born.

This German Doctor, owing to his love of the papacy, has not yet done with praising the popes, for he adds still more:

“And especially in spreading Christianity and civilization among all the Romanic, Germanic, and Scandinavian nations; in view of all these facts, which are coming more and more to be conceded by unprejudiced Protestant historians,” (like Schaff of course,) “we cannot possibly question that the Roman Church,” (see his design to secure all the praise of spreading Christianity and civilization to the Roman Church,) “however corrupt in many doctrines and practices, belongs to the historical development of Christianity itself, and that it must accordingly have some ground even in the Holy Scriptures.”

Answer: This Roman church so “corrupt in many doctrines and practices,” certainly was not the pure and holy church of Rome, to whom Paul addressed his famous epistle to the Romans. Of that church he writes the highest commendation. Read what he says: (Chap. 1, 5-8,) “By whom we have received grace and apostleship, for obedience to the faith among all nations for his name; among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ: to all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called *to be* saints: grace to you, and peace from God our father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world.”

Had neither Paul nor Peter, who were not popes, but apostles, and their successors in the *ministry* done nothing to spread Christianity and civilization among the Romanic, Germanic, and Scandinavian nations? Had the Greek Church done nothing in spreading Christianity and civilization among these nations during *six hundred* years before a pope had existence? How disingenuous, then, in Professor Schaff to attempt to transfer what was accomplished by the true

followers of Christ, to ambitious popes destitute of the fear of God, and to the corrupt Roman church! Can he be an honest Protestant that writes as he writes?

If the reader wish the testimony of credible history, I refer him to GOODRICH'S HISTORY OF ALL NATIONS, about Scandinavia especially, advising him to peruse what he says of *Sweden*, under GUSTAVUS VASA, and GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS. (Vol. ii. pp. 1032, 1033.)

I recommend also the perusal of MOSHEIM, on the Reformation in *Sweden* and *Denmark*. (Vol. iv. cent. xvi., chap. ii., pp. 77-85.) There GUSTAVUS VASA appears. And also *Mosheim*, (vol. v., cent. xvii., chap. i., sec. vi-viii., pp. 106-111.) Here GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS is seen in his noble achievements.

STRANGE LIBERTIES TAKEN BY PROFESSOR SCHAFF.

After all that Schaff has written in this long note on which we have commented, what ground had he for writing, on page 377, beginning with the eighth line from the top, thus:

“If the Church of Rome has *inherited* the prerogatives and gifts of Peter, she has also frequently and on a larger scale repeated his weaknesses and unfaithfulness.”

He has nowhere in this note specified what were the prerogatives and gifts of Peter, and actually reduced Peter's primacy to that of a primacy of honor and influence, and acknowledged that Peter was not the first bishop of Rome, in the *later* sense of the term, and that Peter was not a pope in the *Roman sense*; that is not a pope in any sense. Is it not then *sheer NONSENSE*, vain German speculation, in opposi-

tion to scriptural truth, to talk about the Roman church (or popes) inheriting the prerogatives and gifts of Peter? We have proved that as Peter never was a *primate*, he never did nor could, transfer to the bishop of Rome what he did not possess.

What ground have you, Doctor, for using such language? To my American ears it sounds very strange. I can see no ground for it in any part of your history. It seems to imply that Peter made a *Will*. Did he make a Will? And what did he bequeath to the Bishop of Rome? You speak of the prerogatives and gifts of Peter; but you have not specified what these prerogatives and gifts were, nor named Peter's will. We feel ourselves at a loss to understand you. Tell us how these prerogatives and gifts of Peter descended to the popes. Was it by a will? So some "Roman Catholic theologians" pretend; but you do not, so far as I have discovered.

If Peter made a will tell us plainly, and then we shall understand what you mean; and tell us where Peter's will is to be found, or abandon idle tales fit only for the dark ages.

Professor Schaff has read *Mosheim*, and must know what he has written about the **DECRETALS**.

They were used very adroitly and successfully by ambitious and wicked popes, to enslave the people and to change the government of the church.

To furnish our readers with correct knowledge of them, I shall quote several passages from this profound and faithful historian.

"VIII. In order to gain credit to this new ecclesiastical system, so different from the ancient **rules** of church-government, and to support the haughty pretensions of the pontiffs to supremacy and independence, it was necessary to produce the authority of ancient deeds, to stop the

mouths of such as were disposed to set bounds to their usurpations. The bishops of *Rome* were aware of this; and as those means were looked upon as the most lawful that tended best to the accomplishment of their purposes, they employed some of their most ingenious and zealous partizans in forging conventions, acts of councils, epistles, and such like records, by which it might appear, that, in the first ages of the church, the Roman pontiffs were clothed with the same spiritual majesty and supreme authority which they now assumed. Among these fictitious supports of the papal dignity, the famous *decretal Epistles*, as they are called, said to have been written by the pontiffs of the primitive times, deserve chiefly to be stigmatized. They were the production of an obscure writer, who fraudulently prefixed to them the name of ISIDORE, bishop of *Seville*, to make the world believe they had been collected by that illustrious and learned prelate. Some of them had appeared in the eighth century, but they were now entirely drawn from their obscurity, and produced with an air of ostentation and triumph, to demonstrate the supremacy of the Roman pontiffs. The decisions of a certain Roman council, which is said to have been held during the pontificate of SYLVESTER, were likewise alleged in behalf of the same cause; but this council had never been so much as heard of before the present century, and the accounts now given of it proceeded from the same source with the *decretals*, and were equally authentic. Be that as it may, the decrees of this pretended council contributed much to enrich and aggrandize the Roman pontiffs, and exalt them above all human authority and jurisdiction.

“IX. There were not, however, wanting among the Latin bishops, men of prudence and sagacity, who saw through these impious frauds, and perceived the chains that were forging both for them and for the church. The French bishops distinguished themselves in a particular and glorious manuer, by the zeal and vehemence with which they opposed the spurious *decretals*, and other like fictitious monuments and records, and protested against their being received among the laws of the church. But the obstinacy of the pontiffs, and particularly of NICHOLAS I, conquered this opposition, and reduced it to silence. And as the empire, in the periods that succeeded this contest, fell back into the grossest ignorance and darkness, there scarcely remained any who were capable of detecting these odious impostors, or disposed to support the expiring liberty of the church. The history of the following ages shews, in a multitude of deplorable examples, the disorders and calamities that sprung from the ambition of the aspiring pontiffs; it represents these despotic lords of the church, labouring by the aid of their impious frauds to overturn its ancient government, to undermine the authority of its bishops, to engross its riches and revenues into their own hands; nay, what is still more horrible, it represents them aiming perfidious blows at the thrones of princes, and endeavouring to lessen their power, and to set bounds to their dominion. All this is unanimously acknowl-

edged by such as have looked, with attention and impartiality, into the history of the times of which we now write, and is ingenuously confessed by men of learning and probity, that are well affected to the Romish church and its sovereign pontiff.*

*Ample authorities may be found at the bottom of Mosheim's pages.

NOTE.—Having written the substance of this chapter, I said to a friend who I knew had carefully read S.'s history, "I have not found that the Professor anywhere refers distinctly, either to the *decretals* or to *Peter's Will*," adding "nor can I find he distinctly specifies what Peter's prerogatives and gifts were."

My friend immediately opened Schaff's history, (which I handed to him,) and opened it at pp. 352, 353, and requested me to look at them.

A remark being made by me, "What a singular writer he is!" he responded, "Artful indeed!" and lifting up his hands in token of astonishment, he departed. My pencil marks on the pages revealed to me at once that they had not escaped my notice.

The next morning I read them over carefully, and found, on less than two pages, *nine* pencil checks on the *margin*,—the name Philip,—and these words, "Indeed! and where was Paul during seventeen years?"

From these marks, &c., it is certain I had very distinctly noticed these pages.

I now recollect, that in writing "Antidote to the Poison of Popery," &c., I was led to add to chapters ii. and iii. previously written against the claims of Romanists on Peter's primacy, chapter iv.

The whole argument appeared to me perfectly conclusive.

From the short notice of the "Antidote," by David N. Lord, in his *Theological and Literary Journal*, (see the whole at the beginning of this volume,) I shall here present three extracts:

1. "That the estimate Dr. Janeway has formed of the character of Professor Schaff as a Papist—is correct, we do not doubt.

2. "The pamphlet is written with spirit and point; is marked by high moral feelings; and which is a rare merit, is free from the heartless professions of respect with which many are accustomed to soften and countervail the protestations they utter against false and dangerous teachers.

3. "*It confutes effectually the doctrine of Peter's primacy*, which Professor Schaff sanctions; and points out a series of misstatements, blunders, and inconsistencies, which reveal to the reader the deceptive character of his work, and shows with what caution its representations on the subject of papacy, especially, are to be received."

To these three chapters, (ii. iii. and iv.) which contain the *scriptural argument* against the *primacy* of Peter, I refer the reader, as a full refutation to any thing presented by Prof. Schaff, either in these pages or elsewhere, in favor of such primacy; especially, as he, himself, found it necessary to modify what he had written in his subsequent long note (on pp. 374-377); to which I have paid, in different parts of this work, particular attention.

The church of Rome did place herself, or rather the popes placed themselves, in what she calls the chair of Peter; but Prof. S. is too well read in history not to know that the popes rose to that *anti-christian* eminence, not by inheritance, but in a way totally different, as we shall hereafter show.

In the meantime, this German historian is referred to a brief prophetic history, written by the pen of inspiration, in a subsequent chapter. That chapter will tell him the four following important particulars:

First: What hindered the appearance of popery as soon as Romanists pretend, and, as he now, in opposition to his own previous confession of the truth, claims for it.

Second: When it did appear and enter the church, and begin to obscure the truth, and corrupt the worship of God.

Third: By what means it rose to an enormous height in the middle ages. And

Fourth: How and when it will fall, and be utterly destroyed by the Lord Jesus Christ, the sole Head of his Church on earth and in heaven.

These important particulars he may find in the chapter referred to.

They are not *traditions*, but *verities*, written by men inspired with a prophetic spirit.

After a careful examination of these pages, I can find no distinct specification of Peter's prerogatives and *gifts*, as I supposed might be found in them; and especially, nothing to justify Professor Schaff's insinuation, by the use of the word "*inherited*," that the church of Rome really inherited "*the prerogatives and gifts of Peter*." (See p. 377.)

Such inheritance we utterly deny, and assert boldly, that Schaff has not produced the *semblance* of proof. Here we end this note. But we give notice to the reader that we shall return to it in another place, to show how S. magnifies Peter, and underrates the other apostles, and how he misinterprets the *twelve* chapters of the Acts of the Apostles.

If he will read, and study, and believe this inspired history, and throw away false traditions and vain speculations, then will he be ashamed of what he has written about the church of Rome *inheriting the prerogatives* and gifts of Peter. Then will he become a *true* and *honest* Protestant; and if it were possible, he would wash away what he has written contrary to scriptural truth, *with his tears*.

CHAPTER XI.

DEVELOPMENT EXPOSED.

After the above review of what Prof. S. denominates *facts*, the *concessions* by unprejudiced Protestants of whom he speaks, are unworthy of any reply.

But the development of which he speaks in the next sentence, demands an exposure, on account of its falsehood, and the emphatical manner in which it is uttered. It is a climax to his pretended facts and sophistical reasoning.

Development is a new word that has come into fashionable use with many; and is found neither in *Johnson* nor in *Walker*, though the *verb* *develope*, from which it sprung, is. Webster defines development, "*an unfolding—full exhibition.*"

According to this definition, development occurs in a flower, when it expands its leaves, and displays its beauties; but when it withers and dies, there is no development.

When the body of a child grows from year to year, in size and strength, till it reaches perfect manhood, there is development; but when the body sickens and dies, there is death, but no development.

When, by the grace of God, David was converted, and advanced in sanctification and a holy life, for many years, till he obtained such eminence in divine life, as to be an example worthy of all imitation; there was a bright development of divine grace; but when, by temptation, he fell into two most grievous sins, adultery and murder, by which he incurred the penalty of death; there was indeed an awful development of the power of indwelling sin, even in renewed persons, when not restrained by grace, that should keep us all sensible of our constant dependence on spiritual influence, watchful against temptation, and prayerful for divine aid; but there was no development of divine grace.

Truth can never be developed into *falsehood*; nor the *pure worship* of God, in VILE SUPERSTITION AND GROSS IDOLATRY.

Even Schaff himself, when he speaks of Peter's denying his Lord, and of his base dissimulation at Antioch, dares not call those sinful acts a development of divine grace. He traces them to a very different source. See how he characterizes them in his long note, beginning with these words, "(3) If Peter himself, &c." (17th line from bottom of page 376.) That will appear when we come to review that page.

What Prof. Schaff denominates "a development of Christianity itself," is, in fact, a development of fallen men's native depravity; of his enmity against the true doctrines of the gospel, and against the pure worship of God.

Hence it was, that professing Christians acted over again the part of heathen wise men, and received their punishment. (Rom. i.) "Professing themselves to be wise they became fools; and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." (vs. 22, 23.) They "changed the truth of God into a lie." (v. 25.) And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind." (v. 28.)

SUCH IS POPERY.

It is well and justly portrayed from the 21st verse to the end of the chapter.

Popery really produced in the Romish church all the vile effects that were seen in the Pagan world, resulting from that reprobate mind to which they were delivered, by the righteous judgment of God, as a punishment of their senseless idolatry.

Now, if this exposition of the word *development* is correct, then to talk of "the Roman church, however corrupt in many doctrines and practices," as belonging "to the historical development of Christianity itself, &c.," is to talk NONSENSE.

And thus, Dr. S., a *German Professor and historian*, who looks down upon us Americans, as if we understood neither theology, nor history, TALKS, and utters his language with *undoubting assurance!* Hear him:

"In view of all these facts—we cannot possibly question, that the Roman Church, however corrupt in many doctrines and practices, belongs to the historical development of Christianity itself, and that it must have also some ground even in the Holy Scriptures!" (See his long note at the bottom of page 375 and top of 376, previously quoted.)

SCHAFF'S CONCESSION.

All these *unfounded* facts to which the learned Dr. refers; and the confident and singular language he

utters; seem designed to prepare and smooth the way for concessions he is about to make; concessions seemingly opposite to his language so glorifying to the corrupt Romish Church, in the *Middle Ages*, when it was reaching the climax of iniquity and usurpation; concessions extorted from him by circumstances, and yielded by him with a bad grace. (See extract from his Essay. (Part 1, chap. i. pp. 17-19.)

Had he, like an honorable man, come forward and confessed his errors, and not surrounded himself with the mist of unfounded facts and sophistical reasoning, we should have regarded his concessions in a very different light from what we do.

Is this a new discovery of the learned historian? Does it "belong to the historical development of Christianity itself, and afford a proof that the Romish Church has some ground in the Holy Scriptures?"

How different from the language of his unfortunate Essay, by which he, as well as Dr. Nevin, was teaching the German Reformed Church, and endeavoring to awaken her to a consciousness of being a *Melancthonian* Church; differing both from the Lutheran, on the one side, and the Calvinistic Church, on the other. (See note i. p. 133.)

Did not both Dr. Nevin and Dr. Schaff know, that the German Reformed Church, whose confession of faith they had adopted as the confession of their faith, and promised, when inaugurated, to teach, and preach, and defend, was not a *Melancthonian* church? How then could they endeavor to awaken her to a *consciousness* of being what they were not?

Happy for that church, if they were a *Melancthonian* church!

This was not their aim. It was far different. It was

to deprive them of all evangelical and spiritual life; it was to make them what they both are—*real Roman Catholics, real Papists.*

Alas! they have been too successful in accomplishing their design!

The reader may cast his eye over what follows the above quotation, in Schaff's concessions. But, in regard to wicked Popes, I prefer reciting the language of *Mosheim*. (vol. ii. p. 390.)

"The history of the Roman Pontiffs that lived in this century [*tenth*] is the history of so many monsters, and not of men, and exhibits a horrible, terrible series of the most flagitious, tremendous, and complicated crimes, as all writers, even those of the Romish communion, *unanimously* confess."

Did not Dr. S. know this as well as what he acknowledges, towards the close of his note, (p. 376,) in regard to the reformatory councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil, &c.? How then could he write that most erroneous Essay! (See my *Contrast*, pp. 17-19.)

CONTRADICTS HIMSELF

How contradictory these acknowledgments to his confident assertions in his own published ESSAY!

How shall this great revolution in his historical views be accounted for? He was familiar with Church history; he had read *Mosheim* and many German historians.

Were his views really changed? Then he should have confessed the fact.

Is it uncharitable to suppose, he had begun to discover he had gone too far, in extolling the Romish Church in the *Middle* or the *dark* Ages; that the American mind would not bear to have *darkness* called *light*, and *wicked* Popes honored as doing *right*;

while usurping an unlimited dominion over Church and State, and compelling kings and emperors to do them homage, in order to feel secure on their thrones!

Perhaps an individual of great influence accelerated the change, by giving him a gentle hint on the subject; warning him of the consequences of adhering to his plan of representing the *Papacy*; that the praise was too gross and unfounded; that there were Americans acquainted with history as well as he; and that he must not calculate too much on American ignorance.

Were the Professor near me, I might whisper *confidentially* in his ear, and *perhaps correctly*, the name of the individual.

I now add, that probably he has discovered from events recently transpiring, that to lean on you and your Romish associates, would be as dangerous as for a man to place his hand on a *broken reed* for support.

NOTE.—Let me further say in this place, that Prof. S., in his recent visit to Princeton to feel its pulse, found its pulsations very different from what they were in 1853. He was treated as he ought to, and would, have been treated, had Princeton been duly informed when he made his visit in that year.

Anxious to obtain assistance, professor D., whose turn it was to preach on the Sabbath in the College Chapel, while the examination of the senior class was going on, hearing of S's. arrival invited him to preach for him in the Chapel, which he readily engaged to do.

But as soon as the President heard of the arrangement, (much to his honor and fidelity to his Lord and master,) he promptly and positively forbade the preaching of S. in the Chapel of the College.

In this emergency, the German professor had recourse to the pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, who *imprudently* invited a Roman Catholic to occupy his pulpit.

But when he invited the professors of the College and Seminary to dine with S. at his house, not one accepted the invitation.

As Dr. McGill became a professor in the Seminary since 1853, S. determined to visit him, and try an experiment on him. But he utterly failed. Dr. McGill did not return his visit.

Since I wrote my Antidote in pamphlet form, I have discovered by attentive examination of S's. long note, (as will be seen hereafter,) what I had supposed to be concessions, are in reality mere *pretended* concessions.

Ah! what a curious thing is German development! It shoots *forward* and *backward*. It speaks the truth, and then utters falsehood; it asserts a fact, and then denies it. An instrument managed at the will of the operator to suit his purpose!

What an illustration we have in Prof. Schaff's history! He tells us Popery had no existence for *six hundred years* of the Christian era; that Peter was *not a pope*, but an apostle; that he was not even bishop of Rome in the *later sense* of the term. Then in perfect contradiction to his own serious statement, he ascribes to his beloved papacy a duration of *eighteen hundred years*:

Thus, to make her the more venerable and majestic, and "rock-like in stability," he brings her into the world six hundred years before she was really born.

Thus he asserts, and then denies; affirms a fact, and afterwards affirms a contradictory fact! And both must be true; because Dr. Schaff says they are.

This is German development! A curious thing indeed! A fit instrument for Jesuits! But not for honest Protestants.

The proofs Schaff offers, on page 375, in favor of the early existence of popery, are mere confident and unblushing assertions, which we have already exposed as false and contradicted by true history. See our Chapters v. pp. 32-38, and vi. pp. 38-40.

If the reader will take up MOSHEIM'S "*history of Christianity in the first three centuries*," and carefully

examine what this accurate and profound historian has written on Church government, (vol. ii. pp. 115-137,) he will see how entirely he differs from Schaff. He will learn, too, who was the author of that *proud title*, "*Vicar of Jesus Christ*," not a *Roman*, but an *African bishop*. He "first taught the Roman prelate, that all bishops ought to assume it. And it was commonly adopted from this time onwards by all bishops, as has been proved by Joseph Bingham, in his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*," (vol. i. p. 81, 82. lib. ii. § 10.) "I will add," says Mosheim, "that down to the *ninth* century, it was customary to speak of all bishops as the *vicars of Christ*." (p. 136.)

SCHAFF'S IGNORANCE OF SCRIPTURE.

1. To one who has duly studied the Holy Scriptures, it must be apparent that Dr. Schaff, with all his learning, is ignorant of the great fact, that Jesus Christ, the sole and sovereign Head of the Church on earth, made known to his apostles a plan for the government of his church; and, by the inspiration of his Holy Spirit, enabled them to organize the church on this plan; first, in Jerusalem and Judea, and then afterwards in the Gentile world, before this German doctor was born.

2. The cause of his ignorance is, the so-called Protestant Professor, misled by pride of science, falsely so called, instead of making the scriptures the sole rule of his faith and practice, has suffered himself to be guided by tradition, to which he has attributed authority equal to that of the word of God.

3. No wonder, that thus beclouded by the mist of a false science and false traditions, Schaff could not

see that the papacy entered into that once noble church of Rome, not as the *friend*, but as the *enemy* of Jesus Christ; to corrupt, and by its increasing influence, to degrade that church more and more, until in doctrine, and practice, and worship the Romish church became a *false church*, a *synagogue of satan*, *anti-Christ*; and, by its *own infatuated* acts, in the council of Trent, excinded itself.

From that hour the Romish church has had imprinted on her forehead what is written in Rev. xvii. 5: "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."

4. Prof. Schaff has the presumption to think he has suggested a plan for uniting a false church, which has, for three hundred years, been uttering blasphemies against the God of heaven, with the true protestant church, which, in obedience to the call of heaven, (Rev. xviii. 4,) has come out of her, and renounced her errors and idolatrous worship, and now openly protests against them.

As well might S. attempt an impossibility, to unite *fire and water*.

Hereafter it is to be hoped a number of Roman Catholics will be converted and saved; for it is written, (2 Thes. ii. 8,) "Whom (that wicked) the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, (preaching of the gospel,) and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." (With his terrible judgment.)

5. Would it not be well for the learned professor to enquire, whether he is not acting a very unwise part, by devoting his talents to a *hopeless work*, that is, to uphold the papacy? and whether he is not displaying much *presumption*, and incurring *guilt*, in

holding out to the Romish church encouragement to hope, that she will continue to exist, although Jesus Christ has so plainly predicted in his word, that she *shall fall to rise no more?*

6. When, for their obstinate unbelief and wicked rejection of their long promised Messiah, the Jewish Church was east away from their covenant relation to God, and their nation destroyed by signal judgments, and scattered over the world by their offended Jehovah; hope of their restoration was left on record. That hope will be realized. (See the author's "Hope for the Jews.")

But to imagine it will be by an amalgamation of Judaism with Christianity, like the suggested plan of Schaff for the union of Roman Catholics and Protestants, would be folly indeed.

No! The Jews, when converted to Christianity, will abandon the sacrifices and ceremonies instituted by the law, as "shadows of good things to come," (Heb. x. i.) and embrace the gospel as the substance foreshadowed by them in its doctrines, precepts and promises, just as intelligent Christians now do, and receive pardon, justification, peace, hope and joy in the Holy Ghost. (See Deut. xviii. 15-20. Acts iii. 19-26.)

7. Finally, if Schaff wishes to see the Lord fulfilling his "precious promise, to be and rule in his church continually," he should look to that despised, hated, and persecuted church in the valleys of Piedmont, which he does not deign (as far as I have discovered) even to name, and follow her wherever dispersed, by persecution, and seek after all true believers hidden even in Rome itself; in a word, for all professors of the true religion together with their children. They

were "*the Holy Catholic Church*," acknowledged by Jesus Christ as his visible church, organized on his plan, "in the middle ages," and not the popes, in all their gorgeous splendor, and majesty, and power; depriving the people of the Bible, and compelling all their subjects, with fire and sword, to believe their heretical dogmas.

Among the former, Christ was present, and ruled among them as his *friends*; among the latter he was also present; but he ruled among them as his *enemies* whom he abhorred, and, in his appointed time, he intended to punish, and finally to sweep from the face of the earth.

CHAPTER XII.

GREAT ERROR UNDERLYING HIS THEORY.

In addition to the remarks already made on Schaff's extended note, we add, that what he says in the close of it, (p. 377,) about the Church of Rome inheriting "the prerogatives and gifts of Peter, &c.," and about his being a *type* of one state of the Church,—Paul the type of another,—and John, of a third, still more perfect; is all visionary, destitute of any scriptural authority,—a mere fanciful theory, indulged without due regard to the supreme authority of the inspired word of God.

Let the reader look at the two notes appended to page 133. There, as well as in the text, he will see

how Schaff approves and endorses all the writings of Dr. Nevin; who, by his strange delusions, has been already led, in heart, to *Rome*; and who, if rumor speaks truly, will be there in person, in no distant day, though his friend, Dr. S. says, he cannot do so consistently.

“So long as he holds his theory of *development*, which makes room for different forms and phases of Christianity in the progressive march of the Church.”

But if Dr. Nevin prefers the Roman Catholic phase of the Church, what then, Dr. S.? Can he not go to Rome, consistently, according to his and *your* theory? And when Dr. S. feels the same preference, what is there in his views of truth and duty, to prevent his going also to his beloved Papacy? He has been pleading for it very earnestly and strangely; first, by heaping on the Romish Church the most *unbounded* and *unfounded* praise; and then, finding such lavish praise bestowed upon her, when in her worst and most corrupt state, in the “Middle Ages,” will not suit the American taste, making concessions, with an ill grace; but still pleading for her as a true Church, by artful and sophistical reasoning. When such a man shall feel a preference for the *Roman phase* of the Church, what will prevent his identifying himself with that *apostate* Church?

Now, when I consider all these things, and his insisting on the Romish Church, with all her corruptions in doctrine, her superstitious worship, and Pagan idolatry, being “a development of Christianity itself;” I am constrained to believe, that vile and *fundamentally erroneous dogma* of the Romish Church, which exalts *tradition* to an authority, in determining our faith, equal to the authority of the word of God,

UNDERLIES his whole theory, as it does that of Dr. Nevin, in whom it is producing its legitimate effect.

Of what avail is the professed belief of the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, when connected with the belief of such a neutralizing and impious dogma? Its ruinous effects are seen in the history of the Romish Church. What said our Lord, referring to the hypocritical Jews, in the language of Esaias: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (Matt. xv. 7-9.)

"THE BIBLE, THE BIBLE is the religion of Protestants."—*Chillingworth*.*

THE WRITER'S CONTRAST.†

To one other note, (as far back as page 92,) the reader's attention is requested. In that note this great German historian condescends even to notice

* From the character of Prof. S., and the art apparent in his long note, on which I have written my remarks, I felt persuaded this note was not to be found in the German edition of his history. After finishing my remarks, and not before, I wrote to Dr. Mesick, requesting him to inform me, whether the long note (which I had described by the pages) was in the German edition of S.'s history. After examination, he replied, under date March 14, 1854, describing the note, that it was not in the German edition.

Thus the concessions, which the Doctor, pressed by hard necessity, has so ungraciously yielded, are concealed from the German Reformed Church.

And is it not *curious*, that the recommendations recently published, in the *Presbyterian*, for the English edition, are all, with one exception, for the *German* edition, and so stated at the head of the advertisement? Had the gentlemen who gave the recommendations really examined the contents of the German edition? And are they willing to endorse them?

† Let Prof. H., of a Presbyterian seminary in the *West*, who recently gave a recommendation to S.'s history, review his acts, and ask himself

the humble performance of the writer; and to save him from the reproach of ignorance, kindly withholds his name, while he sneers at *Mosheim* and *Edgar*, on whom the writer relied as *credible* historians, in opposition to the round and *false* assertions of the great Doctor; whose privilege it was to sit at the feet of *Neander*, as Saul did at the feet of *Gamaliel*. And he has become so wise as to correct his Master. See what he has written of *Neander* and himself, pp. 95, &c.

What compassion to conceal my name!

But alas! I appended it to the *Contrast*; so that I must bear the reproach in this country, as far as the *Contrast* may be known, notwithstanding the compassionate attempt of the Professor to conceal it, on account of my "age and ecclesiastical connexions."

But to be *serious*; let me tell Dr. S., I am not ashamed of the *Contrast*, humble as the performance is; and that he may publish it if he choose, even in *Germany*; for I feel assured, that every candid German would pronounce his unsupported assertions of no weight in the scales, when weighed against the historic testimony of *Mosheim* and *Edgar*, with their authorities.

Hear how he himself praises *Mosheim*. (page 74.)

"He (i. e. CHR. E. WISEMANN) was soon eclipsed, however, by the celebrated JOHN LAWRENCE VON MOSHEIM, (1755,) who holds the first place among the Church historians generally, of the last century, and has acquired the honorable title of "father of church history."

this question, Did I act advisably and do my duty? Will my Lord and Master, when he comes to purify his church, and put down the *Papacy*, which S. labours so artfully and earnestly to uphold, approve what I have done?

And on page 73 he writes thus :

“The great effort now is to do justice to all parties ; and there must certainly be admitted, in the works of a Mosheim, a Schrockh, and a Walch, an *impartiality*, which belongs to neither of the preceding schools.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Corrupt in doctrine and idolatrous in worship as the Roman Church is, Dr. S. is by no means willing to admit her to be characterized, in 1 Thess. ii. 2-12, by the falling away, or “the *apostasy*,” and “that *man of sin*, the *son of perdition* ; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped ; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.” (vs. 3, 4.) Nor by that wicked, or *Lawless One* ; (v. 8.) nor by *Anti-Christ* predicted in sundry places to appear “in the last time.” (1 John ii. 18.)

No wonder ; for his eyes are dimmed by his love of the Papacy—of her magnificent cathedrals and splendid buildings,—of her charming poets and great painters ; all animated by motives from above. And yet he has attempted to prove, that Peter wrote his first epistle from *Rome*, though he styles Rome BABYLON, just as John does in the Apocalypse. See pp. 363, 364, where he reasons on the subject and tries to meet objections.

But others whose eyes are not beclouded by love for an *apostate* Church ; that *Anti-Christ* that was to come into the world in the last time ; can see what inspiration has inprinted on her forehead, in such *large and legible characters* : “MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.” (Rev. xvii. 5.)

And they can hear heaven's warning voice: "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." (Rev. xviii. 4.)

That the Papacy or Church of Rome, is designated by the predictions referred to has been proved by Protestants again and again. I shall here neither name the writers, nor go into an argument on the subject. Schaff is not ignorant of their names. I shall only say, I have on my table a copy of a sermon delivered before the *Synod of the German Reformed Church*, in Philadelphia, October 18, 1853; repeated in the *Salem Church*, at Harrisburg, Pa., by Rev. JOHN F. MESICK, D. D. Published by request. The subject, "THE PAPACY, the ANTI-CHRIST." Text, 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.*

* Appended to this sermon is a note, covering, in small type, more than half a page; designed by quotations from Dr. Nevin's publications, in the *Weekly Messenger*, Nov. 25, 1840, to prove, that his views in that year were Protestant and Anti-Popery, in a high degree. To satisfy the reader of this, it will be sufficient to transcribe only two lines and one word.

"Popery," says Dr. N., "is at war with our government. If true to itself, it ought not to be trusted in the midst of our liberties and rights. If true to itself, it must be false to the freedom for which our fathers bled." (p. 4.)

"From the singular sermon, preached by Dr. N., and printed in connexion with Prof. Schaff's Essay, in 1845, it is evident that he was already infected with the *poison* of Popery: (p. 197,) although he could not go with his teacher, so far as to believe the Pope was not Anti-Christ; for he expressly says: (p. 204 at the bottom.) "We do not suppose that the visible unity of the Church demands a single visible head, like the Pope of Rome, who is justly styled the Anti-Christ, for this very 'pretension.'" To have agreed with his teacher entirely, in so short a time, would have been too rapid a change, and would have excited too much surprise.

At last, however, Dr. N. outstript his teacher in the race to Rome; the *proper home* of both.

Had Prof. S. been present at his Synod, and his ear open to hear the truth, conviction might have reached his heart.

The *Romish Church*, the PAPAcy is no part of the visible Church of Christ; and I will tell Prof. S. and others the reason on which my belief is founded.

The chief reason is this: From the beginning of her existence, in the *seventh* century, the *Papacy* has been *tyrannical, persecuting* and *idolatrous*; and became more and more so; till she has become *apostate*; a *synagogue of Satan, Anti-Christ*.

But have no pious individuals been found in the Romish Church? In the course of past ages, many. Now, alas! how few! since the warning voice of God has, for a long time, been calling them to come out of her.

The few that may still be found in that vast body, of error, sin and pollution, spread over a great portion of Europe, and in other parts of the world, can no more change its true and odious character, so as to render it a part of Christ's visible Church; than a few particles of salt sprinkled over an immense mass of putrid matter, could save it from putrefaction; no more than rain falling on the mountains, can fertilize the great *Sahara desert* of Africa.

The doom of the Papacy is recorded in Scripture; and no hope of salvation is held out to her.

One righteous man, Lot, could not, [though ten would,] save Sodom and Gomorrah from destruction, by a fiery tempest from heaven.

When Israel was cast out of God's sight, a promise of mercy was left on record. [See Hosea xiv.] When the Jews were destroyed as a *nation*, and scattered over the face of the earth, many promises of mercy,

and predictions of their conversion and restoration to Palestine, were found both in the Old and in the New Testament.*

In the *Apocalypse* the vile and hateful character of the *Papacy* is drawn by the pen of inspiration; but not one promise of mercy to her is to be found in any part of that Sacred book.

The *Roman Hierarchy* is the "woman whom John saw sitting on a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy,—having seven heads and ten horns." (Rev. xvii. 4, 8.)

The mystery at which the prophet marvelled was explained by the angel. (vs. 7–18.) The doom of the woman is denounced. The ten horns of the beast, or the ten kings that gave their power to the beast, on which she sat in majesty, will eventually hate the whore, and make her desolate and naked, eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. [v. 16.]

The triple crown must be torn from the Pope's head; and this pretended vicar of Christ, who is worshipped as God, must be prostrated in the dust. The beast and the false prophet must be cast into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." [chap. xix. 20.]

The great city must be divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fall; and great Babylon must drink of the cup of the wine of the fierceness of God's wrath. (chap. xvi. 19.) And this will not occur till the seventh angel shall pour out his vial into the air. (vs. 17, 18.) Alas! what judgments are indicated! Instead of repenting, men blaspheme God on account of his righteous judgments. (v. 21.)

The plagues that are to come on the Romish

*See "Hope for the Jews," by the author.

Church, designated by the *earth*, are described. (chap. xvi.) Five of "the vials of the wrath of God," have been poured out, or are pouring out. The *sixth* may have commenced its work on the great river *Euphrates*, and the way for the kings of the east, or from the rising of the sun may be preparing. See vs. 2-17.

Should God be pleased to prolong his life and continue his intellectual powers, the public may hear again from the writer, on this interesting subject; interesting, because it relates to prospects before the church and the world, as held up to view in God's inspired word of prophecy.*

* The reader is requested, to observe and remember, that this *Antidote* is entirely independent of the review of Dr. S.'s history in the January number of the B. R. & P. Review. That Periodical did not come into my hand, till January 31st. Marking the time on the cover, I laid it down with the purpose not to read the review, until my pamphlet was completed. In accordance with this purpose, I did not begin the perusal till March 13th, when one form of eight pages had been printed off, and another was ready for the same operation.

Both reviews are entirely independent of each other.

April 1st, 1854.

P. S. Should another edition of this pamphlet be called for, the author will enlarge it, by publishing, in connexion with it, some of Schaff's notes; and thus save the trouble of referring to his bulky volume of 678 pages, and the expense of purchase, to those who do not wish to possess it.

I am now doing what those who have read my pamphlet may be looking for. J. J. J.

CHAPTER XIII.

PROMISE FULFILLED—SCHAFF'S REASONING EXPOSED.

Agreeably to the promise in the note, page 143, we shall answer what Schaff urges (on pp. 352-354) in favor of Peter's primacy; although he had previously, more than one hundred pages before, distinctly surrendered his primacy as unscriptural.

Here we have a counter part to his contradiction exposed, (pp. 72, 73,) where it is shown that, after he had admitted the papacy had no existence for six hundred years, (A. D.) he ascribes to it a duration of eighteen hundred years.

"Rather," says this vacillating writer, (p. 352,) "must we, with all the fathers and the best modern Protestant interpreters, refer these words, 'Thou art a rock, &c.,' by all means to Peter, indeed, but only to him as he appears in the immediate context, that is to renewed Peter, to whom God had revealed the mystery of the Incarnation (vs. 16, 17); to Peter, the fearless confessor of the Saviour's divinity; in a word to *Peter in Christ.*"

Admirable reasoning! Mere confident assertions! He has not named a single father; nor can he name one to sustain his unblushing assertion! Dr. Proudfit has proved that up to the *fifth* century, not one father, either *Greek* or *Latin*, can be found to justify this reckless assertion. See *New-Brunswick Review*, No. 2.

Nor does Prof. Schaff name one of the best modern Protestant interpreters. Who are they? German interpreters? And are modern German interpreters fit to be compared with ancient Protestant interpreters of the word of God? What are Schaff and other modern German interpreters, who, for reasons

best known to themselves, assume the noble name of Protestants, to true ancient Protestants? Such as LUTHER and MELANCTHON, TURRETIN, URSINUS, VERENFELS, CALVIN, VITRINGA, and Archbishop USHER.

They had thoroughly studied the Romish Church, or the Papacy; they were diligent students of the Holy Scriptures, and were guided by them as the inspired rule of faith and practice, and not by science, falsely so called, and false traditions. But Schaff, we have shown, (pp. 108-114,) is ignorant of the Sacred Scriptures, and misled by false science and silly traditions; instead of being guided by our Lord's word, plainly uttered. Hence his lamentable errors, and those of his associated interpreters, who call themselves Protestants.

SCHAFF'S INTERPRETATION EXPOSED.

Is it not perfectly plain that God had revealed the mystery of the incarnation to all the apostles, as well as to Peter; and that they were all in Christ, as well as Peter?

Had S. studied the Scriptures with an unprejudiced mind, he would not have blundered so much as it will appear he has; for he might in them have learned,

1. That, in Matt. xiv. 33, it is written, "Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the *Son of God*."

2. That his disciples were in the ship. (v. 22.) "Jesus constrained his disciples to get into a ship, and to go before him unto the other side, while he sent the multitude away."

3. That on this occasion Peter's faith failed; although he had faith enough to say, "Lord if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water. (v. 28.) He went at the bidding of the Lord. "He walked on the water, to go to Jesus." (v. 29.) But his faith failed. "But when he saw the wind was boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, Lord, save me." He incurred a rebuke. "And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and caught him, and said unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" (vs. 29-31.)

4. That all recited in this chapter occurred A. D. 31; but the event to which S. refers, in the sixteenth chapter, A. D. 32; and beyond dispute subsequently to what is recorded in chap. xiv.

5. From the Scriptures, he might also have learned, that Nathanael had, in the first year of our Lord's public ministry, made this noble confession: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel,"—and indeed, that the knowledge of the mystery of the Incarnation was revealed to every believer. "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." (John i. 14, 49.)

He adds:

"To Peter, the fearless confessor of the Saviour's divinity."

Did Dr. S. never read what Peter said in the name of his fellow disciples, (A. D. 31,) one year before his confession in Matt xvi. 16-18. "And *we* believe, and are sure, that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." (John vi. 68, 69.)

And let me bring to his remembrance another pas-

sage, relating to John and Peter; and ask him who was the *fearless confessor of their Master*.

All the apostles had promised not to forsake the Lord; but when he was seized by the band of soldiers, they all did depart. But Peter and John recovered from the panic and followed Jesus. John "was known unto the high priest, and went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest. But Peter stood at the door without. Then went out that other disciple, which was known unto the high priest, and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter." (John xviii. 15, 16.)

Alas! what followed is recorded! See vs. 17, 25-27. Luke xxii. 56-62.

That Dr. S. does not possess the qualities requisite to a faithful interpreter of the Holy Scriptures, has, we think, been amply proved in this chapter.

We shall add a TEST of *his qualities* by

A REVIEW OF HIS EXPOSITION OF THE TWELVE CHAPTERS
OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

In the note referred to, (p. 143,) we said, "he *magnifies* Peter and *underrates* the other apostles."

Now for the proof.

On the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost was shed down upon the apostles and disciples, did Peter begin first to speak?

The narrative by *Luke*, in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, does not say so, but the contrary.

It is recorded, (v. 4,) "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Attracted by the noise accompanying this stupendous miracle, or by report, the multitude had, we suppose, assembled around the house where the apostle and disciples were, and that they (all who had shared in the gifts of the Spirit) had gone out to the multitude; and guided by the Spirit, had addressed different portions of them, in their own tongues. Hence their amazement and inquiry among themselves. (See vs. 6-12.)

A very different effect was produced on others, probably inhabitants of Jerusalem, unbelieving Jews. (v. 13.) They, "mocking, said, These men are full of new wine." As these mockers were probably alarmed, and wished to arrest the impressions made on the minds of many, they may have spread themselves among the strangers assembled at Jerusalem, and proclaimed what they thought, that "these men were full of new wine."

Their mocking being heard by all the apostles, may have brought them together, and led to an agreement that Peter should address the multitude, explain the miracle, and expose the mockers. Thus we account for what is written in the *fourteenth* verse: "But Peter, standing up with the *eleven*, lifted up his voice, and said unto them, Ye men of *Judea*, and *all ye that dwell at Jerusalem*, be it known unto you, and hearken to my words." See his address from the 14th to the 36th verse.

The substance of his address is recorded,—not the whole (v. 40); and the effect of it is stated (v. 37): "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter, and to *the rest of the apostles*, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" See Peter's answer, vs. 38, 39.

The result of the preaching and labors of the apostles on that memorable day, we have recorded in v. 41; for it would be unreasonable to believe that the Holy Spirit accompanied, with his convincing light and renewing grace, only the addresses of Peter. All were honoured by the Spirit, as instruments in converting sinners; all assisted in examining applicants, and taking their confession of repentance and faith, as well as in applying water in baptizing the three thousand who were added to the church that day. The physical powers of Peter were insufficient for the mighty work of the day of Pentecost; and the miraculous endowments of the eleven apostles and others, show that God had qualified them for effecting the glorious addition he designed for his church. It is written in v. 43: "And fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done by the *apostles*." And in the last verse, "And the Lord added to the *church* daily such as should be saved."

In the *third* chapter the miracle wrought on a cripple, at the Beautiful gate of the temple, is by Peter attributed to *John*, as well as to himself; for he said, (v. 4,) "Look on *us*." The healed cripple did the same; he "held Peter and *John*." (v. 11.) The people did the same. (v. 12.) Peter again ascribed it to *John* as well as to himself, saying to the people, "Why look ye so earnestly on *us*, as though by *our own* power or holiness *we* had made this man to walk." (v. 12.) And he gives the glory to Jesus Christ. (v. 16.)

In the *fourth* chapter, we are informed of the imprisonment of Peter and John. (vs. 1-3.) Of their appearance before the council the next day. (vs. 5-7.) Of Peter's address. (vs. 8-12.) The rulers see the

boldness of Peter and *John*. (v. 13.) They command them not to "teach in the name of Jesus." (v. 18.) Peter and *John* answer. (vs. 19, 20.) Being dismissed, Peter and *John* "went to their own company, and reported all, &c." (vs. 23-30.) The prayer of the company is answered. (vs. 31-33.)

In the *fifth* chapter, Peter appears prominent; but it is said, "And by the hands of the *apostles* were many signs and wonders wrought among the people," "and believers were the more added to the Lord; multitudes both of men and women." (vs. 12-14.) The high priest, &c., imprison the *apostles*. (vs. 17, 18.) The angel of the Lord delivers *them*, at night, and commands them to "Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life." *They* obey. (vs. 19-21.) When brought before the council, to the demand of the high priest, "Peter and the *other apostles* answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men, &c." (vs. 29-32.) The council are filled with wrath. Gamaliel interposes. They yield. But they beat the *apostles* and commanded *them* not to "speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go. And they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name. And daily in the temple, and in every house, *they* ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ." (vs. 40-42.)

The *sixth* chapter contains an account of the proposition of the *twelve* apostles to the multitude of the disciples, to choose seven deacons to relieve themselves from the burden of serving tables, that they might devote themselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word. The proposition pleased the whole multitude. They chose seven deacons and

set them before the *apostles*; (not Peter alone,) and having prayed, *they* laid *their* hands on them. (v. 6.) "The disciples were multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." (v. 7.)

The remainder of the chapter relates to *Stephen's* success in disputing with the members of a synagogue; his great wonders and miracles; their conspiracy against him, and their bringing him before the council, &c.

The *seventh* chapter contains Stephen's noble defence before the high priest and council, and glorious and triumphant death.

The *eighth* chapter informs us that, in consequence of a great persecution against the church at Jerusalem, the disciples, *except the apostles*, were scattered abroad, throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria; and that *Saul* made havoc of the church. (vs. 1-3.)

It narrates the wonderful success that accompanied the preaching of the gospel by *Philip*, in the city of Samaria. Previously to his visit, *Simon*, a sorcerer, had bewitched that people, so that they all, from the least to the greatest, regarded him as "*The great power of God.*"

But when *Philip* preached Christ, "the people with one accord gave heed to the things which he spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did." "There was great joy in that city." Believing Philip, "they were baptized, both men and women." Even *Simon* himself believed, and was baptized, and continued with Philip, wondering at the miracles and signs he saw done. (vs. 5-13.)

Philip, at the direction of the angel of the Lord, went to the south. There he saw a man of Ethiopia, an eunuch of great authority, under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, returning from Jerusalem; and, while sitting in his chariot, he was reading Esaias, the prophet. At the direction of the Spirit, Philip ran to his chariot, and inquired whether he understood the prophet's meaning? At the invitation of the eunuch, he ascended the chariot; and from the passag  he was reading, he preached Jesus and his salvation; and as he had doubtless spoken to him about baptism, in the name of Christ, when the eunuch saw water, he desired to be baptized. Having replied to Philip's inquiry, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;" he was baptized. "The Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing." (vs. 26-39.)

"But Philip was found at Azotus (Ashdod): and passing through, he preached in all the cities, till he came to Cesarea." (v. 40.)

"History," says Doct. Scott, ("*a modern interpreter,*") "informs us, that this eunuch became a preacher of the gospel in Ethiopia and the adjacent regions, and there founded a flourishing church, which continued for several ages afterwards; and it is supposed, on very probable grounds, that he was endued with the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, to qualify him for that service."

But of the wonderful success of Philip's preaching, which is contained in the *eighth* chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, Schaff takes no notice. It would have interfered with his fruitless attempt to sustain the papal assumption of Peter's primacy in the apostolical college.

Having passed over what is said of Peter, we return to it.

When the apostles at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, what did they do? Did they apply to Peter, to send some one or two to inquire into the state of things in that City, and put them in proper order? No such thing is recorded by Luke; but he does record, that the apostles "*sent* unto them Peter and *John*." (v. 14.)

Was anything like this heard of in the Romish church, which Schaff tells us "inherited the prerogatives and gifts of Peter?"

Did the cardinals, who elect the pope, and kiss his toe, and worship him as a God, ever *send* him to visit a church and preach the gospel? Would not his holiness rebuke their presumption, and spurn their assumption of authority?

But the apostles did actually send *Peter* their primate, and *John*, his younger brother. And when they had arrived at Samaria, did Peter act the part of a *primate*? Not an intimation of this appears in the record. Had Schaff held the pen, he would have written very differently. The inspired record is plain and rebukes this professed Protestant. "Who, when *they* were come down, prayed for them,—and then laid *they* THEIR hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." "Simon saw through laying on of the *apostles'* hands, the Holy Ghost was given." (v. 18.) He coveted the same power, and offered money; to whom? to Peter? No, he saw no *primacy* in Peter; and therefore offered money to *them*,—to *John*, as well as to Peter. And when Peter rebuked his impiety, and denounced God's displeasure, and exhorted him to pray; whose prayers did he (Simon) solicit,

only Peter's? No. He said, "Pray *ye* to the Lord for me, that none of these things which *ye* have spoken, come upon me." (v. 24.) Throughout, the plural number is used.

Paul was converted in the year 35, only two years after the preaching of the gospel on the day of Pentecost; and from the year of his conversion to the meeting of the apostolic council at Jerusalem in 52, there are seventeen years. During that time Paul had been twice at Jerusalem; the *first* time, three years after his conversion, when he saw Peter and abode with him fifteen days; but he saw no other of the apostles, "save James, the Lord's brother." (Gal. i. 18, 19.) The *second* time, he went to meet the apostles in council, by revelation. (Gal. ii. 1, 2.) And Paul tells us the estimation he formed of the apostles whom he saw in the council, by the arrangement in which he puts them: "And when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." (v. 9.) The remainder of this chapter contains an account of Peter's base dissimulation at Antioch, and of the just and faithful rebuke which Paul gave "to Peter before them all."

All this, however, Schaff keeps in the back ground, that he may utter, without being immediately convicted of falsehood, his shameless boast. (See it at the close.)

Any reader who carefully considers what has been said under this *test*, will, I think, allow that I have shown that Professor S. does not possess the qualities requisite to an *honest* and *fair* interpreter of the *Sa-*

5. Schaff artfully conceals the date when a primacy like that of Peter

“Was undoubtedly conceded to the bishop of Rome, by the ancient church, both of the East and of the West;”

and artfully connects this with the three councils he names.

Surely *Mosheim* had taught him, that before the council of *Nice*, (325,) ambition had much infected Christian bishops, even before the Roman empire was declared *Christian* by CONSTANTINE; and was afterwards greatly augmented by his lavish and princely favors; so that the ministry, and especially the office of bishop, became an object coveted by many unconverted men.

Dr. Schaff well knows, that CONSTANTINE was able, by his influence, without opposition from any members of the council of *Nice*, to mould the external form of the Christian church, so as to make it correspond with the three Prefectures into which he had distributed his civil empire; and that after he had built CONSTANTINOPLE, and had removed to that city the seat of government, he made it the *See* of a bishop, who was raised to a rank of influence and authority, equal to that enjoyed by either of the three previously established by him.

The authority over the church, assumed by the first Christian emperor, was an encroachment on the divine prerogatives and rights of Jesus Christ, the sole and sovereign Head of the Church on earth. Of course it was highly displeasing to Him, and brought upon the empire the frowns of Almighty God, who will not give his honor to a sinful mortal. It prepared the way for the grand *apostasy*, the ruin of the Roman empire, and the elevation of *Anti-Christ* to his

impious throne; whose doom and downfall are so clearly predicted in the Holy Scriptures.

With one "vast stride," (to use his own words in regard to the *medicæval popes*;) this German philosopher, in defiance to scriptural truth, and all true and authentic history, passes over the *first, second and third* century, and enters the *fourth*, with the Papacy (no light burden) on his back, and places it (as he imagines) on a sure foundation, the *council of Nice*. (A. D. 325.) But it will prove to be a foundation of sand, when the floods come!

Taught by the Papacy, Schaff has become an apt scholar; and, like holy mother, he aims at great achievements!

But as this German philosopher professes to believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, (though we shall see, in the coming chapters, how he sets it aside, by the authority he attributes to traditions,) I shall here, for his instruction and conviction, remind him of the *inspired* testimony of Paul, who said, in vindication of his apostolical character: "For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles. (2 Cor. xi. 5.)

And to remind this German historian of facts, which he seems apt to forget, or to keep out of view, because they do not suit his purpose, I shall set before him and my readers, what another German historian, a real Protestant, has recorded of the centuries which he has passed over, by one "vast stride."

Of the government of the church, in the three first centuries, MOSHEIM writes thus (cent. 1, vol. i. p. 99, sect. viii.):

"The rulers of the church were called either *presbyters*, or *bishops*, which two titles are, in the New Testament, undoubtedly applied to the same order of men. These were persons of eminent gravity, and such

as had distinguished themselves by their superior sanctity and merit. Their particular functions were not always the same; for while some of them confined their labours to the instruction of the people, others contributed in different ways to the edification of the church."

Sect. xii, p. 103, he writes:

"Let none, however, confound the bishops of this primitive and *golden* period of the church with those of whom we read in the following ages. For, though they were both distinguished by the same name, yet they differed extremely, and that in many respects. A bishop, during the first and second century, was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly, which, at that time, was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly, he acted not so much with the authority of a *master*, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful *servant*. He instructed the people, performed the several parts of divine worship, attended the sick, and inspected into the circumstances and supplies of the poor. He charged, indeed, the presbyters with the performance of those duties and services, which the multiplicity of his engagements rendered it impossible for him to fulfil; but had not the power to decide or enact any thing without the consent of the presbyters and people. And, though the episcopal office was both laborious and singularly dangerous, yet its revenues were extremely small, since the church had no certain income, but depended on the gifts or *oblations* of the multitude, which were, no doubt, inconsiderable, and were moreover to be divided between the bishops, presbyters, deacons, and poor."

Sect. xiii. *Mosheim* says:

"The power and jurisdiction of the bishops were not long confined to these narrow limits, but soon extended themselves, and that by the following means. The bishops, who lived in the cities, had either by their own ministry or that of their presbyters, erected new churches in the neighbouring towns and villages. These churches, continuing under the inspection and ministry of the bishops, by whose labours and counsels they had been engaged to embrace the gospel, grew imperceptibly into ecclesiastical provinces, which the Greeks afterwards called *dioceses*. But as the bishop of the city could not extend his labours and inspection to all these churches in the country and in the villages, so he appointed certain suffragans or deputies to govern and to instruct these new societies; and they were distinguished by the title of *chorepiscopi*, i. e. country bishops. This order held the middle rank between bishops and presbyters, being inferior to the former, and superior to the latter."

But, in sect. xiv. he writes:

"The churches, in those early times, were entirely independent; none of them subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each one governed

by its own rulers and its own laws. For, though the churches founded by the apostles, had this particular deference shewn them, that they were consulted in difficult and doubtful cases; yet they had no juridical authority, no sort of supremacy over the others, nor the least right to enact laws for them. Nothing, on the contrary, is more evident than the perfect equality that reigned among the primitive churches; nor does there even appear, in this first century, the smallest trace of that association of provincial churches, from which *councils* and *metropolitans* derive their origin. It was only in the second century that the custom of holding councils commenced in *Greece*, from whence it soon spread through the other provinces.

CHANGE IN THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

Chapter II. Century II., our historian writes :

“The form of ecclesiastical government, whose commencement we have seen in the last century, was brought in this, to a greater degree of stability and consistence. One inspector, or *bishop*, presided over each Christian assembly, to which office he was elected by the voices of the whole people. In this post he was to be watchful and provident, attentive to the wants of the church, and careful to supply them. To assist him in this laborious province, he formed a council of *presbyters*, which was not confined to any fixed number; and to each of these he distributed his task, and appointed a station; in which he was to promote the interests of the church. To the bishops and presbyters the ministers, or *deacons*, were subject; and the latter were divided into a variety of classes, as the different exigencies of the church required.

“During a great part of this century, the Christian churches were independent of each other; nor were they joined together by association, confederacy, or any other bonds but those of charity. Each Christian assembly was a little state, governed by its own laws, which were either enacted, or, at least, approved by the society. But, in process of time, all the Christian churches of a province were formed into one large ecclesiastical body, which, like confederate states, assembled at certain times, in order to deliberate about the common interests of the whole. This institution had its origin among the Greeks, with whom nothing was more common than this confederacy of independent states, and the regular assemblies which met, in consequence thereof, at fixed times, and were composed of the deputies of each respective state. But these ecclesiastical associations were not long confined to the Greeks; their great utility was no sooner perceived, than they became universal and were formed in all places where the gospel had been planted. To these assemblies, in which the deputies or commissioners of several

churches consulted together, the name of *synods* was appropriated by the Greeks, and that of *councils* by the Latin; and the laws that were enacted, in these general meetings, were called *canons*, i. e. *rules*.

“These *councils*, of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of this century, changed the whole face of the church, and gave it a new form; for by them the ancient privileges of the people were considerably diminished, and the power and authority of the bishops greatly augmented. The humility, indeed, and prudence of these pious prelates prevented their assuming all at once the power with which they were afterwards invested. At their first appearance in these general councils, they acknowledged that they were no more than the delegates of their respective churches, and that they acted in the name, and by the appointment of their people. But they soon changed this humble tone, imperceptibly extended the limits of their authority, turned their influence into dominion, and their counsels into laws; and openly asserted, at length, that CHRIST had empowered them to prescribe to his people *authoritative rules of faith and manners*. Another effect of these councils was, the gradual abolition of that perfect equality, which reigned among all bishops in the primitive times. For the order and decency of these assemblies, required, that some one of the provincial bishops met in council, should be invested with a superior degree of power and authority; and hence the rights of Metropolitans derive their origin. In the mean time, the bounds of the church were enlarged, the custom of holding councils was followed wherever the sound of the gospel had reached; and the universal church had now the appearance of one vast republic, formed by a combination of a great number of little states. This occasioned the creation of a new order of ecclesiastics, who were appointed, in different parts of the world, as heads of the church, and whose office it was to preserve the consistence and union of that immense body, whose members were so widely dispersed throughout the nations. Such was the nature and office of the *patriarchs*, among whom, at length, ambition, being arrived at its most insolent period, formed a new dignity, investing the bishop of *Rome*, and his successors, with the title and authority of prince of the patriarchs.

“The Christian doctors had the good fortune to persuade the people, that the ministers of the Christian church succeeded to the character, rights and privileges of the Jewish priesthood; and this persuasion was a new source both of honors and profit to the sacred order. This notion was propagated with industry some time after the reign of ANRIAN, when the second destruction of Jerusalem had extinguished among the Jews all hopes of seeing their government restored to its former lustre, and their country arising out of ruins. And, accordingly, the *bishops* considered themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the *high priest* among the Jews, while the *presbyters* represented the priests, and the *deacons* the *Levites*. It is, indeed, highly probable, that they who first introduced this absurd comparison of offices so

entirely distinct, did it rather through ignorance and error, than through artifice or design. The notion, however, once introduced, produced its natural effects; and these effects were pernicious. The errors to which it gave rise were many; and one of its immediate consequences was the establishing a greater difference between the Christian pastors and their flock, than the genius of the gospel seems to admit.

The reader, who will examine for himself, is referred to *Mosheim's* history of the III century, chap. ii. pp. 256–280; from which he will see the progress;—its restrictions;—the arts by which it deteriorated more and more from Christian simplicity and scriptural rule;—and what a deplorable change in the morals of the clergy followed this great change in church government, produced by the pride and ambition of ungodly bishops of various ranks;—that finally brought on the great apostasy, and the reign of *Anti-Christ*.



CHAPTER XV.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

“The latter (that is, supremacy of jurisdiction) was early claimed by the popes, but resisted in many instances, by Ireneas, Firmilianus, Cyprianus, by the whole Greek church, and was fully established only in the middle ages.”

Here is a great misstatement of facts. This supremacy of jurisdiction was never established over the Greek church. It led to a final separation between the Eastern and Western churches. It still exists, and these churches will never be reunited,

while a sovereign pontiff occupies what he falsely calls the chair of Peter; and impiously styles himself the vicar of Christ; and dares to require and receive from idolatrous cardinals and others like them, divine honor.

He must be precipitated from his impious seat, by the just judgments of Jehovah Jesus.

When that predicted event shall have arrived, (2 Thess. ii. 8,) then will many deluded Roman Catholics be converted by the preaching of the gospel; and in the same way multitudes belonging to the Eastern churches, will be enlightened and reclaimed from their errors; and being brought to embrace a pure scriptural faith, be prepared to unite with all true professing christians in the West, and other parts of the world; not by acknowledging a visible head. (another pope.) No, they will acknowledge Jesus Christ, the sole and sovereign Head of the church; they will embrace the true doctrines of his gospel; they will worship at the same throne of grace in his name, and love one another, as He has commanded all his disciples.

What assemblies, composed of delegates from all churches in the four quarters of the world, may hereafter be devised for the sake of interchanging views, giving tokens of fraternal love, and exhibiting a visible unity of the church, we leave to the future to determine.

Schaff makes no mention of the manner or means, by which this asserted supremacy of jurisdiction was established. This would cover the Papacy with shame and confusion. He, therefore, makes another "vast stride," from GREGORY VII to PIUS IX, the present pope; embracing eight centuries in four lines in his types.

But let us be just, even to S., who calls himself a Protestant, while, in fact, he is a Papist.

A CONTRAST BETWEEN PETER AND THE POPES.

Prof. S. has drawn a contrast in these words :

“(2). But there are other differences equally important as to the nature of this primacy, and the mode of its exercise. From the purely spiritual superiority of Peter, a fisherman of Galilee, who even when an apostle, had no silver or gold, (Acts iii. 6,) who traveled from land to land, preaching the gospel, without the least ostentation, accompanied by his wife, (1 Cor. ix. 5,) who humbly called himself a “co-presbyter,” and emphatically warned his brethren against all tyranny over conscience, and love of filthy lucre, (1 Peter v. 1-3,) it is a vast stride to the temporal as well as spiritual dominion which the later mediæval popes exercised over all the churches and states of western Christendom; distributing crowns and kingdoms, deposing princes, absolving the subjects from the oath of allegiance, persecuting all dissenters, good and bad, ruling the conscience with the iron rod of despotism, and even frequently perverting their unlimited power to their own selfish ends.”

Here indeed is a *contrast*, drawn by Schaff himself, between Peter the apostle, and the popes of the middle-ages. But let us improve it.

What pope of these ages, from HILDEBRAND to LEO X., was ever destitute of silver or gold, as Peter was?

What pope ever traveled about in humble style, like Peter; except the present pope, when, in 1848, he fled from Rome, in the disguise of a coachman, to Naples?

What pope ever went to preach the gospel, like Peter, in different places?

What pope, from GREGORY VII. to LEO X., ever had a lawful wife, as Peter, and did not gratify their lusts by fornication and adultery?

What pope, from HILDEBRAND, through the whole range of time to this day, has not persisted in the great wickedness of setting aside the law of God in regard to marriage; because he considered such impiety a great support to papal influence and authority over church and state?

What pope, in this long range of ages, ever published a bull, forbidding cardinals, archbishops, and bishops having mistresses, or indulging their animal propensities in criminal ways?

How unlike are the popes to Peter, whose successors they falsely claim to be, by divine right!!!

Let the reader turn to pages 21, 22, Part I., and read what MOSHEIM and EDGAR have said of the state of the Romish Church in the *tenth* century.

And does not Prof. S. know that this "vast stride" was commenced by GREGORY VII., and continued by his successors, till it was completed?

As his memory seems to answer his own purpose, by forgetting certain facts, I beg him to recollect the testimony of MOSHEIM, already printed (part i. pp. 39 4-6); where the character of HILDEBRAND is drawn, and the all-grasping and audacious plans of this unchristian and impious pontiff are exhibited to view, and in such a way that Schaff cannot deny the facts.

In America, which is not subject to the dominion of popery, he may be allowed to write what is contained in his long note, in the English language; but in a Roman Catholic country, he would not dare to publish it either in the English or German language. The Professor will understand me.

Surely he knows that no pope, to this day, has ever relinquished any portion of his dominion over church or state.

What does Professor S. think of the *insane* deification of the *Virgin MARY*, by the present pope and his council, lately convened at Rome; in defiance to *MARY'S* own *experience*, that she was a sinner, and therefore needed a *Saviour*, as well as other human beings? Hear her own testimony to the fact, while uttering words dictated by the Holy Ghost, before Jesus was born:

“And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord,

“And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour, &c.” (Luke i. 46-56.)

As a proof that no pope will ever relinquish his grasp on any power gained, and the fatal delusion of his subjects, let the German philosopher look at the *concordat* which the pontiff of the nineteenth century has drawn from AUSTRIA, and contemplate the degraded condition to which this Roman Catholic power has reduced herself.

APOLOGY FOR WICKED POPES.

Hear what Schaff says in their behalf:

“(3) If Peter himself, after having received the glorious promise, Matt. 16, thought *humanly* and not divinely; if he in carnal zeal cut off Malchus' ear; nay, thrice denied his Lord and Master from fear of men; and even after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost committed at Antioch a scandalous inconsistency; much less can we expect of his successors, who are not endowed, as he was, with the same supernatural gifts, that they should have always lived and acted consistently with their high calling any more than the kings and high-priests of the Jewish theocracy. Just in proportion, however, as the popes have abused their power, followed their own thoughts and plans instead of the word of God, and degraded the pastoral office by a wicked life, as in the disgraceful tenth century, again at the time of the reformatory councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil, and at the end of the fifteenth century and beginning of the sixteenth, (for an example we have but to remember that moral monster, Alexander VI,) in that degree is an earnest protest not only allowed, but even authorized and demanded.”

What a strange man we have to encounter! He repeats his errors, and we are compelled to repeat our refutations.

After having stated it as a fact, that there was no pope during the first six centuries, and yielded the primacy of Peter again and again; he, in the previous part of this paragraph of his note, (p. 376,) first insinuates that the church of Rome derived her pre-eminence from Peter, and then openly denominates the popes his *successors*.

What an obstinate adherence to error, in opposition to the Holy Scriptures, and to historical facts, clearly settled!

Here, then, we must recall to the reader's remembrance, that we have proved that Peter was never appointed primate of the apostolic college, and that Schaff has distinctly admitted the *equality* of the apostles more than once. Consequently, it follows conclusively, Peter never did, nor could, transfer to the *See of Rome* what did not belong to him to transfer. Peter was not bishop of Rome at any time; and even S. has acknowledged he was not bishop of Rome, in the *later* sense of the term; because it was inconsistent with the dignity of an apostle. (See pp. 114, 115.)

How absurd, then, in Schaff to call the popes Peter's successors!

SHAMEFUL APOLOGY!

The apology which this German philosopher draws from the mournful falls of Peter, to extenuate the guilt of the detestable crimes of those abandoned popes of the *tenth* century, certainly deserves to be reprobated in the severest terms of Christian indignation.

Those vile monsters are destitute of any possible excuse; and the man who attempts to frame one brings himself under just suspicions of being what he ought not to be. It is an utter perversion of scripture facts, recorded for far different purposes, than to furnish an apology for crimes the most detestable!

On the opposite page, (377,) Schaff insinuates that

“The church of Rome (popes of Rome?) has inherited the prerogatives and gifts of Peter.”

Will this philosopher tell us what prerogatives and gifts of Peter?

Peter enjoyed the gift of a wife to whom he was lawfully married. He prized this gift, and was thankful to enjoy her company in his travels “from land to land,” while preaching the gospel. Did “the late *medieval popes* prize such a gift? HILDEBRAND, for example?

Alas! by no means. A wife would have been an encumbrance, that would have greatly interfered with the ambitious and audacious project of establishing an universal monarchy in church and state.

GREGORY VII. found it more consistent with his boundless views of worldly grandeur, to live in the fortress of *Canusium*, with the young MATHILDA, countess of *Tuscany*, and convince her,

“by experience, that neither ambition nor grace had extinguished the tender passions in his heart.” [See p. 127.]

It was another delightful *prerogative* of Peter to preach the gospel, and show to sinners, by unfolding the scheme of redemption by Christ, how they could obtain forgiveness of sin, by believing in him, as he did to Cornelius, the Roman centurion. (Acts x.) In no other way did the apostles ever forgive sins.

Did any of the *later mediæval* popes ever claim this prerogative of the holy apostles?

No, no! This they despised. They invented a less laborious and a more expeditious plan for gratifying their covetousness, and filling their coffers with riches. They delighted in the sale of indulgences. Thus they forgave sins of all kinds; they never preached the gospel; they hated the light, and closed the Bible, lest their evil deeds should come to the light; they substituted their impious dogmas in place of God's holy word. Thus they kept men in darkness, in sin and misery. (See chap. v. pp. 50-52.)

It was also Peter's prerogative to die a *martyr* for the TRUTH.

As a martyr for the TRUTH, it was an absolute impossibility for any one of the later mediæval popes to die. He might die as a martyr for his errors and wickedness, but not to uphold the cause of truth, and godliness, and righteousness.

Against the apology pleaded by Schaff in favor of these vile popes, I make my solemn protest before the world.

A SUPPOSITION FOR ILLUSTRATION.

Suppose a man were indicted for adultery and murder in one of our criminal courts.

Would any one but a *brazen faced Jesuit* dare to appear for him, and plead thus:

May it please your honors,

I can tell you from the Bible, that David, king of Israel, a man highly favored by God, committed first adultery, and then, to conceal his crime, committed a greater crime by murdering his faithful soldier, Uriah, the husband of Bathsheba.

Now, here stands before your bar a poor unhappy man, arraigned for two crimes, adultery and murder; and when the court considers the case of such a good and great man as king David, who fell, when left to himself, into the same crimes, should they not feel compassion on him, and forbear to inflict on him the punishment threatened by the law?

Thus might a Jesuit reason; but not a Protestant, nor an intelligent honest man, nor a man of common sense, who regarded the *purity* and *welfare* of civil society. He knows that the crimes of no man can be pleaded in excuse for the crimes of another. Every man must answer for himself at a human tribunal, as well as at the awful tribunal of eternal justice. The law must pronounce its righteous sentence. Let the murderer die for his crime. He is unfit to live. If, before the sentence is inflicted, he repents and believes, God will, for Christ's sake, forgive and save him; as the dying Saviour assured the penitent expiring thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."

David had, by his sins, incurred the penalty of death; but God, the sovereign lawgiver, was pleased to say to him, by Nathan, the prophet, when David had said, "I have sinned against the LORD, The LORD also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die." (2 Samuel xii. 13.) See in this chapter how severely he was chastised for his sins.

We have expressed our feelings at the singular apology which S. attempts to make for wicked popes; and now I shall just direct the attention of the reader to the screen which he casts over

"The reformatory councils of Pisa, Constance and Basil;"
instead of exposing them to full view and thus reveal-

ing the impieties of the popes. We shall hereafter notice them, to show their utter failure, through the cunning craft and death-like grasp of the popes, to their usurped and impious power; it will, therefore, be sufficient to state here, that they were convened through the urgent request and persevering importunity of the rulers of the Roman Catholic states, who felt the absolute necessity of a reformation of the church in its *head*, (the popes,) and its *members*, the priests, &c. But these councils, instead of effecting a reformation, resulted in perpetuating the abominations of the church. The popes dreaded nothing more than loss of any portion of their power.

Then, to prove what needs no proof, (to a student of the Bible,) that a protest ought to be made against wicked popes, (such for example, as "that moral monster, Alexander VI,") S., to show his impartiality, spreads his proofs through *ten* lines of his small types.

I have now noticed every thing deemed worthy of notice, in this long, artful and deceptive note; and for review and analysis, printed *verbatim* the whole, with the exception of less than a half page, referring to Paul, John and Peter, as types of churches. This I regard as mere German philosophical speculation, utterly unauthorized by Holy Scripture. Unwilling to allow it to appear on my pages, I dismiss it as unworthy of any further notice.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PAPACY, OR THE ROMISH CHURCH
DRAWN BY THE PEN OF INSPIRATION.

No one who has attentively read the preceding parts of this work, can for a moment imagine I am now speaking of the Church of Rome, as it existed in the days of the apostles.

No; I speak of the church of Rome, corrupted in faith, and practice, and worship by the papacy; such as it became by disregarding the warning of Paul in his epistle to the Romans; (chap. ix. 13-21) such as it existed after the council of Trent, and is now in the *nineteenth* century; and yet glorified so much by Prof. Schaff, who, a Protestant by profession, has, *knowingly*, set himself in opposition to the whole Protestant world.

Of this Romish church we speak, which by her own acts in the council of Trent, excinded herself from the church of Christ.

In our preceding chapters we have shown the tergiversations of S., and his attempts to mistify his writings, and to persuade his readers to believe errors, in opposition to facts which he had acknowledged to be true.

His glorification of the Romish church, in his unfortunate essay, (which he has not recalled, and I presume, dares not contradict, so far as the *abominable mass* is concerned,) is founded in deception; contradicts clear historic truth and plain scriptural teaching.

The character of the Papacy or Romish church is

drawn by the prophet Daniel,—by the apostle Paul,—and by the apostle John.

I. First by the prophet Daniel, in his *seventh* chapter.

Daniel delivered his prediction, B. C., 555 years, and before the existence of the Papacy, 606 A. M.—that is, *eleven hundred and sixty-one years* before the Papacy came into the church of Christ to corrupt its faith, and practice, and worship; and more than two thousand years before its approaching overthrow.

This corrupt state of the church was exhibited to the prophet Daniel in a vision, by the symbol of “another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things.” (v. 8.)

This little horn has long been regarded by Protestant writers as predicting the rise of popery in the church. Many things referred to, or said, in Daniel’s vision, prove the interpretation to be correct.

1. *The time* when it was seen by the prophet. He saw it coming up among the ten horns of the fourth beast, while the Roman empire, symbolized by “the fourth beast, dreadful and terrible,” continued to exist.

GREGORY the great was not pope in 590 A. D., as Schaff says on his page 36.

Gregory was a singular man. Had he studied the Holy Scriptures more, and paid less regard to false traditions, he would have acted a wiser part, and been preserved from the infection of sinful ambition, so prevalent among the bishops of his day; and been preserved from that degrading conduct of flattering PHOCAS, that abominable tyrant, who waded through

blood to reach the throne of the Cæsars. He failed in obtaining his object. *Phocas* flattered him, and excited his expectations; but he died before his exaltation to the pontifical chair. Besides, he could not have accepted the title of universal bishop, consistent with his own avowed sentiments; for he regarded such a title as *blasphemous*, and as the forerunner of *Anti-Christ*. See Bower's history, vol. i. pp. 412, 413.

Gregory ought to have known better, than to urge an argument founded on the supposition of Peter being a bishop of Rome: a falsehood inconsistent with Peter's dignity as an apostle.

Augustin, who was sent to England with forty monks, by GREGORY, arrived there A. D. 597; and became the first archbishop of Canterbury, A. D. 607. BONIFACE III obtained from PHOCAS the title of *universal bishop*; which GREGORY had called "*blasphemous, anti-christian, heretical, diabolical.*" See Bower, vol. i. p. 426.

2. "Behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man" (v. 8); indicating, say interpreters, great sagacity, craft, policy. How characteristic of popery!

3. "A mouth speaking great things." (v. 8.) "A mouth that spake very great things." (v. 20.) "And he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings." (v. 24.) "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and shall think to change times and laws." (v. 25.)

The usurper, the haughty, blaspheming pope, is plainly depicted in these verses!

4. "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them." (v. 21.)

Large volumes have been written to record facts, that prove the diabolical wicked spirit of the Papacy, manifested in murdering Christ's saints.

A small specimen will be given in the next chapter.

5. "And they shall be given into his hand, until a time and times and the dividing of time." (v. 25.)

This marks the duration of the reign of popery; and it agrees exactly with the duration assigned to it by John. (See Rev. xii. 14.)

6. From verses 13, 14, we learn, that the kingdom of the Son of Man was set up during the existence of the fourth beast or kingdom; and that "his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

7. By vs. 26, 27, we are taught that, at the appointed time, "the judgment shall sit" on the little horn, "and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end."

How clearly is the ruin of Anti-Christ or the Papacy here foretold!

8. "And the kingdom and dominion, and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given unto the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." (v. 27.)

What a clear prediction of the universal spread of truth and righteousness; or, in other words, how manifestly is the extension of the church of Christ over the whole earth, here exhibited in full view!

One remark more will finish this part of the character of the Papacy or Romish church, as drawn in Daniel's vision.

The remark is this: That the little horn is described without particular reference to his act of plucking up by the roots three of the ten horns, and thus becoming a civil power. This indeed is one mark by which he is known, and that attracted the prophet's attention; the truth of which he desired to know, as well as of the fourth beast. (See vs. 19-22.)

Daniel had "beheld in this horn eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things." (v. 8.) The explanation given to the prophet is found in vs. 24-26: He would rise *after* the first ten horns, and "be *diverse* from the first,—and shall speak great words against the Most High, and wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand, until, &c." All this is characteristic of the little horn.

He had eyes like the eyes of man,—a mouth that spake great, very great things against the Most High,—his looks were more stout than his fellows,—he blasphemed the Most High,—he thought to change times and laws,—made war with the saints,—sentence was given against him, &c.

All are characteristic of the popes; and all are fully verified by history.

The definition of the Papacy, as being a *civil*, tyrannical, persecuting, idolatrous *empire*, adopted by some, we think to be erroneous; because it throws back the existence of the Papacy to a time not warranted by the teaching of the vision.

The *ecclesiastical power*, the *popes*, *Anti-Christ*, are held up to view in this wonderful vision.

The popes became the *prime* movers of all the wickedness in the Romish church, and finally controlled all orders of the Hierarchy. The popes ex-

cited wars and persecutions, that deluged the Latin or western part of the Roman empire with blood!

All this appears from the extracts already given from different historians; and will be confirmed by the testimony of other historians, that will hereafter appear.

2 THESS. II. 3-12.

II. The apostle Paul has, in his epistles, clearly foretold the same sad and lamentable events that were predicted by DANIEL, 555 years before the Christian era; and consequently more than eleven hundred years before the Papacy had a formal existence; and before its final overthrow and destruction, more than two thousand and four hundred years. What a wonderful extent of prophecy in *Daniel's* vision!

1. The second chapter of Paul's second epistle to the Thessalonians, furnishes very striking and conclusive evidence, that coincides with and confirms the vision of Daniel.

On the verses in this chapter, I had inserted the Greek words with their appropriate articles, to show that they required a more emphatical translation. But as there are no Greek types in this office, I am compelled to devise another plan. I, therefore, propose to give a translation composed of the common version, and of the versions of Drs. *Doddridge* and *Mac Knight*; referring the reader to them and their authorities, to justify my translation.

The third verse then will read thus:

“Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day* (of judgment) *shall not come*, except the great apostasy come first; and that man of sin be revealed, that son of perdition:

“4. Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the church of God, showing himself that he is God.

5. Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?

6. And now, you know what restraineth, that he may be revealed in his time.

7. For the mystery of iniquity already worketh; only till he that restraineth be taken out of the way:

8. And then shall that lawless one be revealed; whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit or breath of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:

9. Whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders,

10. And with all deceit of unrighteousness in them who perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.

11. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie;

12. That they all may be damned, who believed not the truth, but took pleasure in iniquity.”

How perfectly this prediction of Paul harmonises with the vision of Daniel!

Surely the New Testament prophet has presented to the church a correct portraiture of the popes, that lawless one, that man of sin, that son of perdition; who, as a God, sitteth as a God in the church; changing God's positive laws, and selling forgiveness of sins already committed, and authorizing the commission of sins, for stipulated sums of money!

And how should the heart of a true christian weep, when he thinks of the delusions of the poor Roman

Catholics; from whom the popes have taken away the Bible; and compelled them to believe their lying dogmas; who are thus shut up under condemnation by God's holy and perfect law, in this world; and will, if they be not delivered from their delusions, be damned in the next world!

I TIMOTHY IV. 1-8.

This passage so plainly depicts the Papacy, that it needs no comment to enable those who are tolerably read in the history of the Romish church, or will carefully read our historical extracts to apply to the Roman hierarchy.

We shall, therefore, transcribe the verses, and leave them with the reader to reflect upon, and, from his own knowledge of papal history, trace the accuracy of the portraiture.

1. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils:

2. Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron:

3. Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.

4. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving:

5. For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.

6. If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained.

7. But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness.

8. For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.

2 TIMOTHY III. 1-9.

This passage needs no comment.

That it refers to the Papacy, describes the wickedness, deceitfulness, cruelty, licentiousness, formality, and final ruin of the Romish church, will appear manifest to all who have read her history. We, therefore, merely transcribe these verses, as we did those of the first epistle, and leave them to our readers to discover in history whom they depict.

1. "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come:

2. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy,

3. Without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good,

4. Traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God;

5. Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away.

6. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts;

7. Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.

8. Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth : men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.

9. But they shall proceed no further : for their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as theirs also was.

REVELATION XIII.

This chapter is too long for quotation. I must, therefore, leave it to my readers to be carefully read and studied, and compared with history written by honest and impartial Protestant writers, who love the truth, and are guided by scriptural truth ; not by such men as Prof. S., who depart from truth taught in the Bible, and from truth recorded in history ;—while they profess to be Protestants.

Such careful comparison of this chapter with true history, will lead them to discover that the New Testament prophet had, by *three symbols*, exhibited to him *three different phases* of the Papacy, or Romish church (corresponding to Daniel's little horn) ; and like that little horn, *blaspheming God*,—*persecuting his saints*,—*overcoming them*,—*reigning "forty and two months,"*—and finally *to go into captivity and to be killed*.

The xvii chap. of REVELATION should be read in connexion with the preceding ; because it contains the explanation of John's vision by another symbol of a "woman sitting upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, &c. And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, &c."

Then follows the explanation,—the war with the Lamb, and the Lamb's triumph, &c. (vs. 14–18.)

Believing it would produce a favorable impression on common minds, I had intended to transcribe passages clearly referring to the Papacy or Romish church—its gradual fall and final extermination; amounting to nearly *thirty*. But to keep this volume within proper limits, they shall be omitted.

THE VIALS.

The vials of God's wrath upon the earth (chap. xvi.) should not be entirely passed over; and yet I do not design to give an explanation of them in this book. Should I live a sufficient time, I may hereafter attempt it in a separate volume.

But as it is important for the church to know what point of time in prophetic chronology she has reached, I shall briefly indicate my opinion.

I believe that the first vial began to be poured out when the revolution in FRANCE commenced, in 1789.

My opinion is based on an exposition given by the late Rev. Dr. *Schmucker*; who was pleased to give me, some years ago, his volumes on prophecy; and to inscribe in the *first* the words, "*Pretium affectionis.*" His exposition seems conclusive.

For brevity sake, I pass by the *second*, *third* and *fourth* vial, and give it as my belief that the *fifth* vial (vs. 10, 11) began to be poured out at the revolution in Italy (A. D. 1848); when the present pope was compelled, in such humiliating style, to flee from Rome and run to Naples for protection.

"The vial was poured out upon the head (*throne*) of the beast; and his kingdom was filled with darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain."

“And they blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains, and their sores, and repented not of their deeds.”

Was not this symbol fulfilled at that time? What were the feeling of anguish by the dignitaries of the apostate church, when their head, whom they worshipped as God, fled from his throne in “the eternal city,” as a *coachman*, in disguise, to Naples, it is easy to imagine.

That they have not repented of their deeds has been proved by their insane and impious conduct, in establishing the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, as a dogma necessary to be believed for salvation; so insulting not only to the Son, but to the Father also. (John v. 22, 23. 1 John ii. 18, 22, 23.)

Must not our blessed Redeemer resent the shameful indignity offered to him by the deification of Mary, and teaching sinful mortals to rely on *her mediation* and *intercession*? Is not this robbing Him of his glory as our Mediator? What has he taught us on this point? He himself said: “For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all *men* should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him.” And again, He said, “He that hateth me, hateth my Father also.” (John xv. 23.)

From this declaration of the Master, the inference is irresistible, that if a man love the Son, he will love the Father; and that if a man do not love the Son, he will not love the Father. Equally conclusive is the inference, that if the pope and cardinals and archbishops, &c., who lately sat in council at Rome, had loved the Son of God, they would not have robbed him of

his mediatorial glory, and insulted him so grossly ; and consequently, dishonored and insulted the Father also ; as they have done by the dogma of the immaculate conception.

“Who is a liar,” inquires John, “but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father. Let that therefore abide in you which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father.” (1 John ii. 22–24.)

The final conclusion is this : The Romish church, by adopting the immaculate conception of Mary as an article of faith, has contradicted the testimony of the Holy Ghost, plainly recorded, as we have shown, in the gospel of Luke ; and thus set tradition in authority above the authority of God’s inspired word.

She has insulted and denied the Son of God. She has insulted and denied the Father also. In fine, she has proved herself to be a *false church*,—a *synagogue of Satan*,—*Anti-Christ*.



CHAPTER XVII.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, OR THE PAPACY NO PART
OF THE VISIBLE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

In the xvi. chapter we have endeavored to present the character of this apostate church, as drawn by the pen of inspiration; ages before she came into the world.

We briefly assigned, in chapter xii., p. 160,) the reasons on which our judgment was founded.

From the beginning of her existence in the *seventh* century, the papacy has been tyrannical, persecuting and idolatrous, and became more and more so, till she has become *apostate*, a *synagogue of satan*—*Anti-Christ*.

The question asked by some: "Have no pious individuals been found in the Romish Church?" we have already answered in chapter xii. p. 160.

And now, I am constrained to add what may appear harsh and uncharitable; but fidelity to my master, and love to the souls of men, demand its utterance.

It is this: No real Roman Catholic, living and dying in the belief and practice of his false religion, can be saved; because he belongs to a class of sinners who, the apostle Paul says, (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10,) "shall not inherit the kingdom of God." He is an idolater.

He may be an honest, upright man, and a respectable, useful citizen. Such was Paul before his conversion and faith in Jesus Christ. He could say of himself: "Touching the righteousness which is of the law, blameless." He entertained high hopes of heaven, and did not doubt his acceptance with God; for he says of himself: "I was alive without the law once." He was ignorant of himself, an unbelieving sinner, and therefore a persecutor of Christ's saints, just as the deluded Roman Catholics are, and relying just as they do, on his own righteousness or good works. "But when the commandment came," he says, "sin revived and I died." (Rom. vii. 9, 10.) He became convinced his own obedience and false Jewish faith could not save him from condemnation by God's most

holy and perfect law. Thus he was led to repentance and to rely on the righteousness of Christ, by faith, for pardon and acceptance with God. (Phil. iii. 3-14.)

The case of the young man who said he had "kept all the commandments from his youth up;" and inquired, "what lack I yet?" might be used to illustrate the condition of the Roman Catholics. (See Matt. xix. 16-26.)

True, a Roman catholic may, by coming to the knowledge of the true gospel, be enlightened, regenerated and sanctified by the spirit; he may repent and believe in Christ, on his dying bed, and be saved: just as the crucified thief who had reviled the Saviour; but before he died, being enlightened, he repented and believed, and he received to his petition this all gracious assurance: "To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." (Luke xxiii. 43.)

But then, let it be remembered, the penitent and believing sinner will be saved, not for his prayers, but as a sinner, enlightened, penitent and believing; not as an idolator and a Roman Catholic; but as one, who, being enlightened to see its errors, has renounced that idolatrous church, and all its superstitions, and committed himself for salvation to Jesus Christ, who he now believes to be the sole and sovereign Head of the universal church on earth; and that none can be saved in any other way than by relying on his obedience unto death, as the only ground of acceptance with a holy God. Such a penitent and believing sinner will, immediately after death, be received into the invisible and triumphant church in heaven.

PROOFS OF THE TYRANNICAL AND PERSECUTING SPIRIT OF
THE ROMISH CHURCH.

In Part I, we have given the quotations from *Mosheim* and *Edgar*, embracing four centuries, which show the miserable state of the Romish church in regard to ignorance, impurity, licentiousness of all orders, and the miseries that were brought on Rome itself by contending popes; and what calamities were brought on Germany, by the ambition, tyranny and impiety of GREGORY VII; who excited the people to rebel against the emperor, by pretending to have power to release them from the binding power of their oath of allegiance to their sovereign.

I. *The first proof* of the tyrannical spirit of Rome is the fact—she has taken away (i. e. by the popes) from her members the Holy Scriptures.

What greater act of tyranny and impiety could the Romish church have done, than depriving the people of the privilege of reading the word of God? How directly does this go in opposition to the injunction of Jesus Christ, who said to the Jews, and of course to all, "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." (John v. 39.)

Speaking of the popes, *Mosheim* (vol. iv. p. 208) says:

"They permitted their champions to indulge themselves openly in reflections injurious to the dignity of the sacred writings, and by an excess of blasphemy almost incredible (if the passions of men did not render them capable of the greatest enormities), to declare publicly, that the edicts of the pontiffs, and the records of oral tradition, were superior, in point of authority, to the express language of the holy scriptures."

As early as the *twelfth* century, and of course *four*

centuries before the *sixteenth*, in which the above quotations appear, *Mosheim* had written about the violent efforts of the popes to deprive the church of Rome of the light of divine truth, and of the deplorable consequences resulting from the ignorance of the priests and people, of the sacred scriptures, in corrupting the beautiful simplicity of christian worship, and in leading the ignorant to place more confidence in *relics* than in the merits of Christ.

“All orders contributed, though in different ways, to corrupt the native purity of true religion. The Roman pontiffs led the way; they would not suffer any doctrines that had the smallest tendency to diminish their despotic authority; but obliged the public teachers to interpret the precepts of Christianity in such a manner as to render them subservient to the support of papal dominion and tyranny. This order was so much the more terrible, in that such as refused to comply with it and to force the words of scripture into significations totally opposite to the intention of its divine author, such, in a word, as had the courage to place the authority of the gospel above that of the Roman pontiffs, and to consider it as the supreme rule of their conduct, were answered with the formidable arguments of fire and sword, and received death in the most cruel forms, as the fruit of their sincerity and resolution. The priests and monks contributed, in their way, to disfigure the beautiful simplicity of religion; and, finding it their interest to keep the people in the grossest ignorance and darkness, dazzled their feeble eyes with the ludicrous pomp of a gaudy worship, and led them to place the whole of religion in vain ceremonies, bodily austerities and exercises, and particularly in a blind and stupid veneration for the clergy.”

“The consequences of all this were superstition and ignorance, which were substituted in the place of true religion, and reigned over the multitude with an universal sway. Relics, which were for the most part fictitious, or at least uncertain, attracted more powerfully the confidence of the people, than the merits of Christ, and were supposed by many to be more effectual than the prayers offered to heaven through the mediation and intercession of that divine Redeemer.”

Moreover, *BOWER*, in his history of the popes, proves that Gregory VII, that ambitious and audacious pontiff, as *Mosheim* styles him, had begun this vile and impious work of robbing the people of the word of God, in the *twelfth* century.

GREGORY saw plainly enough, that if the people were permitted to read the Scriptures, he could not carry into execution the infernal plan of a universal monarchy, both in church and state.

When "the Duke of Bohemia desired leave to have divine service performed in the Slavonian tongue, that is, in the language of the country."

GREGORY wrote a letter in reply, containing an absolute refusal, in which he dared to say most falsely, that it was

"manifest to all who will but reflect, that it has pleased the Almighty that the Scripture should be withheld from some, and not understood by all, lest it should fall into contempt, or lead the unlearned into error. And it must not be alledged that all were allowed, in the primitive times, to read the Scriptures, it being well known that in those early times the church connived at many things, (how false) which the holy fathers disapproved and corrected when the Christian religion was firmly established. We therefore cannot grant, but absolutely forbid, by the authority of Almighty God and his blessed apostle Peter, what you ask, and command you to oppose to the utmost of your power, all who require it."

Bower proves how contradictory this was to our Saviour's command, and to 1 Cor. xiv.

He then shows how utterly opposite it was to the permission granted to the Moravians, by two of his predecessors in the pontifical chair, ADRIAN II and JOHN VIII.

The permission granted to Moravians was confirmed to them, notwithstanding the decree of Gregory, by Innocent IV, in 1248.

Pope against Pope! Yet all infallible!

CHAPTER XVIII.

PERSECUTION OF THE WALDENSES.

II. *Second proof* of the tyrannical and fiendish spirit of the Romish church, is her early begun and long continued persecutions.

Fox, in his history of martyrs, has indeed given an account of the martyrs under *Pagan Rome*; but in his account of martyrs under *Papal Rome*, he ascends no higher than the *seventeenth* century. Neither he nor *Mosheim* seems to have discovered the fact, that they began much sooner.

Bishop Newton has brought forward unexceptionable testimony from three witnesses, Roman Catholics, to prove her persecutions began very early.

We shall, therefore, introduce Newton's discoveries first.

He writes thus (vol. ii. p. 258):

"I will only produce the testimonies of three witnesses concerning them, whom both sides must allow to be unexceptionable, Reinerius, Thuanus, and Mezeray. Reinerius, flourished about the year one thousand two hundred and fifty-four; and his testimony is the more remarkable, as he was a Dominican, and inquisitor general.

"Among all the sects, which still are or have been, there is not any more pernicious to the church than that of the Leonists. And this for three reasons. The first is, because it is older; for some say that it hath indured from the time of Pope of Sylvester; others, from the time of the apostles. The second, because it is more general; for there is scarce any country wherein this sect is not. The third, because when all other sects heget horror in the hearers by the outrageonsness of their blasphemies against God, this of the Leonists hath a great show of piety; because they live justly before men, and believe all things rightly con-

NOTE.—Fox died A. D. 1587; Newton, A. D. 1781; or nearly two hundred years afterwards.

cerning God, and all the articles which are contained in the creed, only they blaspheme the church of Rome and the clergy; whom the multitude of the laity is easy to believe.' ”

“The credit of Thuanus as an historian is too well established to need any recommendation; and he is so candid and impartial, as to distinguish between their real opinions, and those heresies which were falsely imputed to them by their enemies. ‘Peter Valdo, a wealthy citizen of Lyons, about the year of Christ one thousand one hundred and seventy, gave name to the Valdenses. He (as Guy de Perpignan, bishop of Elna, in Roussillon, who exercised the office of inquisitor against the Waldenses, hath left testified in writing) leaving his house and goods, devoted himself wholly to the profession of the gospel, and took care to have the writings of the prophets and apostles translated into the vulgar tongue. When now in a little time he had many followers about him, he sent them forth as his disciples into all parts to propagate the gospel. Their fixed opinions were said to be these: that the church of Rome, because she hath renounced the true faith of Christ, is the whore of Babel, and that barren tree, which Christ himself hath cursed, and commanded to be rooted up; therefore we must by no means obey the Pope, and the bishops who cherish his errors; that the monastic life is the sink of the church, and an hellish institution; its vows are vain, and subservient only to the filthy love of boys: the orders of the presbytery are the marks of the great beast, which is mentioned in the Apocalypse: the fire of purgatory, the sacrifice of the mass, the feasts of the dedications of churches, the worship of saints, and propitiations for the dead, are inventions of Satan. To these the principal and certain heads of their doctrine others were feigned and added, concerning marriage, the resurrection, the state of the soul after death, and concerning meats.’ ”

“Mezeray, the celebrated historiographer of France, is short, but full to our purpose; for he saith, that ‘they had almost the same opinion as those who are now called Calvinists.’ ”

“It cannot be objected that this is protestant evidence, for they were all three members of the church of Rome.”

“In the *thirteenth* century, the Waldenses, and Albigenses had spread and prevailed so far, and were prevailing still further, that the pope thought it necessary to exert his utmost efforts to suppress them. For this purpose the first croisade was proclaimed of Christians against Christians, and the office of inquisition was first created, the one to subdue their bodies, the other to enslave their souls. It is enough to make the blood run cold, to read of the horrid murders and devastations of this time, how many of these poor and innocent Christians were sacrificed to the blind fury and malice of their enemies. It is computed that in France alone were slain a million; and what was the consequence of these shocking barbarities? No writer can better inform us than the wise and modern historian Thuanus. ‘Against the Waldenses, (saith he) when exquisite punishment availed little, and the evil was exasper-

ated by the remedy which had been unseasonably applied, and their number increased daily, at length complete armies were raised: and a war of no less weight than what our people had before waged against the Saracens, was decreed against them; the event of which was, that they were rather slain, put to flight, spoiled every where of their goods and dignities, and dispersed here and there, than that convinced of their error they repented. So that they who at first had defended themselves by arms, at last overcome by arms fled into Province and the neighboring Alps of the French territory, and found a shelter for their life and doctrine in those places. Part withdrew into Calabria, and continued there a long while, even to the pontificate of Pius IV. Part passed into Germany, and fixed their abode among the Bohemians, and in Poland and Livonia. Others turning to the west obtained refuge in Britain.' ”

Thuanus states that the sects of Leonists, or Waldenses is traced to the times of the apostles; and this is confirmed by a statement made by the Rev. J. P. Revel, Moderator of the Waldensian Synod, and representative of that ancient and venerable church. He came to this country to solicit aid for his people, who deserve respect and aid from all who love the truth, and wish to honour our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

He appeared before our General Assembly, while sitting in Philadelphia, in 1853; and on Thursday, May 26, he was introduced to the General Assembly, when he made a brief address, to which the Moderator responded; and after mutual salutations, Dr. Spring offered a resolution which was unanimously adopted. (Minutes p. 439.)

On page 595 is found “*Appeal of the G. A. in behalf of the Waldenses.*”

NOTE.—The above is Newton's translation. The original Latin is printed on the same pages with the translation; so that there is reason to believe Schaff has read these testimonies; but they were too audid for him. It suited his purpose best to take no notice of them.

FOX'S BOOK OF MARTYRS.

We are now prepared to select our extracts from this faithful writer.

Fox says, (vol. i. pp. 187-188):

“Pope Clement the Eighth, sent missionaries into the vallies of Piedmont, to induce the Protestants to renounce their religion; and these missionaries having erected monasteries in several parts of the vallies, became exceeding troublesome to those of the reformed, where the monasteries appeared not only as fortresses to curb, but as sanctuaries for all such to fly to, as had any way injured them.

“The Protestants petitioned the duke of Savoy against these missionaries, whose insolence and ill usage had become intolerable; but instead of getting any redress, the interest of the missionaries so prevailed, that the duke published a decree, in which he declared, that one witness should be sufficient in a court of law against a protestant; and that every witness who convicted a protestant of any crime whatever, should be entitled to an hundred crowns.

“It may be easily imagined upon the publication of a decree of this nature, that many protestants fell martyrs to purjury and avarice; for several villainous papists would swear anything against the protestants for the sake of the reward, and then fly to their own priests for absolution from their false oaths. If any Roman Catholic of more conscience than the rest blamed the fellows for their atrocious crimes, they themselves were in danger of being informed against, and punished as favorers of heretics.

“The missionaries did all they could to get the books of the protestants into their power, in order to burn them; when the protestants, doing their utmost endeavors to conceal their books, the missionaries wrote to the duke of Savoy, who, for the heinous crime of not surrendering their bibles and prayer books, and religious treatises, sent a number of soldiers to be quartered on them. These military gentry did great mischief in the houses of protestants, and destroyed such quantities of provisions, that many families were thereby entirely ruined.”

The cruelty of this treatment was little to what followed:

1. The duke tried to bribe protestants to abjure

NOTE.—See in LEMPRIER'S Bio. Dict. a sketch of his life, taken it seems, from a biography written by his son.

their religion and turn Roman Catholics, by promising exemption from taxes for five years.

2. He

“established a court, called ‘The Council,’ for extirpating hereties,” the design of which was to take away the ancient privileges of the Protestant churches.

3. The duke published a decree

“prohibiting any protestant acting as a school master or tutor, either in public or private, or to teach any art, or science, or language, directly or indirectly, to persons of any persuasion whatever.”

4. Then followed another edict which decreed that no Protestant should hold any place of profit, trust, or honour; and, to wind up all, commanding all Protestants to attend diligently on mass, that abominable rite.

“This edict,” says Fox, “may be compared to unfurling the bloody flag; for murder and rapine were certain to follow. (p. 188.)

“One of the first objects that attracted the notice of the papists, was Mr. *Sebastian Basan*, a zealous Protestant, who was seized by the missionaries, confined, tormented fifteen months, and then burnt.” (p. 188.)

“Previously to the persecution, the missionaries employed kidnappers to steal away the protestants’ children, that they might privately be brought up roman catholics; but now they took away the children by open force; and if they met with any resistance, murdered the parents.

“To give the greater vigor to the persecution, the duke of Savoy called a general assembly of the roman catholic nobility and gentry, when a solemn edict was published against the reformed, containing many heads, and including several reasons for *extirpating* the protestants, among which were the following:

“1. For the preservation of the papal authority.

“2. That the church livings may be all under one mode of government.

“3. To make an union among all parties.

“4. In honor of all the saints, and of the ceremonies of the church of Rome.”

To make sure of his prey, the cruel duke published an order that no Protestant, or any of his family,

should, within three days after the publication thereof, depart from certain places named.

"This was ordered on pain of death, and confiscation of house and goods, unless within the limited time they turned Roman Catholics."

"The publication was made January 25, A. D. 1655. The winter was remarkably sudden and rigorous."

Knowing what was coming, many would have fled, and left all to save themselves, but could not. Women were in circumstances that they could not; and husbands preferred staying with their wives, and parents with their children, to fleeing from them; risking all consequences.

"The papists, however," says the historian, "drove the people from their habitations at the time appointed, without even suffering them to have sufficient clothes to cover them; and many perished in the mountains, through the severity of the weather, or for want of food. Some, however, who remained behind, after the decree was published, met with the severest treatment, being murdered by the popish inhabitants, or shot by the troops who were quartered in the vallies. A particular description of these cruelties is given in a letter written by a protestant who was upon the spot, and who happily escaped the *carnage*."

"The army," says he, "having got footing became very numerous, by the addition of a multitude of neighboring popish inhabitants, who, finding we were the destined prey of the plunderers, fell upon us with an impetuous fury. Excluding the Duke of Savoy's troops and the popish inhabitants, there were several regiments of French auxiliaries, some companies of Irish brigades, and several bands formed of outlaws, smugglers and prisoners, who had been promised pardon and liberty in this world, and absolution in the next, for assisting to exterminate the protestants from Piedmont."

"This armed multitude being encouraged by Roman catholic bishops and monks, fell upon the Protestants in a most furious manner. Nothing now was to be seen but the face of horror and dismay; blood stained the floor of houses; dead bodies bestrewed the streets; groans and cries were heard from all parts. Some armed themselves and skirmished with the troops; and many with their families fled to the mountains. In one village they cruelly tormented one hundred and fifty women and children, after the men were fled, beheading the women, and dashing out the brains of the children. In the towns of Villaro and Bobbio, most of those who refused to go to mass, who were upwards of fifteen years of age, they crucified with their heads downwards; and the greater number of those who were under that age were strangled." (pp. 188, 189.)

Let Prof. Schaff know that this was one of the middle ages, which he lauds so highly; when all things were in such beautiful order, and men were so pious. How pious the Duke of Savoy, and his missionaries, and his troops, and his outlaws and smugglers, whom he promised to reward if they would assist in the good work, of exterminating heretics! How pious were all, in the estimation of the discriminating German and learned doctor! who has come to America to teach us not to profess to believe what we do not believe, and always to keep our solemn engagements! All were acting from motives from above—truly heavenly!

The general history is followed by an account how horribly individuals were tortured to death, and how children were dashed to pieces; and some before the eyes of their fathers; because they would not abjure their Lord and Master, and throw away their own immortal souls!

FURTHER PERSECUTIONS IN THE VALLEYS OF PIEDMONT,
IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

Under this head are narrated more than one hundred particular cases of persons in those valleys, who endured the most horrible tortures rather than renounce the true faith to save life. Among them were children. Some had gunpowder put into their mouth, and then the powder being set on fire, they were blown up. Some were hung in a barbarous way; some precipitated on the rocks, and dashed to pieces; some flayed alive, many after being killed given to dogs; and some before they were dead. Some had a

joint of each finger cut off, then another. In like manner their toes were cut off. Thus the legs and arms were maimed, by dis severing them at the joints. Days were spent in the operation. (pp. 190, 191.)

What an exhibition of the cruelty of a false religion, and how it can extinguish every tender feeling, and turn men into fiends!



THE PERSECUTIONS IN FRANCE: THREE.

First,—The MASSACRE at *Vassy*, by the *duke of GUISE* and his *brother*, CARDINAL GUISE.

Second,—The MASSACRE of ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S day, conducted by CHARLES IX. and the Queen mother, and CARDINAL LORRAIN.

Third,—The inhuman and infernal persecution of the Protestants, by LOUIS XIV and CARDINAL MAZARIN.

Having given a *small specimen* of the tender mercies of the *Papists* or *Roman Catholics*, in the VALLEYS OF PIEDMONT, &c., we proceed to hold up to view some on a *larger scale*, in FRANCE.

CHAPTER XIX.

FIRST—MASSACRE AT VASSY, 1562.

We begin with the MASSACRE AT VASSY, in the

This bloody tragedy was conducted by the duke of Guise and Cardinal Guise, his brother, on *Sunday*, the first day of March, 1562. (See Fox, vol. ii. p. 641.)

“ Arrived at Joinville, the duke of Guise inquired of some with whom he was familiar, whether the people of Vassy had sermons preached constantly by their minister.”

Being informed they had,

“ and that they increased daily more and more, he fell into a greivous passion,”

and formed the horrible purpose of destroying these unoffending Hugonots.

And to execute his fiendish design the more covertly and completely, without exciting the apprehensions of his contemplated victims,

“ he departed from Joinville ; accompanied with the cardinal of Guise, his brother, and those of their train, and lodged in the village of Dammartin the Free, which is distant from Joinville about two French miles and an half.

“ The next day being Sunday, after he had heard mass very early in the morning, being attended with about two hundred armed men, he left Dammartin, and passed along to Vassy. As he went by the village of Bronzeval, which is distant from Vassy a short quarter of a mile, the bell (after the usual manner) rang for sermon. The duke hearing it, asked those he met, why the bell rang so loud at Vassy. They told him it was to give the people warning of the sermon that was to be preached there. Then one called La Montague, said, ‘ It is for the assembling of the Hugonots ;’ adding, moreover, that there were many in the said Bronzeval who frequented the sermons preached at Vassy ; and, therefore, that the duke would do well to begin there and offer them violence. But the duke answered, ‘ March on, march on, we shall take them amongst the rest of the assembly.’ ”

The rejoicing of the pages and footmen we omit.

Certain soldiers of the duke, who had lodged with the papists, were seen on Saturday to prepare their weapons for use. But the fears of the faithful were not awakened ;

“ because they were the king’s subjects, and the duke and his brethren, about two months before, passing by near to Vassy, had given no signs of their displeasure.”

The duke had made arrangements for the preservation of the Papists from harm, by warning them of the danger of losing their lives, if they went into the streets.

He then assembled his retinue, and commanded them to march on to the place where the sermon was to be delivered. It was a barn in which the Protestants assembled for worship; amounting to about twelve hundred, consisting of men, women and children.

Horsemen went before, the duke and his retinue followed, and then the attendants of his brother, the cardinal.

The minister, Mr. Leonard Morel, had finished his first prayer and begun his sermon to his audience, when the horsemen

“shot off two harquebusses at those in the galleries near the windows. Alarmed at this, the people within endeavored to shut the door; but were prevented by the ruffians, rushing in with drawn swords, crying ‘Death, kill, kill these Hugonots.’”

Having seized one victim, when he had, on demand, avowed his faith in Jesus Christ,

“they smote him twice with a sword, which felled him to the ground. Having arisen, they struck him a third time. He fell and expired instantly.”

Two others were slain as they were attempting to escape through the door.

“The duke of Guise, with his company, entering violently, struck down the poor people with their swords and cutlasses, without sparing any sex or age.”

Of course this created great confusion, so that the poor creatures ran in all directions, in hope of escaping, like a flock of sheep, among whom a furious and devouring wolf had come. And wherever they

fled, they precipitated themselves on soldiers armed with cutlasses, to smite them in some part or other of their body; so that if not mortally wounded, they were maimed.

Some by breaking a hole in the roof, in hopes of escaping, endeavored to conceal themselves by lying down upon it. But others, after they had got on it, fearing they would be discovered there and shot down, preferred leaping over the walls of the city; which were very high, with a design of flying into the woods and among the vines. In this attempt, they were hurt in various parts; in their arms, or heads, or feet, or legs, or other places.

“The duke presenting himself in the house, with his sword drawn in his hand, commanded his men to kill especially the young men.”

Those on the top of the building were shot at, and killed or wounded.

Cardinal Guise

“was leaning at the walls of the church of Vassy, looking towards the place where his attendants were shedding the blood of his fellow creatures,”

for believing God's truth, and worshipping Him as He has prescribed in his word.

“The minister did not cease preaching till his pulpit was hit by a ball from a gun. Immediately falling upon his knees, he entreated the Lord to have mercy not only on himself, but on his poor persecuted flock. Having ended his prayer, he left his gown behind, in hopes of being unknown; but as he approached the door, he stumbled against a dead body, when he received a blow with a sword upon his right shoulder. Rising again, and endeavouring to escape, he was seized and severely wounded in his head with a sword. Deeming himself mortally wounded, he cried, ‘Lord, into thy hands I commend my spirit; for thou hast redeemed me, thou God of truth.’”

While thus praying, one of the murderers ran with an intent to hamstring him; but it pleased God to

save him, by breaking the sword of this wretch at the hilt. Two gentlemen interposed, and because he was the minister, thought proper to convey him to the duke, who, with his brother the cardinal, was now at the monastery. Taking him by both arms, they brought him before the gate of the monastery. The duke and the cardinal appearing, said :

“ ‘Come hither. Art thou the minister of this place? Who made thee so bold as to seduce this people thus?’ ‘Sir, I am no seducer,’ replied the minister, ‘for I have preached to them the gospel of Jesus Christ.’ ”

The duke feeling his cruel outrages condemned by this intrepid answer,

“ began to curse and swear. Determined to put him to death, he said, ‘Provost, go let a gibbet be set up, and hang this fellow.’ ”

“ He was delivered into the hands of two pages, who shamefully abused him; and ignorant papist women casting dirt into his face, previously cried, ‘kill him, kill him;’ ”

and with difficulty he was kept out of their violent hands.

The duke going into the barn, the large Bible was put into his hands.

“ Looking at it, he called to the cardinal: ‘Lo! the Hugonot’s hook.’ The cardinal examining it, said, ‘There is nothing but what is good in this book, for it is the Bible, the holy scriptures.’ ”

Offended at the manner in which his brother spake of the book, the duke flew into a greater rage than before; he uttered blasphemous expressions, and reproached his brother with speaking in an ignorant manner. Much displeased with such treatment, the cardinal was heard to mutter: “An unworthy brother!”

In this massacre, which continued a full hour, perished fifty or sixty persons. Besides as many as two hundred and fifty men and women were so wounded

that some died, and others lost a leg, or an arm, or their fingers.

The minister was kept a close prisoner for twenty-four hours. None were permitted to supply him with any necessaries, nor even to see or to speak to him. Often his keepers threatened to sew him up in a bag, and drown him. Their attempts to seduce him from his faithfulness to his religion, were ineffectual. He was kept a prisoner till May 8th, 1563; when, at the suit of the most illustrious prince of Portien, he was set free.

Such were the fiendish deeds of this duke of Guise. (Fox, vol. ii. pp. 641-644.)

CHAPTER XX.

SECOND—MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY, IN FRANCE, 1572.

This most atrocious massacre was, under the influence, planned and executed by king CHARLES IX, the Queen mother, and Cardinal LORRAINE.

The marriage of HENRY of *Navarre* with Charles's sister, furnished an opportunity for enticing the QUEEN OF NAVARRE, *Admiral COLIGNI*, and other distinguished Protestants to Paris. It was embraced. The plan for enticing them to come within their reach, was laid and executed with great deceit, and accompanied with solemn promises of being protected.

The admiral, as he was returning to his lodgings to dine there,

“accompanied by twelve or fifteen gentlemen, while reading a petition, was deliberately shot out of a window of a house, with a harquebuse, charged with three brass bullets. Feeling that he was wounded, the admiral requested some of his followers to enter the house, and to enquire by whom and by whose direction he was shot.”

The fellow had fled from the house on a horse provided for him behind the house. (See Fox, vol. ii. p. 648.)

“The king of Navarre, the prince of Conde, with many other of their religion having notice of the admiral’s hurt, complained to the king of this untimely accident; intreating they might have leave to depart out of the city, seeing they could expect no safety there. The king made great lamentations to them of the mischance that had happened, swearing and protesting that he would execute such impartial justice upon the offender, and on all the complotters, as should give the admiral and all his friends content; only he willed them to stay, promising them ere long to provide for their security.

“Among the surgeons and physicians sent for was Ambrose Pare, the king’s surgeon, a man very expert.”

He extracted the balls and cut off the admiral’s wounded finger;

“which put him to great pain, because his scissors were not sharp enough”

“The admiral endured all with an undaunted countenance and wonderful patience; while those who stood by and saw him so mangled, could not refrain from tears. Captain Monins held him with both his arms about the middle, and Cornaton held his hands. He, seeing them astonished, said, ‘My friends, why weep you? I think myself happy to be thus handled in the cause of God.’ And now casting his eyes upon a minister, called Merlin, he said, ‘Here you see, my friend, God’s blessings. I am hurt indeed; but I know it is come to pass by the will of my heavenly Father, humbly thanking his majesty, in that he is pleased to honor me so far, as to suffer anything for his holy name. Let us pray to him, that he would grant unto me the gift of perseverance.’

“Then looking upon the said minister who wept over him: ‘Oh, master Merlin,’ said he, ‘what, will you not comfort me?’ ‘Yes, sir,’ said he; ‘for wherein may you take greater comfort than in calling to mind how greatly God hath always honored you, in esteeming you worthy to suffer reproach for his name’s sake, and true religion.’ The admiral replied, ‘Alas! if God should deal with me according to my deserts, he might have put me to greater torments than these. But blessed be his holy name, in that he is pleased to take pity on his poor and unworthy servant, &c.’

“Then said Merlin, ‘Sir, you do well in turning away your thoughts from him who hath committed this outrage upon you, in looking only to God; for no doubt it is his hand that has smitten you; therefore for the present cease to think on the malefactor.’ ‘I assure you,’ said the admiral, ‘I do freely forgive him from the bottom of my heart, and those also that are his abettors, being fully persuaded that none of them all could have done me the least harm; no, though with violent hands they had put me to death. For what is death itself to God’s children, but an assured passage to an eternal rest and life.’

“About two o’clock in the afternoon, the king, accompanied with the queen-mother, his brother, with other of the lords went to visit the admiral.

“The king with tears seemed to be exceedingly sorry for that which was come to pass, promising him with one blasphemous oath upon another, to revenge the fact no less than if it had been committed on his own person: praying him to come and take up his lodging with him in the Louvre, for his greater security and safety. The admiral gave him most humble thanks for so great a favor as to visit him in his own person.”

The queen-mother played her part in the vile hypocrisy, and professed sorrow for what had happened. As the king’s physician gave it as his opinion that the admiral could not be removed without danger, he remained at his lodging.

• The noble admiral, persuaded that nothing could happen without the will of God, and being entirely submissive to his will, was deceived by the protestations of the king, and reposed confidence in his promises.

“Yet, when Bartholemew’s day came, about break of day, August 24th, 1572, they began to knock at the door of the house where the admiral lay. La Bonne, who lay not far from him, having the keys, perceiving there were some who came on a message from the king to the admiral, came down quickly and opened the door. Presently COSSEINS who had been appointed by the Duke of Anjon to defend the admiral’s lodging) fell upon him, and stabbed him with his dagger, so that he died. Then with his harquebusses rushing into the house, killing such as they met. Cornaton awaking with the noise that he heard at the door, (for he lay in the next chamber,) ran thither, causing the Switzers with other officers to fortify it. COSSEINS hearing that, cried out to him to open it in the king’s name, and he so handled the matter, that with the help he had, he forced the door open, and after gained the stairs. The admiral and those that were with him, taking notice how they shot off pistols

and gune, finding themselves inclosed in their enemy's hands, fell to prayer, begging pardon of God for their sins.

"The admiral rising out of his bed and putting on his night gown, commauded Merlin the minister to make the prayer. He also earnestly calling upon Jesus Christ his God and Saviour, commended his spirit into his hands. He that testified these things, and made report thereof coming into the chamber, and being asked by the admiral what that tumult meant, 'Sir,' said he, 'God is now summoning us to look to our end.' The admiral seeing what would be the issue, answered, 'I have long since expected death. Save yourselves if it be possible; for you cannot secure me. I commend myself into the hands of a merciful God.' Those who were present and escaped, have affirmed that the admiral was no more affrighted at death, which he saw present before his eyes, than if there had been no likelihood thereof at all.

"Besine, Cosseins and Sarlabour, with their targets in one hand, and their naked swords in the other, broke open the admiral's chamber door, and Besine (who was afterwards slain himself by one Bertoville upon the way, after he had escaped out of prison,) coming to the admiral, holding the point of his sword to his breast, said thus: 'Art not thou the admiral?' 'I am the man,' said he, with undaunted courage, as the murderers afterwards confessed. Then, beholding the naked sword, 'Young man,' said the admiral, 'thou oughtest somewhat to respect my years, and my infirmity of body, hut it is not thou that canst shorten my days.' Besine desperately thrust the admiral into the body with his sword, and then smote him therewith on the head, and the rest had each one a blow at him, so that he presently fell down wounded to death.

"Whilst this mischief was acting above, the Duke of Guise being below in the base court with other Romish Catholic lords, cried to the murderer above, 'Besine, hast thou done?' 'It is done,' said he. Then the duke replied: 'Monsieur, our knight, (meaning king Henry's bastard,) will not believe unless he see it with his eyes; throw him down out of the window.'"

How like the author of the bloody tragedy at
Vassy!

"Then Besine and Sarlabour, lifting up the body of the admiral, cast him down unto them, where he lay naked on the ground, exposed to all sorts of scorn and mock of the multitude; some trampling upon him with their feet. Now, because the blow which Besine had given the admiral on his head, had so covered his face with blood issuing thence, that his visage could not be discerned, the duke of Guise, stooping down, took his handkerchief and wiping his face therewith, said, 'It is he, I know him well enough;' giving his poor dead body a spurn on the head with his foot (whom all the murderers in France feared while he lived) he passed thence, encouraging his soldiers, saying, 'We have made a

good beginning ; now let us go on to the rest, for the king hath so commanded—the king hath so commanded,' repeating it twice over." (pp. 150, 651.)

"An Italian of the duke of Nevers' guard cut off the admiral's head, and brought it to the king and queen-mother: which, being embalmed, was sent to Rome to the Pope, and to the Cardinal of Lorraine, being here at that time.

"The common people the next day, cut off his hands and privy members ; and then, in this woful plight, being dragged up and down three days in the channels throughout the streets, he was at last carried out of the city to Mount Faucon, where they hanged him by the feet. Some, however, well disposed went to the gibbet secretly by night, took the admiral's body down, which they interred in a manner so secret that the papists were never able to find where it was buried, and they were obliged to make a body of straw and hang it up in place of the true body, rather than have nothing at all."

Besides a disgraceful decree passed by the parliament of Paris, against Gasper Coligni, admiral of France, after the massacre ; general processions were ordered to be made on the 24th of August, 1572, through the city of Paris, by way of thanksgiving to God, for this punishment inflicted upon the conspirator. (p. 652.)

REJOICING AT ROME AT THE MASSACRE.

"At Rome solemn masses were sung, and thanks were rendered unto God for the good success which the Roman Catholics had obtained in massacring the Hugonots. At night, in token of joy and gladness, many great bonfires were made in sundry places ; and it was reported the cardinal of LORRAINE gave a thousand crowns to the person who brought him this welcome news !" (p. 652.)

"It was credibly reported, that the number slain on *Sunday* and the two following days, in Paris and the suburbs, did amount to more than *ten thousand* ; counting lords, gentlemen, presidents, counsellors, advocates, lawyers, scholars, physicians, merchants, tradesmen, women, maids and children. The streets were covered with dead bodies ; the pavement dyed with blood ; the gates and entrance into the king's palace stained with the same colour. But the blood thirsty were not yet satisfied, for they still continued to go from house to house with their associates where they thought to find any Hugonots. They broke open the doors, then cruelly murdered whosoever they met, sparing neither

sex nor age. Carts were laden with dead bodies of young maidens, women, men and children, which were discharged into the river, it being covered, in a manner, all over with slain, and dyed with their blood, which also streamed down the streets from sundry parts thereof; whereat the courtezans laughed their fill, saying the wars were now ended, and that hercafter they would live in peace, &c." (pp. 652, 653.)

At this slaughter of human beings professing the true religion, and worshipping God and his Son Jesus Christ, (but not saints and angels, and the Virgin Mary,) the pope and his cardinals rejoiced. They will *wail* in the judgment day, with all idolators and murderers; when martyrs and all saints will triumph in their Lord and Saviour. (Fox, vol. ii. pp. 644-653.)

What we have extracted from the two folio volumes of FOX, is not a *twentieth* part of what his volumes contain. We have said nothing of Germany, nothing of Bohemia, nothing of the Netherlands, nor of Spain and its horrible inquisition; and merely a few words of England; although the account of the persecution of England, Scotland and Ireland occupies 1320 pages.

I only add, that Charles IX died at the age of twenty-five, a miserable death; dreadfully tormented in mind, yet blaspheming; laid upon pillows with his heels upwards and his head downward. The blood gushed from different parts of his body, but especially from his mouth; so that he expired in a few hours. (Fox, vol. ii. p. 640.)

Having selected all that we deemed proper from Fox's Book of Martyrs, to shew the persecuting and impious spirit of the Papacy or Romish church, to prove that it has so fallen in doctrine, in worship, and in conduct, as to have forfeited the name of a church of Christ; we now turn to *Quick's* SYNODICON

IN GALLIA REFORMATATA; *published in London, from ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS, in 1692.*

It contains the acts and proceedings of all the national synods that were held in France (*thiriy-nine* in number) during one hundred years; besides the doings of the Particular Synods.

MEMBERS OF THAT CHURCH SLAIN IN A FEW YEARS.

Quick (vol. i. p. lix.) says :

“And I remember the author of *Le Cabinet du Roy de France*, a book printed in the year 1581, and dedicated to HENRY the III., makes computation of their martyrs to have been, in a very few years, at least above two hundred thousand cut off from the gospel.”

He makes up his account thus: “Allow but an hundred martyrs to every church, and you have the sum; and it is as clear as the sun at noon day, that the sum is vastly more. For 'tis a truth incontestable, that there have been cut off by the sword and massacres for religion from the Church of *Caen*, above fifteen or sixteen thousand; from the Church of *Alencon*, five thousand; from the Church of *Paris*, thirteen thousand; from the Church of *Pheims*, twelve thousand; from the Church of *Trois*, twelve thousand; from the Church of *Sens*, nine thousand; from the Church of *Angiers*, seven thousand five hundred; from the Church of *Poictiers*, twelve thousand persons, &c.” (See *Le Cabinet du Roy, Livres premiers*; pp. 274, 275, 276, 277.)

Total martyrs in a very few years, two hundred and sixteen thousand.

In defiance of all this bitter persecution and terrible slaughter, the Reformed Church in France, by the special blessing of her exalted Head, increased and flourished. So that in the National Synod of *Rochelle*, in the year 1571, Mr. *Beza* presiding in it, the reformed could count then above two thousand one hundred and fifty churches; and in many of these above ten thousand members; and in most of them two ministers; in some they had *five*; as in the year 1561, there served in the church at *Orleans* (which at

that time had seven thousand communicants) *Anthony Chanoriet*, Lord of *Merangeau*, *Robert Macon*, Lord of *des Fontaines*, *Hugh Sureau*, *Nicholas, Fillon*, Lord of *Valls*, and *Daniel Tossane*. (vol. i. pp. lix, lx.)

The king's edict for pacifying the troubles of the kingdom, made at Nantes, in the month of April, 1598, and published in Parliament, February 15, 1599. As also those particular articles about it which were afterwards verified in Parliament; may be found recorded on pages lxi-lxxxv.

(Signed) "HENRY."

The secret articles on pages lxxxvi-xcv.

(Signed) "HENRY."

By two edicts, Louis, called the Great, (the first that of *Nismes*, given in July, 1629; the second given at *Germain in Laye*, May 21, 1652,) confirmed the *Edicts* of his father, HENRY the fourth; as a reward for saving his own kingdom, as they had done before his father's kingdom, by their fidelity and valour. vol. i. xcvi-civ.

(Signed) "LOUIS."

CHAPTER XXI.

THIRD—RUIN OF PROTESTANTS BY LOUIS XIV.

But the popish clergy could not rest, but incessantly endeavoured to obliterate from his mind all sense of gratitude for the signal services rendered to him by Protestant subjects, by suggesting they were not to be relied upon, and that they would desert him when an opportunity offered.

The weak mind of LOUIS was poisoned by his popish advisers. The ruin of the reformed was determined on.

QUICK gives an account of the methods devised by the Court for ruining the reformed in France, in violation of the edict of Nantes, given by HENRY, and confirmed by LOUIS, from cvi-cxxxviii, in sect. from xx-xlvi.

NOTE.—My prescribed limits prevent further quotation from Newton, which I should be gratified with producing. I must, therefore, content myself with barely referring the reader to what the bishop says of the opposers of popery; for example, Almeric and his disciples,—William of St. Amorer, a doctor of the Sorbonne, on page 262,—Robert, great head bishop of Lincoln, Matthew Paris, Dante and Petrarch, on page 263,—Peter Fitz Cassiodor, Michael Casenas and William Oream, Marsilius, a famous lawyer of Padua, on page 264,—Walter Lollard, John Wickliff, on page 265, &c. I must cease.

Here I am glad to be able to do justice to Fox, by stating I have found by looking at his first volume of martyrs, that he has traced his christian martyrs up to the thirteenth century. He has given an account of persecutions in Portugal, and particularly in Spain. He gives a large account of the various persecutions of the Waldenses in the valleys of Piedmont, and of the diabolical cruelties of the Roman Catholics, and long continued sufferings of that unoffending people.

Here I cannot forbear calling the attention of the reader to a chapter on page 155 with this heading:

“Some private enormities of the INQUISITION laid open by a very singular occurrence.”

The French troops having separated from the Spanish, marched against the city of Arragon, under the duke of Orleans. The magistrates came to offer him the keys, but he haughtily refused them, and determined to enter the city through a breach in the walls made by his cannon. He did so. Having arranged matters, and laid heavy contribution on the city, he departed to subdue other places; “leaving a strong garrison to over-awe and defend, under the command of his lieutenant-general, M. De Legal. This gentleman, though brought up a Roman Catholic, was totally free from superstition. He united great talents with bravery, and was at once, the skillful officer and accomplished gentleman.”

No difficulty was found in collecting money levied on the magistrates and principal inhabitants; “but when the proper persons applied to the heads of the convents and monasteries, they found that the ecclesiastics were not so willing as other people to part from their cash.”

M. De Legal wisely began with the Jesuits. He therefore sent to them "a peremptory order to pay the money immediately. The superior of the Jesuits returned for answer, that for the clergy to pay money to the army was against all ecclesiastical immunities; and that he knew of no argument which could authorize such a procedure. M. De Legal then sent four companies of dragoons to quarter themselves in the college, with this sarcastic message: 'To convince you of the necessity of paying the money, I have sent four substantial arguments to your college, drawn from the system of military logic; and, therefore, hope you will not need any farther admonition to direct your conduct.'"

The Augustins and Carmelites took warning and prudently paid their money.

But the Dominicans being connected with the inquisition hoped to escape. The chief sent word to the military commander that his order was poor, and had no money to pay the donative, "and that their wealth consisted in silver images of the apostles and saints, as large as life, which are placed in our church, and which it would be sacrilege to remove."

Undismayed by this statement, M. De Legal "sent word that the silver images would make admirable substitutes for money, and would be more in character in his possession, than in that of the Dominicans themselves. 'For,' says he, 'while you possess them, in the manner you do at present, they stand up in niches, useless and motionless, without being of the least use to mankind in general, or even to yourselves; but, when they come into my possession, they shall be useful, I will put them in motion; for I intend to have them coined, when they may travel like the apostles; be beneficial in various places, and circulate for the universal service of mankind.'"

The Dominican friars attempted to excite the people to their rescue by the manner in which they carried, at night, the silver to the commander's house. But to carry on the farce, he ordered four companies of grenadiers, properly equipped with a loaded fuzee in one hand, and lighted taper in the other, to line the street which led to his house. The common people were afraid to obey the friars, who tried to excite them into a tumult.

The Jesuits tried every method to frighten M. De Legal. They excommunicated him; and he excommunicated them in a certain form. Finally he turned them out of their college and quartered his troops in it, and sent them to another place. Thus he exposed to view the horrible atrocities of the inquisition.

It was found that the three inquisitors had constantly a seraglio of about sixty beautiful young ladies, taken from any family they chose; and when tired in using them they were disposed of, and their places supplied with new victims of debauchery.

The whole account of *eight* pages should be read to see the horrible enormities of the inquisition.

THE FORM OF ABJURATION.

THE

Mark of the Beast :

OR.

The profession of the Catholick, Apostolick, and Romish Faith, which the protestants in *France* were enforced to make and subscribe, through the Violence of Persecution in *France*.

In the Name of the Father, and of the Son,
and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.

I do believe, and profess with a firm Faith all and every thing and things contained in that Creed which is used by the holy Church of *Rome*, to wit:

I believe in one God the Father Almighty, who hath made Heaven and Earth, and all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ the only begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all Ages, God of God, Light of Light, True God of the True God, Begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us Men and our Salvation came down from Heaven, and was Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin *Mary*, and was made Man, and was Crucified also for us under *Pontius Pilate*, he suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again, accord-

ing to the Scriptures, and ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and he shall come again with Glory, to judge both the quick and the dead: whose Kingdom shall have no end.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father, and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is Worshipped and Glorified, who spake by the Prophets. And I believe one Catholick and Apostolick Church. I acknowledge one Baptism for the Remission of Sins, and I look for the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Life of the World to come. *Amen.*

I receive and embrace most firmly the Apostolick, and
2 Ecclesiastical Traditions, and the other Observations and Constitutions of the same Church.

In like manner I receive the Holy Scripture, but with
3 that sense which the holy Mother Church hath, and doth now understand it, to whom it doth belong to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures, and I shall never take it, nor interpret it otherwise than according to the unanimous Consent of the Fathers.

I profess also, that there be truly and properly seven
4 Sacraments of the new Law, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and needful for the Salvation of Mankind, although not alike needful to every one, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Marriage, and that they do confer Grace. And that Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without Sacrilege.

I receive and admit also the Ceremonies received and
5 approved by the Catholic Church, in the solemn Administration of all these fore-mentioned Sacraments.

I receive and embrace all and every thing and things,
6 which have been determined and declared concerning original Sin and Justification by the holy Council of *Trent.*

I likewise profess, that in the Mass there is offered unto God a true, proper, and propiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead, and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially,
 7 the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that in it there is made a Change of the whole substance of the Bread into his Body, and of the whole substance of the Wine into his Blood, which Change the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation.

8 I confess also, that under one only of those two Elements, whole Christ and a true Sacrament is received.

I constantly affirm, that there is a Purgatory, and that
 9 the Souls there detained are relieved by the Suffrages of the Faithful.

In like manner the Saints reigning with Jesus Christ
 10 are to be Worshipped, and Invocated, and that they offer up Prayers unto God for us, and that their Relicks are to be honoured.

I do most stedfastly avow, that the Images of Jesus
 11 Christ, and of the Ever-Virgin Mother of God, and also of the other Saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration must be yielded to them.

Moreover I affirm, that the power of Indulgences was
 12 left unto the Church by Jesus Christ, and that their usage is very beneficial unto Christians.

I acknowledge the Holy Catholick, Apostolick, and
 13 Roman Church, to be the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches.

And I promise and swear true Obedience to the Pope
 14 of *Rome*, Successor of blessed *St. Peter*, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

In like manner, I receive and profess, without doubt-
 15 ing all other things left, defined, and declared by the holy Canons, and General Councils, and especially by the most holy Council of *Trent*.



And withal, I do condemn, reject, and accurse all
 16 things which are contrary, and whatever Heresies have
 been condemned, rejected, and accursed by the Church.

*And swearing upon the Book of the Gospels, he must
 say,*

I promise, vow, and swear, and most constantly to
 confess (God aiding me) and to keep intirely and inviol-
 ably unto the death, this self-same Catholick Faith, out
 of which no Person can be saved, which I do now most
 17 willingly and truly profess, and that I will endeavor, to
 the utmost of my Power, that it shall be held, taught
 and preached by my Vassals, or by those who shall be-
 long unto my charge. So help me God, and these holy
 Gospels. So be it.

I _____ of the Parish of _____
 do Certifie unto all whom it may concern, that having
 acknowledged the falseness of the Pretended Reformed,
 and the truth of the Catholick Religion, of my own free
 will, and without any Compulsion, I have made Profes-
 18 sion of the Catholick, Apostolick, and Roman Religion in
 the Church of _____ in the hands of _____
 In Testimony of the Truth hereof, I have signed this Act
 in presence of these Witnesses, whose names are here-
 unto subscribed this _____ day of the Month of _____
 and in the year of our Lord _____

SECT. XLVII. When these poor Wretches had signed
 this Abjuration, and hoped thereby to be at rest, they
 were far enough from it; for their Consciences flew in
 their Faces, and many of them were driven unto despair.
 Yet their Persecutors never ceased tormenting them;
 19 they must own and attest it before the World, that they
 embraced the Roman Religion freely, voluntarily and of
 their own accord, and that no Violence was offer'd them
 to move or induce them to turn from the Reformed Reli-
 gion. And if after this they scrupled to go to Mass, to
 communicate after the Popish way, to tell over their

Chaplet of Beads, or if a Sigh escaped from them, indicating their Grief and Sorrow for their great Sin in forsaking the Truth, immediately there were great Fines laid upon them, and their old Guests the Dragoons are sent back again to beat up their quarters, and they must entertain afresh those old Guests, who had wearied them out of their Faith and Life.

REMARKS ON THE CREED.

The preceding creed is not what is commonly called the apostles' creed, and received by Protestants; but let it be remembered that Protestants received it not as prepared by the apostles, for it was not; but by other hands, after they had left the world. They received it because it accorded with their inspired writings. It was adopted by the churches before the existence of popery, and by Protestants after the Reformation from popery or the Romish church. It was very short, comprized in a few lines.

The Romish creed marked No. 1, is twice as long, and seems to be the creed adopted by the council of Nice. (A. D. 325.) But that is far from styling the church of Rome *holy*; for in 325 its papistical form had no existence, and in 325 the church of Rome was only a part of the universal church. But when the Papacy entered, it became more and more corrupt; so that when this creed was formed and adopted, the Romish church had excinded herself, by her acts in

NOTE.—The original "Form of Abjuration," in *Quick's Synodicon* was printed in *italics*—it is now necessarily reversed; the italic being in roman type, and *vice versa*.

the *council of Trent*, by confirming all the errors and usurpations of the Papacy, and by excommunicating and anathematizing all churches and individuals who did not adopt her heresies, and superstitions, and idolatries.

No. 2. She has exalted *ecclesiastical traditions* in authority above the HOLY SCRIPTURES.

No. 3. She has taken away the right of private *judgment*.

There are no *apostolic* traditions not contained in the Scriptures.

No. 4. She has dared to usurp the authority of our Sovereign, the Lord Jesus Christ, by instituting sacraments which he never instituted, and impiously pretending they *all confer grace*.

No. 5. By her ceremonies she has corrupted baptism and the Lord's supper.

No. 6. She has fatally corrupted both the doctrine of original sin and of justification.

No. 7. The Heidelberg Catechism justly says, "that the *mass* at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry."

And *Calvin*, in chap. ix, as we have seen, pp. 133, 134, what the Reformed church of France, and Calvin believed concerning the Romish church and the mass.

No. 8. The Romish church has grievously sinned, by depriving the laity of the cup which Jesus Christ gave them.

No. 9. There is no *purgatory*. An invention to extract money from the pockets of the people to the pockets of the priests. It is a satanic delusion.

No. 10. We reject the proposition. It has led not only to superstition, but to gross idolatry.

No. 11. Violates the second commandment.

No. 12. Is utterly *false*, and ruinous to the souls of men.

No. 13. False. Instead of being what she pretends to be, we are proving the Romish church to be no part of Christ's visible church.

No. 14. The pope pretends to have inherited the prerogatives and gifts of Peter; but his pretensions are founded in lies, and upheld by forged documents, as we have shown in p. 141; and even Schaff confesses what she

"early claimed, was, in several instances, resisted by *Ireneos*, &c., and was fully established only in the Middle Ages."

But how established he does not say. (p. 376.)

No. 15. By the acts and curses of the *council* of TRENT, the church of Rome, as we have already said, excinded herself and all her adherents from the church of Christ.

No. 16. Another impiety of the apostate church of Rome.

No. 17. Her wickedness and impiety increase.

No. 18. The climax of falsehood, impiety, and perjury.

Full proof that the apostate church of Rome has by compelling Protestants to perjure themselves, participated in the guilt of perjury, and dyed their garments with crimson guilt.

"I have by me a letter from *Mets*, giving an account of the poor Protestants upon their Abjuration, which may not be unacceptable to the reader. (Signed) "E——."

"Dated Oct. 2, 1686."

Being too long for printing, I present an extract:

"Finally on our side we have no means left us of escaping, so that we must absolutely resign ourselves to the will of God, 'till he open a door

for us. Yet I beseech yon, do not believe, that worldly considerations, as of goods and estates, do detain us here; no, no, could we but have had liberty of departure, we had long e'er this gone away, though only with our shifts about us, yea, though we had left our children behind us. But it is not God's will that we should yet quit this place, nay, 'tis his will that we be patient, and that we hinder our childrens' falling into such hands as would educate them in Idolatry, in a false Religion, and in an aversion for ourselves also. I must add, that we had no preservative from subscribing, it was wholly impossible to avoid that Subscription against the Protestant Reformed Religion, tho' as yet we are not obliged to go to Mass; but expect once more the dragoons with their swords in their hands to drive us to it. We know we have subscribed, but we know also we have not changed our Religion, and through Grace we shall never change it. I may assure yon, that so great were our oppressions, that they might have oblig'd us to have been Turks as well as Papists, and to have wore a turban, had it been as high again as the Triple Crown."

"N. B. *Monsieur Chevenis, who is mentioned in this letter, was a venerable and ancient gentleman, a person of eminent prudence, illustrious for learning and Godliness, and Counsellor to the King in the Court of Metz. He persisted faithful to death; and when dead they dragged most inhumanly his dead carcass upon a hurdle, and buried it in a dunghil. He hath a brother, a very reverend Minister of the Gospel, refugied in this City of London.*"

Of all the martyrs, (many were the victims to the revocation of the

"Edict of Nantz, by Louis XIV, instigated by popish influence and urgency,) only one shall be selected; and that is *Monsieur Homel*, Pastor of the Church of *Soyon*, and then of the Church of *Vivaretz*. He was a venerable divine, aged some sixty-five years, whose whole life had been unblamable. This eminent servaut of God was broken alive upon the wheel at *Tournon*. (where, by the way, reader, the Jesuits have a college.) He received forty blows of the iron bar upon the scaffold. He languished under this hellish cruelty two days together. The very thoughts thereof strike an horror into the hearts of them that hear it. My author tells me, he trembled, the hair stood on end at the remembrance. Some passages of his martyrdom are fallen into my hand, written by an eye and ear witness of them, which, for the reader's satisfaction, are here communiated without addition or alteration."

"'I count myself happy,' said this dying saint, 'that I can die in my Master's quarrel. What! would my gracious Redeemer descend from heaven unto earth, that I might be lifted up from earth to heaven? Would he undergo an ignominious death, that I might be possessed of a most blessed life? Verily, if after all this, to prolong a frail and misar-

able life, I should lose that which is everlasting, should I not be a most ungrateful wretch unto my God, and a most cruel enemy to my own happiness? No! no! the die is cast. I am immoveable in my resolution. I breath after that hour. O! when will that good hour come, which will period my present miserable life, and give me the enjoyment of one which is infinitely more blessed? Farewell, my dear wife. I know your tears, your continual sighs hinder your bidding me adieu. Don't be troubled at this gibbet upon which I must expire; 'tis to me a triumphal chariot, which will carry me into heaven. I see heaven open'd, and my sweet Jesus with his out-stretched arms ready to receive me; yea, he will receive me, who is the divino epouse of my soul. I am leaving the world, in which is nothing but adversity, that I may get to heaven, and enjoy everlasting felicity. You shall come unto me, I shall never any more come back to you. All that I recommend unto you is, educate our dear children in the fear of God, and be careful that they swerve not from that way prescribed them in the Holy Scriptures. I have bequeathed them a little formulary for their instruction, that if ever they be brought into the like condition with myself, they may undergo it courageously: and be confident in the goodness of our God, who will send them the Divine Comforter to strengthen them in all their straits and distresses. Prepare them for suffering betimes, that so in that great day, when we shall appear before the Judgment-seat of Christ, we may be able to bespeak him, Lord! Here we are, and the children which thou hast graciously given us! Ah! I shall never have done. Ah! why am I hindered from my departure? why am I kept so long in this my earthly tabernacle? Farewell my dear people, 'tis the last farewell I shall ever give you. Be ye steadfast, be ye fixed! And know, that I never preached to you any thing but the pure truth of the gospel, the true way which leads unto heaven.'

"Some one then told him he spake too much. 'How,' said he, 'do I speak too much? I speak nothing but the very truth. I have neither spoken nor done anything that was in the least offensive to the Sacred Majesty of our August Monarch. But on the contrary, I have always exhorted the people, committed by the Lord unto my charge, to render those honors which are due unto our King, and have informed them, that our lives and fortunes are at his disposal, and that we are bound to employ them in the defense of his estate and crown. But as for our consciences, we hold them of our God, and must keep them for him.'

"Then his judges leaving him, ordered the executioner to do his office, which he did, breaking his arms and his legs. And being then demanded whether he would die a Roman Catholic, he answered, 'How, my Lords! Had it been my design to have changed my religion, I would have done it before my bones had been thus broken to pieces. I wait only for the hour of my dissolution. Courage! courage! O my soul! Thou shalt presently enjoy the delights of heaven. And as for thee, O my poor body, thou shalt be reduced to dust, but 'tis that thou may'st be raised again a spiritual body. Thou shalt see things that never

entered into the heart of man, and which are in this life impossible to be conceived.'

"He again addressed himself unto his wife. 'Farewell once more, my well-beloved spouse! I am waiting for you. But know though you see my bones broken to shivers, yet my soul is replenished with unexpressible joys.

He uttered many excellent matters, which are now slipt my memory. Only I shall not omit, that he kissed his very judges, who poured out a shower of tears, being astonished at so great a constancy. His eyes were always lifted up to heaven. He never gave one cry for all the blows that were laid upon him after the first. His life was had in singular veneration, and as long as this earth shall continue, his death will be in admiration." (pp. cxxxvi, cxxxvii.)

CONDITION OF THE UNHAPPY PROTESTANTS WHO WERE
UNABLE TO ESCAPE.

This may be seen from the preceding extract from a letter written from *Mets*.

I wish I had room for a very interesting letter from *Geneva*, Nov. 1685. It displays the liberality of *Geneva* and *Lyons*, and other parts of *Protestant Switzerland*, in receiving and relieving the poor refugees from France,—the marvellous escape of many, their joy in having reached a Protestant country, and overwhelming sorrow for parents, husbands, wives, and children left behind,—and the *torment of conscience* of some, who, yielding to the temptation of saving their worldly estate, had abjured their religion, but were compelled, by remorse, to leave all behind, and flee to Switzerland, that they might again profess the true religion.

Geneva "received daily and supplied thirty, fifty, eighty, ninety persons of all ages, of both sexes, and of all conditions."

But the bitter, persecuting spirit of *Louis*, the king, followed these outcasts to Switzerland; so that at last, owing to the Roman Catholic cantons, they, as

many as 17,500, had to leave Switzerland and seek other countries for rest and safety.

GOODRICH, in his "History of all Nations," says (vol. ii. p. 877):

"Notwithstanding the vigilance of the government, no less than half a million found means to escape, carrying into other countries their money, their skill in manufactures, and their habits of industry. A large number took refuge in America, and settled in the region now known as North and South Carolina. France never recovered from the blow which her industry thus received. The Huguenots were quiet and peaceable citizens, and carried on exclusively many branches of trade. The art of preparing tin and steel was known only to them, and the knowledge of it was thus lost to the kingdom. It was said of this period, 'France is like a sick person, whose legs and arms have been cut off, as a remedy for a disorder, which mildness and patience would have totally cured.'"

The Marquis De la Fere, author of "Memoirs and Reflections on the reign of Louis XIV.,"* makes the number who escaped to have been

"more than eight hundred thousand Huguenots."

See a quotation from his writings in *De Cormenin's "History of the Popes,"* vol. ii. p. 341.

Of CLEMENT X, De Cormenin says (vol. ii. p. 335):

"The holy father, weakened by old age, and worn out by intoxication, fell into a prostration, which took from him even the power of motion, and carried him off, the 26th of July, 1676."

The pontiff INNOCENT XI was a very different character. Of him De Cormenin says (p. 336):

"Before embracing the ecclesiastical career, he had followed the trade of arms, and when he put on the *tiara*, there might still be seen on his brow the mark the *casque* had left there.

"Louis XIV appeared to him to be a rival worthy of him, and against whom he might display his double warlike and sacerdotal energy. The moment was the more opportune for a rupture with that monarch, as he was at war with the apostolic Roman emperor, Leopold of Austria."

* See *Lempriere's Bio Diet.*

De Cormenin says (p. 341):

“Although his holiness was at open war with the great king on the subject of the regale, he sent to him a letter of congratulation on the act of infamy he had accomplished in revoking the edict of Nantz, which encouraged Louis XIV to persevere in this deplorable path. His majesty was soon not content with the execrable glory he had acquired of murdering his own subjects, he wished to hear of massacres in the states of his neighbours, and compelled Victor Amadeus, duke of Savoy, to exterminate the inhabitants of the valleys of Lucerne, La Peronse and St. Martin, commonly called the Vaudois, who professed the doctrines of Calvin.”

“The Piedmontese troops, united with the dragoons of the king of France, enveloped all the country, and massacred more than twenty thousand Huguenots in the defiles of the mountains.”

In a letter recorded in QUICK'S *Synodicon* vol. i. p. clvi, Pope Innocent XI flatters Louis in the same manner, calling him

“Our dearest son in Christ.”

“Given at Rome, the 18th of November, in the tenth year of our pontificate.”

And why does he flatter him thus? To dispose Louis to give up the regale to his *Holiness*; which would have been a source of much revenue to him, but which the kings of France chose to appropriate to their own use.

“*Inbred piety!*” So much for the knowledge of *original sin* by the pontiff!

Louis had not a particle of piety if he be judged by the Scriptures.

We are not ignorant that his holiness (p. 337) says:

“You seek to make *compensation* for the crimes of your life by *praiseworthy actions*.”

And what were these actions? He tells us,

“You destroy the synagogues,—you persecute the heretics,—you wish to prepare yourself for the *infinite recompenses* of heaven!”

What a teacher of religion! Louis had murdered

hundreds of thousands of his best subjects, and poured out torrents of blood from the rent veins of CHRIST's dear saints; and by these fiendish acts, in the estimation of the pretended head of the church, the haughty cruel monarch was to merit "*the infinite recompenses of heaven.*"

Here too is the evidence of his being in Christ! When darkness becomes light, then shall we see evidence of piety and likeness to Christ in the cruel and detestable conduct of Louis! Long before this, both the monarch and the pontiff who stimulated him in his inhuman course, have found that shedding the blood of *saints* was no recommendation at the judgment-seat of eternal and infinite justice! and that great crimes can not be atoned for by committing greater crimes! and that no *pope* or *priest* ever had power to forgive sin!

REVIEW.

This and the preceding chapters have been devoted to prove that the Romish Church or Papacy of the *seventeenth* century, is no part of the visible church of Christ.

Our general proof has been, that the spirit of the Romish Church, since the Papacy entered it, in the *seventh* century, corrupted it in doctrine and conduct, and has been *tyrannical, persecuting, and idolatrous.*

Our particular proofs have been,—

—She has, by unheard of tyranny, taken away God's holy bible from the people, forbidden them to read it, under the severest penalties, substituted in its place her false and wicked dogmas, and commanded

them to believe these and what she teaches, and not the Holy Scriptures. (See pp. 206–208.)

—She has displayed a *fiendish spirit of persecution* against the *saints* of God.

—In her persecutions carried on, at different times, in the valleys of Piedmont; where, by robberies and horrible cruelties, she laboured perseveringly to extirpate that noble church of Christ, which still survives her utmost efforts, and will live to see her final ruin. (See pp. 209–215.)

—In her persecutions against the saints of God, in France, on a larger scale.

—In the diabolical massacre at Vassy, by the duke of Guise.

—In the MASSACRE ON ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY; when the blood of so many Protestants, shed in a manner so treacherously becoming a church, which maintains the satanic maxim, "The end justifies the means." (See pp. 221–228.)

—In the *persecution of* LOUIS XIV, who so wickedly revoked the edict of Nantz; and, under popish teaching, took delight in shedding the blood of thousands of his best subjects; because he was taught by the head of this apostate church, that by these horrible crimes he could merit heavenly glory. (See p. 242.)

Can more proof be needed to prove the Romish Church to be APOSTATE, and *no part of the visible Church of Christ*?

It is utterly impossible that such persecutions should spring from true religion, the teachings of Christ. *Paul* has taught us what fruit grows from the teachings of the *Spirit*, and how different they are from the fruits of the *flesh*. (See Gal. v. 19–26. Phil. iv. 4–9.)

Peter agrees with Paul. (1 Pet. iv. 12-19. v. 1-11.)

Were additional proof needed to establish the fact, that the church of Rome, since the doings of the council of TRENT, is certainly APOSTATE and ANTI-CHRIST, and no longer a part of CHRIST'S *visible Church*, we might adduce three of her institutions.

1. The execrable society of JESUITS.

2. The horrible and infernal INQUISITION. It is utterly impossible that a true church should employ such *satanic institutions*, and not bring down on it the curse of a holy God.

3. *Origin and progress* of the SALE OF INDULGENCES.

Mosheim says (vol. iii. cent. xii. p. 81):

"This universal reign of ignorance and superstition was dexterously, yet basely improved, by the rulers of the church, to fill their coffers, and to drain the purses of the deluded multitude.

"The *bishops*, when they wanted money for their private pleasures, or for the exigencies of the church, granted to their flock the power of purchasing the remission of the penalties imposed upon transgressors, by a sum of money; which was to be applied to certain religious purposes; or, in other words, they published *indulgences*, which became an inexhaustible source of opulence to the episcopal orders, and enabled them, as is well known, to form and execute the most difficult schemes for the enlargement of their authority, and to erect a multitude of sacred edifices, which augmented considerably the external pomp and splendour of the church.

"The *abbots* and *monks*, who were not qualified to grant *indulgences*, had recourse to other methods of enriching their convents. They carried about the country the carcasses and relics of the saints, in solemn procession, and permitted the multitude to behold, touch, and embrace these sacred and lucrative remains at certain fixed prices. The monastic orders gained often as much by this raree-show, as the bishops did by their *indulgences*."

On page 82 he tells us that the Roman pontiff coveting the immense treasures accumulated by the inferior rulers of the church, from the sale of indulgences, limited the power of the bishops, and finally

engrossed to themselves all the profits, and transcended the bishops in the sale of indulgences for *audacious impiety*.

“In consequence of this new measure, the court of *Rome* became the general magazine of indulgences; and the pontiffs, when either the wants of the church, the emptiness of their coffers, or the demon of avarice, prompted them to look out for new subsidies, published, not only an universal, but also a complete, or what they called a *plenary* remission of all the *temporal* pains and penalties, which the church had annexed to certain transgressions. They went still farther; and not only remitted the penalties, which the civil and ecclesiastical laws had enacted against transgressors, but audaciously usurped the authority which belongs to God alone, and impiously pretended to abolish even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity; a step this, which the bishops, with all their avarice and presumption, had never once ventured to take.

“The pontiffs first employed this pretended prerogative in promoting the holy war, and shed abroad their *indulgences*, though with a certain degree of moderation, in order to encourage the European princes to form new expeditions for the conquest of *Palestine*; but, in process of time, the charm of indulgences was practised upon various occasions of much less consequence, and merely with a view to filthy lucre. Their introduction, among other things, destroyed the credit and authority of the ancient *canonical* and *ecclesiastical discipline of penance*, and occasioned the removal and suppression of the *penitentials*, by which the reins were let loose to every kind of vice. Such proceedings stood much in need of a plausible defence, but this was impossible. To justify therefore these scandalous measures of the pontiffs, a most monstrous and absurd doctrine was now invented, which was modified and embellished by St. THOMAS in the following century, and which contained among others the following enormities: ‘That there actually existed an immense treasure of *merit*, composed of the pious deeds, and virtuous actions, which the saints had performed *beyond what was necessary* for their own salvation, and which were therefore applicable to the benefit of others; that the guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure was the Roman pontiff; and that of consequence he was empowered to *assign* to such as he thought proper, a *portion* of this inexhaustible source of *merit*, suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes.’ It is a most deplorable mark of the power of superstition, that a doctrine, so absurd in its nature, and so pernicious in its effects, should yet be retained and defended in the church of *Rome*.” (pp. 81-83.)

CHAPTER XXII.

THE ROMISH CHURCH OR THE PAPACY IRRECLAIMABLE.

From the commencement of the *Papacy*, in the early part of the *seventh* century, to the commencement of the *Reformation*, in the beginning of the *sixteenth* century, is more than *nine* hundred years; and during all this time the church of Rome was becoming more and more abandoned to error in doctrine, corrupt in morals, and unchristian in worship; although three general councils had been assembled to effect a partial reformation in the *head* and *members* of the church.

From the entrance of the Papacy into the church, to the close of the sessions of the council of *Trent*, have passed away nearly *nine hundred and sixty* years; and, although her people have suffered from the corruption of the *priesthood* innumerable and dreadful miseries, yet so far from a reformation having been produced in the *head* and the *members* of that apostate church, her heretical errors in doctrine, her superstitious worship, and her pagan idolatry, were confirmed by the decrees of that famous council. (See pp. 206-208.)

THE COUNCIL OF PISA.

Mosheim says (vol. iii. chap. ii. p. 390):

“The most eminent writers of this century (XV) unanimously lament the miserable condition to which the christian church was reduced by the corruption of its ministers, and which seemed to portend nothing less than its total ruin, if Providence did not interpose, by extraordinary

means, for its deliverance and preservation. The vices that reigned among the Roman pontiffs, and indeed among all the ecclesiastical orders, were so flagrant, that the complaints of these good men did not appear at all exaggerated, or their apprehensions ill-founded, nor had any of the corrupt advocates of the clergy the courage to call them to an account for the sharpness of their censures and of their complaints. Nay, the more eminent rulers of the church, who lived in a luxurious indolence, and the infamous practice of all kinds of vice, were obliged to hear with a placid countenance, and even to commend, these bold censors, who declaimed against the degeneracy of the church, declared that there was almost nothing sound either in its visible head, or in its members and demanded the aid of the secular arm, and the destroying sword, to lop off the parts that were infected with this grievous and deplorable contagion. Things, in short, were brought to such a pass, that they were deemed the best Christians, and the most useful members of society, who, braving the terrors of persecution, and triumphing over the fears of man, inveighed with the greatest freedom and fervor against the court of *Rome*, its lordly pontiff, and the whole tribe of his followers and votaries.

“At the commencement of this century, the Latin church was divided into two great factions, and was governed by two contending pontiffs, BONIFACE IX. who remained at *Rome*, and BENEDICT XIII. who resided at *Avignon*. Upon the death of the former, the *Cardinals* of his party raised to the pontificate, in the year 1404, COSBAT DE MELIORATI, who assumed the name of INNOCENT VII, and held that high dignity during the short space of two years only. After his decease, ANGELI CORRARIO, a Venetian cardinal, was chosen in his room, and ruled the Roman faction under the title of GREGORY XII.

“A plan of reconciliation was however formed, and the contending pontiffs bound themselves, each by an oath, to make a voluntary renunciation of the papal chair, if that step were necessary to promote the peace and welfare of the church; but they both violated this solemn obligation in a scandalous manner. BENEDICT XIII. besieged in *Avignon* by the king of *France*, in the year 1408, saved himself by flight, retiring first into *Catalonia*, his native country, and afterwards to *Perpignan*. Hence eight or nine of the cardinals, who adhered to his cause, seeing themselves deserted by their pope, went over to the other side, and, joining publicly with the cardinals of GREGORY XII. they agreed together to assemble a council at *Pisa* on the 25th of March, 1409, in order to heal the divisions and factions that had so long rent the papal empire. This council, however, which was designed to close the wounds of the church, had an effect quite contrary to that which was universally expected, and only served to open a new breach, and to excite new divisions. Its proceedings, indeed, were vigorous, and its measures were accompanied with a just severity. A heavy sentence of condemnation was pronounced the 5th day of June, against the contending pontiffs, who were both declared guilty of heresy, perjury, and contumacy, unworthy of the small-

est tokens of honour or respect, and separated *ipso facto* from the communion of the church. This step was followed by the election of one pontiff in their place. The election was made on the 25th of June, and fell upon PETER of CANDIA, known in the papal list by the name of ALEXANDER V.; but all the decrees and proceedings of this famous council were treated with contempt by the condemned pontiffs, who continued to enjoy the privileges and to perform the functions of the papacy, as if no attempts had been made to remove them from that dignity. BENEDICT assembled a council at *Perpignan*; and GREGORY, another at *Austria* near *Aquileia*, in the district of *Friuli*. The latter, however, apprehending the resentment of the Venetians, made his escape in a clandestine manner from the territory of *Aquileia*, arrived at *Caieta*, where he threw himself upon the protection of LANISLAUS, king of *Naples*, and, in the year 1412, fled from thence to *Rimini*." (pp. 391-393.)

COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

"Thus was the Christian church divided into three great factions, and its government violently carried on by three contending chiefs, who loaded each other with reciprocal maledictions, calumnies, and excommunications. ALEXANDER V. who had been elected pontiff at the council of *Pisa*, died at *Bologna* in the year 1410; and the sixteen cardinals, who attended him in that city, immediately filled up the vacancy, by choosing as his successor BALTHASAR COSSA, a Neapolitan, who was destitute of all principles both of religion and probity, and who assumed the title of JOHN XXIII. The duration of this schism in the papacy was a source of many calamities, and became daily more detrimental both to the civil and religious interests of those nations where the flame raged. Hence it was, that the emperor SIGISMUND, the king of *France*, and several other European princes, employed all their zeal and activity, and spared neither labour nor expense, in restoring the tranquility of the church, and uniting it again under one spiritual head. On the other hand, the pontiffs could not be persuaded by any means to prefer the peace of the church to the gratification of their ambition; so that no other possible method of accommodating this weighty matter remained, than the assembling of a general council, in which the controversy might be examined, and terminated by the judgment and decision of the universal church. This council was accordingly summoned to meet at *Constance*, in the year 1414, by JOHN XXIII. who was engaged in this measure by the entreaties of SIGISMUND, and also from an expectation, that the decrees of this grand assembly would be favourable to his interests. He appeared in person, attended with a great number of cardinals and bishops, at this famous council, which was also honoured with the presence of the emperor SIGISMUND, and of a great number of German princes, and with that of the ambassadors of all the European states,

whose monarchs or regents could not be personally present at the decision of this important controversy.

“The great purpose that was aimed at in the convocation of this grand assembly, was the healing of the schism that had so long rent the papacy; and this purpose was happily accomplished. It was solemnly declared in the fourth and fifth sessions of this council, by two decrees, that the Roman pontiff was inferior and subject to a general assembly of the universal church; and the authority of councils was vindicated and maintained, by the same decrees, in the most effectual manner. This vigorous proceeding prepared the way for the degradation of JOHN XXIII. who, during the twelfth session, was unanimously deposed from the pontificate, on account of several flagitious crimes that were laid to his charge, and more especially on account of the scandalous violation of a solemn engagement he had taken about the beginning of the council, to resign the papal chair, if that measure should appear necessary to the peace of the church; which engagement he broke some weeks after by a clandestine flight. In this same year, (1415,) GREGORY XII. sent to the council, CHARLES DE MALATESTA, to make, in his name, and as his proxy, a solemn and voluntary resignation of the pontificate. About two years after this, BENEDICT XIII. was deposed by a solemn resolution of the council, and OTTA DE COLONNA raised, by the unanimous suffrages of the cardinals to the high dignity of head of the church, which he ruled under the title of MARTIN V. BENEDICT, who resided still at *Pirpignan*, was far from being disposed to submit either to the decree of the council, which deposed him, or to the determination of the cardinals with respect to his successor. On the contrary, he persisted until the day of his death, which happened in the year 1423, in assuming the title, the prerogatives; and the authority of the papacy. And when this obstinate man was dead, a certain Spaniard, named GILES MUNIOS, was chosen pope in his place by two cardinals, under the auspicious patronage of ALPAONSUS, king of *Sicily*, and adopted the title of CLEMENT VIII.; but this sorry pontiff, in the year 1429, was persuaded to resign his pretensions to the papacy, and to leave the government of the church to MARTIN V.” (pp. 393-395.)

This council disgraced themselves, and proved, beyond dispute, how incurably they had embraced the heresies and abominations of the Papacy, by three detestable acts.

1. They burned alive JOHN HUSS, that holy and intrepid man, as a heretic. He had come to the council under the protection of a safe conduct, both in coming to and in returning from *Constance*; given to him by the emperor Sigismund. But by the influ-

ence of the enemies of this martyr in the council, the emperor gave him to the flames, in opposition to the convictions of his own mind in regard to duty; and thus furnished a striking illustration of that detestable maxim of the Romish church: "*No faith is to be kept with heretics!*"

Huss "was burnt alive the 6th of July, 1415; which dreadful punishment he endured with unparalleled magnanimity and resignation, expressing in his last moments the noblest feelings of love to God, and the most triumphant hope of the accomplishment of those transporting promises with which the gospel arms the true Christian at the approach of eternity." (p. 400.)

2. They put to the same cruel death, JEROME of Prague, a man of remarkable eloquence. He had come to Constance to aid his friend HUSS, to whom he was devoted, in defending and maintaining the cause of their Master. The fear of death, produced at first a willingness to submit to the council; but, through the grace of God, he recovered his constancy of mind,

"professed anew the opinions which he had deserted for a while from a principle of fear, and maintained them in the flames, in which he expired on the 30th of May, 1416." (p. 400.)

3. They dared to condemn the scriptural writings of the famous WICKLIFFE, justly styled, "The morning star of the Reformation." He had been dead and buried in 1384 (Lempriere's Bio. Dict.) a long time.

But, "by a solemn decree, they branded the memory of this eminent servant of Christ with infamy; and on the 4th day of May, in the year 1415, an order was issued out to commit all his works, together with his bones, to the flames." (p. 405.)

Papists *hate the TRUTH OF GOD, and are afraid of the LIGHT of the HOLY SCRIPTURES. They love darkness.*

4. This council gave another proof of the obstinate rebellion of the Papacy or Romish church against the

sovereign authority of Jesus Christ as the sole Head of his Church on earth, by ordaining it as a rule in the Romish church, that in the administration of the Lord's Supper, the laity should receive only the *bread*, in opposition to the will of Christ, who has given to all communicants both the elements, the wine or cup as well as the bread. (p. 405.) See Matt. xxvi. 27. Mark xiv, 23. Luke xxii. 17. 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

UTTER FAILURE OF THE COUNCIL IN ITS GREAT DESIGN.

What was this design? *Mosheim* answers:

“The reformation of the church in its *head* and in its *members*, by setting bounds to the despotism and corruption of the Roman pontiffs, and to the luxury and immorality of a *licentious* clergy.” “The eyes of all Europe,” he goes on to say, “were fixed upon the council of *Constance*, from an universal persuasion of the necessity of this reformation, and an ardent desire of seeing it happily brought into execution. Nor did the assembled fathers deny, that this reformation was the principal end of their meeting.” (p. 407.)

Why, then, was this great and necessary work not commenced? *Mosheim* ascribes the obstacles in the way to the *passions* and interests of the assembled fathers. (p. 407.)

To explain what the historian means by their *passions*, I must refer the reader to my *Contrast*, Part I, chap. v. p. 51. (DR. EDGAR, CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY.) There you will see that

“the clergy of every grade, *priests*, *bishops*, and *pontiffs*, were become infamous for their want of continence and their licentious practices.”

It is added by *Mosheim* (p. 408):

“The cardinals and dignified clergy, whose interest it was that the church should remain in its corrupt and disordered state, employed all their eloquence and art to prevent its reformation; and observed, among other artful pretexts, that a work of such high moment and importance

could not be undertaken with any prospect of success, until a new pontiff was elected. And, what was still more shocking, the new pontiff, MARTIN V. was no sooner raised to that high dignity, than he employed his authority to elude and frustrate every work that was made to set this salutary effort on foot; and made it appear most evidently, by the laws he enacted, that nothing was more foreign from his intention than the reformation of the clergy, and the restoration of the church to its primitive purity.

“Thus this famous council, after sitting three years and six months, was dissolved, on the 22d day of April, 1418, without having effected what was the chief design of their assembling; and they put off to a future assembly of the same kind, which was to be summoned five years after this period, that pious design of purifying a corrupt church, which had been so long the object of the expectations and desire of all good Christians.” (p. 408.)

THE COUNCIL OF BASIL.

More than five years passed away before MARTIN V. could be prevailed upon by the persuasion of individuals feeling deeply interested in the necessity of a reformation in the church, to summon the meeting of a council. He, however, did at last consent to that important measure. But he did not live to witness the proceedings of the council; for

“he died February 21st, 1431, just about the time when the council was to meet.

“His immediate successor, who assumed the name EUGENIUS IV, approved of all the measures entered into by his predecessor in relation to the assembling of the council of *Basil*, in 1431; which was accordingly opened the 23d of July, 1431, under the superintendence of cardinal JULIAN CESARINI, who performed the functions of president, in the place of EUGENIUS.” (pp. 408, 409.)

“That the Roman pontiffs,” says our historian, “who were considered as the head of the church, and the bishops, priests, and monks, who were looked upon as its members, were become excessively corrupt; and that, to use the expression of the prophet in a similar case, *the whole head was sick, and the whole heart was faint*, was a matter of fact too striking to escape the knowledge of the obscurest individual.”

“Two grand points were proposed to the deliberation of this famous council;”

and they selected the latter as their first point for deliberation, the *reformation of the church*, which had been postponed by the council of *Constance*, to the deliberation of this council, which was assembled for the purpose. And to accomplish their purpose, they wisely made such a classification of their members as to guard against the cabals and intrigues of the *Italians*. (See the note below, in *Mosheim*, by his translator.)

By this form of the council, by its method of proceeding, and by the first decrees, they proved that they

“were in earnest, and firmly resolved to answer the end and purpose of their meeting.

“Eugenius IV was much alarmed at the prospect of a reformation, which he feared above all things; and beholding with terror the zeal and designs of these spiritual physicians, he attempted *twice* the dissolving of the council.

“These repeated attempts were vigorously and successfully opposed by the assembled fathers, who proved by the decrees of the council of *Constance*, and by other arguments equally conclusive, that the council was superior, in point of authority, to the Roman pontiff.

“This controversy, which was the first that had arisen between the council and the pope, was terminated, in the month of November, 1433, by the silence and concessions of the latter, who, the month following, wrote a letter from *Rome*, containing his approbation of the council, and acknowledgment of its authority.” (pp. 409-410.)

The doings of the council provoked the pontiff in the highest degree, so that he again formed a design of

“setting bounds to its zeal for the reformation of the church.”

A violent contest ensued between the parties.

“The council summoned the pontiff to appear before them at *Basil*, July 26th, 1437, in order to give an account of his conduct; but the pontiff, instead of complying with this summons, issued out a decree, by which he pretended to dissolve the council, and to assemble another at *Ferrara*. With the consent of the emperor, the king of France, and several other princes, the council continued their deliberations at *Basil*;

and on Sept. 28th, in the same year, pronounced a sentence of contumacy against the rebellious pontiff, for having refused to obey their order. (pp. 411, 412.)

“In the year 1438, EUGENIUS in person opened the council which he had summoned to meet at *Ferrara*; and at the second session thundered out an excommunication against the fathers assembled at *Basil*.

“On the other hand, the council of *Basil* deposed him from the papacy, June 25, 1439; which vigorous measure was not approved by the European kings and princes.” (p. 412.)

“The affronted pontiff lost all patience, and devoted, for the second time, to hell and damnation the members of the council of *Basil* by a solemn and most severe edict, in which also he declared all their acts null, and all their proceedings unlawful.”

Compare this with his letter from Rome, acknowledging the authority of the council, &c.

Such is the INFALLIBILITY of a POPE and of a COUNCIL!

Deriding the papal thunder, the council of *Basil* raised to Peter's chair FELIX V. in the place of EUGENIUS, whom they had deprived of the high honors he had forfeited.

“This election,” says our historian, “was the occasion of the revival of that deplorable schism, which had formerly rent the church; which had been terminated with so much difficulty, and after so many vain and fruitless efforts, at the council of *Constance*.” (pp. 412, 413.)

“The new breach was still more lamentable than the former one, as the flame was kindled not only between two rival pontiffs, but between two contending councils of *Basil* and *Florence*. The greatest part of the church submitted to the jurisdiction, and adopted the cause of *Eugenius*; while *Felix* was acknowledged as lawful pontiff by a great number of academies, and among others, by the famous University of *Paris*, as also in several kingdoms and provinces.”

NICOLAS V. is praised by Mosheim for his erudition and genius, as a zealous patron and protector of learned men; and for his moderation, meek and pacific spirit; and also for setting the seal of his approbation and authority to the acts and decrees of the council of *BASIL*. (pp. 415, 416.)

But he says not a word of his knowledge of the

Holy Scriptures; which, if he had known, he never would have permitted himself to be exalted to the chair of Peter, and be worshipped as God; which Peter never did. (Acts x. 25, 26.) I, therefore, think that De Cormenin speaks more correctly, when he says of Nicolas :

“Some ecclesiastical historians exalt the qualities and virtues of Nicolas; but conscientious historians only say he was one of the *best* of the *bad* popes.” (No reflection on *Mosheim's* integrity.)

“CALIXTUS III. was remarkable,” says *Mosheim*, “for nothing but his zeal in animating the Christian princes to make war upon the Turks; his reign also was short, for he died in the year 1458.”

De Cormenin tells more about him and what he did with the money he collected from the different states of Europe, and the great favors conferred by him on his vicious relatives. (See vol. ii. pp. 128-130.)

PIUS II. succeeded in 1458, who, although he had distinguished himself in the council of *Basil*, by his erudition and genius, in favor of a reformation of the church, and the superiority of a council over a *pontiff*; yet after he ascended the papal throne,

“in 1460, denied publicly that the pope was subordinate to a general council, and even prohibited all appeals to such a council, under the severest penalties.”

“But,” adds *Mosheim*, “the most egregious instance of *impudence* and *perfidy* that he exhibited to the world, was in the year 1463, when he published a solemn retraction of all that he had written in favor of the council of *Basil*, and declared, without either *shame* or *hesitation*, that as *Æneas Sylvius*, he was a damnable heretic; but, as *PIUS II.*, he was an orthodox pontiff.”

“This indecent declaration was the last circumstance worthy of notice that happened during his pontificate, for he departed this life in the month of July in the year 1464.” (See pp. 416-419.)

How “the mystery of iniquity works!” Pope against pope! and council against council! Where is the boasted unity of Roman Catholicism?

I only add from *De Cormenin* (p. 135):

“He himself soon perceived the approach of death, and called his cardinals around his bed to exhort them to give him a successor who was truly animated with the Pontifical spirit.”

What follows about his desire for extreme unction, and the reply of the bishop of Ferrara, I cannot record; although it exhibits the very spirit of that false religion. (p. 135.) See what Mezerai says of him (same page.)

PAUL II, who succeeded him, was indeed animated with the true *pontifical* spirit, and trod in the steps of his predecessor in *perfidy*; for according to *De Cormenin*, although the cardinals, before his elevation, had bound him by an oath consisting of many particulars (p. 135); yet says *De Cormenin*:

“As soon as he was consecrated a sovereign pontiff, he wished, in contempt of his oath, to govern *despotically*, without even counselling with his cardinals; he conferred the principal dignities and benefices of the church on his creatures, and framed laws which he presented in form to the sacred college to be ratified; but he forwarned them that he would immediately depose those who refused to obey him.” (p. 136.)

See the boldness of one cardinal in reproaching him as a traitor, perjurer, &c.,—Paul’s dissimulation, &c., in what follows. (pp. 137, 138.)

Of this pontiff *Mosheim* writes (vol. iii. p. 419)

“His administration was distinguished by some measures, which, if we consider the genius of the times, were worthy of praise; though it must, at the same time, be confessed that he did many things that were evidently *inexcusable*, not to mention his reducing the jubilee circle to twenty-five years, and thus accelerating the return of that most absurd and superstitious ceremony. So that his reputation became at least dubious in after times, and was viewed in different lights by different persons.”

Mosheim did not know the man. His spirit was pontifical in the highest degree. He violated his oath in the most shameful manner; for when reminded of his oath, he replied with great wrath,

“‘Doest thou summon us before judges? Doest thou not know that all laws are lodged in our breast—‘*in scrinio pectoris nostri.*’ Sentence is given, and all shall obey it; I am pope, and have a power to approve or condemn at my pleasure the actions of all other men.’” (See *Bower*, vol. iii. pp. 245-246.)

Both *Bower* and *De Cormenin* represent him as being very suspicious and excessively cruel. (See *De Cormenin*, vol. ii. p. 138.

CHAPTER XXIII.

LEO X.

In our last chapter, the vain attempts of the councils of *Pisa*, *Constance* and *Basil*, passed before us. They were convened at the earnest entreaties of civil rulers who felt the necessity of a reformation of the church in her head and members. But no reformation was effected. It was prevented by the opposing influence of the cardinals and bishops, who loved the gratification of their animal passions and splendid living, more than pure religion and the prosperity of the church. A greater obstacle was found in wicked popes. They were so destitute of all religious principles, that they did not hesitate to violate the most solemn promises, and even oaths, rather than comply with the wishes of those who had labored to effect a reformation in the head and members of the church so absolutely necessary.

No reformation certainly had taken place when *Leo* was elected to fill the papal chair. This is per-

fectly manifested from his destitution of every religious principle, his intrigues to secure his own election, and the circumstances that brought it to pass.

From *Mosheim* his character will appear very bad. Hear what he has written, vol. iv. p. 13:

“He (pope JULIUS, a furious and audacious pontiff,) was succeeded in the year 1513, by LEO X. of the family of MEDICIS, who, though of a milder disposition than his predecessors, was nevertheless equally indifferent about the interests of religion and the advancement of true piety. He was a protector of men of learning, and was himself learned as far as the darkness of the age would admit of. His time was divided between conversation with men of letters and pleasure; though it must be observed, that the greatest part of it was consecrated to the latter. He had an invincible aversion to whatever was accompanied with solicitude and care, and discovered the greatest impatience under events of that nature. He was remarkable for his prodigality, luxury, and imprudence, and has even been charged with impiety, if not atheism.”

“He did not, however, neglect the grand object which the generality of his predecessors had so much at heart, even the promoting and advancing the opulence and grandeur of the Roman see. For he took the utmost care that nothing should be transacted in the council of the Lateran, which JULIUS had assembled and left sitting, that had the least tendency to favor the *Reformation* of the church. He went still farther; and in a conference which he had with FRANCIS I. king of *France*, at *Bologna*, he engaged that monarch to abrogate the *Pragmatic Sanction*, which had been so long odious to the popes of *Rome*, and to substitute in its place another body of laws, more advantageous to the papacy, which were imposed upon his subjects under the title of the *Concordate*, and received with the utmost indignation and reluctance.”

See what is said in the next section about

“the raging thirst of dominion that consumed these pontiffs, and their arrogant endeavours to crush and oppress all that came within the reach of their power, were accompanied with the most insatiable avarice.”

De Cormenin will tell us more of the character of LEO, and how he came to succeed in his vile and wicked aspirations for the pontificate (vol. ii. 174, 175):

“Among the members of the conclave, John de Medicis showed himself the most desirous for the heritage of Julius the Second. Varillas thus speaks of this cardinal: ‘John de Medicis had been scarcely three months reinstalled in his palace at Florence, when the news of the death

of Julius the Second arrived. He immediately conceived the design of causing himself to be elected sovereign pontiff, and took the road for Rome, although he was afflicted with a violent disease, and had two enormous abscesses, which prevented him from walking, or even riding on horseback. He made the journey in a litter, the mules travelling on a walk, in order to avoid the least motion; in this manner he arrived at the holy city; but the obsequies of Julius were terminated, and the conclave had commenced; nevertheless, he caused them to open the gates of the Vatican, and took his place among the other cardinals. Already the members of the sacred college, young and old had canvassed for their candidates, and seemed so obstinately fixed in their choice, that a long vacancy was threatened, when a very strange event suddenly changed the direction of their wishes and put an end to their intrigues. John de Medicis, though sick and tormented by sharp pains, laboured assiduously to create partizans for himself."

CAUSE OF HIS SUCCESS.

"It happened that at the close of a day more laborious than the others, the abscesses broke and gave a passage to vicious humours, which spread through the conclave an infectious smell. The old cardinals, fearing they could not resist the baneful effects of this vitiated atmosphere, consulted physicians as to the mode of preserving themselves from the danger to their health, which must result from a forced residence in the same room with the sick man. They replied, there was no resource but to await the death of De Medicis, which must take place within a month. This opinion of the physicians created a revolution in the conclave; intrigues ceased at once, and the tiara was unanimously conferred on John the Medicis, who was proclaimed sovereign pontiff, at the age of thirty-six, by the title of Leo the Tenth.

"The opening of the abscesses saved him from certain death; the corrupt humors flowed through the wounds, and he was cured of his disease.

"At the age of thirteen he had been elevated to the cardinalship, by Innocent the Eighth.

"His education was entirely worldly. According to Paul Sarpi, he had no tinge of religious ideas; he even affected a silly impiety, saying openly that religion was only good, in order to restrain the common people in obedience, and ought not to govern the actions of the powerful and rich.

"Leo the Tenth, as proud and ambitious as his predecessor, was capable of committing any crime in order to obtain the desired end, but more courtly than Julius the Second, he was less rude and coarse in his intercourse with sovereigns."

GORGEOUS INSTALLATION.

“ His holiness, wishing to wait for the return of his strength, delayed the ceremony of his exaltation until the 11th of April, the anniversary of the battle of Ravenna, on which he had been made prisoner by the French. On the day appointed for the ceremony, clothed in garments studded with diamonds and rubies, his head covered by a tiara so glittering with precious stones that it was impossible steadily to contemplate it, he came to the church of the Lateran, followed by an escort so numerous and brilliant, that, according to a historian of the time, no emperor nor king had ever displayed so much magnificence in their triumphal processions. The Roman clergy, the magistracy, the nobility, the different orders of the monks, black, gray, and white, the different trades, the chiefs of the soldiery, clothed in glittering armour, formed an immense cortege; young maids and children, clothed in white, cast palms and flowers before the steps of the pontiff through the route. He himself advanced, mounted on an Arabian courser, having around him the members of the sacred college and his relatives, among whom, the commander of the Medici, armed at all points, was distinguished. The procession had not passed the walls of the city when a courier arrived, announcing the death of Raphael Pucci, archbishop of Florence; Leo, after having read the despatch, turned towards his cousin, and without interrupting the march, said to him with a loud voice, ‘ My cousin, I announce to you that to-morrow you will quit the profession of arms to receive the succession of Raphael Pucci, and become an archbishop.’ This took place, though the commander was as much a stranger to the duties as a lawless soldier could be, whose whole life had been passed in pillaging, stealing, and throat cutting.”

His address to his cousin showed him to be destitute of a sense of common decency.

LUXURIOUS FEAST.

“ After the celebration of the pontifical mass, the holy father bestowed his blessing on the people, and retraced the road to the Vatican, where a feast awaited him worthy of Lucullus or Apicius. The expense of this feast was computed at more than a hundred thousand crowns of gold.”

INFAMOUS CONDUCT.

“ As soon as he was installed in the Holy See, the new pope abandoned himself to luxury and debauchery; he invited to Rome all the

artists and authors of Italy, and his court soon became the most brilliant in Europe. We should render him the justice of having banished brutal debauchery, which he replaced by gallantry, a species of corruption less ignoble, but more dangerous, inasmuch as it depraves society without drawing on itself general reprobation.

“The court of Rome became a school of materialism, and of philosophical atheism, from the bosom of which the pontiff king directed the political affairs of the church. He at once studied the aggrandizement of his family.”

HIS DECREE AGAINST THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, &c.

“During the same sitting, Leo the Tenth published a decree relative to the immortality of the soul: ‘We command all philosophers, professors in the universities; to combat the views which opposed the faith established by the church, in maintaining that the soul is mortal like the body, and the world is eternal.’

“Martin Luther affirms in his works, that Leo the Tenth denied positively the immortality of the soul, and that one day, after having listened to two skilful doctors, who were discussing this fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith, he terminated it by this singular conclusion: ‘The reasons which you give for the affirmative, appear to me profound, but I prefer the negative, because it is determined for us to endeavour to take care of our bodies, and to acquire *embonpoint*.’”

TWO HYPOCRITICAL DECREES.

“Leo the Tenth continued to preside at the meetings of the council of the Lateran; at the tenth session two remarkable acts were committed; the publication of a decree in favour of usury, and the promulgation of a bull against the liberty of the press. In the first decrees the holy father decided that pawnbrokers were authorised to levy upon the unfortunate a greater interest than the ordinary one, provided they would pay over half the profits into the treasury of the pope; an odious calculation, and which ought the more to excite our indignation, because, under the mask of philanthropy, it aided to despoil the poor of their last resources. In the second decree, the pontiff, after enumerating at length the inconveniences which resulted to religion from the fever for instruction which had taken possession of men’s minds, and which the invention of printing tended to propagate, resolved, in his wisdom, that the works of authors should be submitted to censors, and that no book should be printed for the use of the faithful, who inhabited the states of the church, which had not received the approbation of the vicar of the pope

and the master of the sacred palace, and of the diocesan bishops, or inquisitors of districts in other countries, under pain of being excommunicated and judged as heretics; that is, of being burned alive!

“Despite these threats of Leo, whom servile historians call the restorer of letters, and who thought to thicken the darkness which enveloped the world, the press triumphed, and nothing could subdue that power which was about to break down absolute thrones, and overthrow the altars of superstition. The time had not, however, yet arrived for the people to free themselves entirely from this odious yoke, and the popes were still the pests of nations.

“His holiness pursued his objects for the aggrandisement of his family, and married to his brother Julien, the young princess Philiberte of Savoy, &c.” (pp. 177-178.)

We shall close our account of the execrable wretch LEO X, by quoting what *De Cormenin* quoted from two orthodox ecclesiastics:

“How long shall we be scandalized by your adulteries, and your incests, ye unworthy priests? cried the monk Thomas from the gallery of the cathedral of Bordeaux. When will you cease to fill your gross stomachs with dainty food and sparkling wine? When will you cease to steal money from the poor in order to have a concubine in your bed, a fat mule in your stable, and all by the grace of the crucifix, and taking the trouble to say, *Dominus Vobiscum*?

“I know well you will reply, what matters it to you if the poor shall fall famished at your gates; nevertheless, have you no shame in selling sacraments and devouring the goods of widows and orphans, under pretext of solacing souls in purgatory? Curses upon you, ministers of Satan, who seduce young girls and married females, and who learn from them at confession the means of drawing them into sin. Shame on you, priests of Lucifer, who dare to use the ascendant which your character gives you over credulous minds, in order to initiate the young into foul pleasures. Shame on you, who make of your parsonages houses of infamy, where you rear young girls and young boys for lust and infamy! Shame on you who do not fear to show to your friends the mysteries of these new seraglios, and to gorge yourselves in them with wine, viands, and luxury. Have I not heard, with my own ears, the curate James boast before an assemblage of infamous ecclesiastics, that he played, swore, drank, and fornicated better than any of them.’

“Maillard, who had been preacher to Louis the Eleventh, thundered with still more force against the disorders of the priests: ‘I see,’ said he ‘abbots, priests, monks, and even prelates heaping up treasures on treasures, accumulating prebendaries and benefices, and decoying Christians, like pick-pockets.

“‘I see the cape, the frock, and the pallium entering taverns by day and night for the purpose of debauch. Canons or clerks elevated to

dignities, themselves govern places of prostitution; they sell the wine and hold the pledges as the bullies of the girls. I have seen others who walked about insolently disguised as soldiers, or clothed as dandies, with their beards fashionably trimmed, with women of pleasure lounging on their arms. I know a bishop who is every night served at supper by young girls entirely naked; and I know another who keeps a seraglio of young girls, whom he calls prostitutes in moultng.

“Shameful as all these things are, there exists others still more infamous. Bishops no longer give away livings but at the request of females, that is to say, when the mother, sisters, neices, or cousins of the candidate, have paid the price of them with their honour.

“Speak, ye infamous bishops and priests—ye blessed simoniacs—ye blessed concubine-keepers—ye blessed drunkards and bullies—ye blessed procurers, who gain orders by rendering foul services? Go to the devil ye infamous wretches! At the hour of your death will you dare present yourselves before Christ, full of wine, holding in your hand the gold which you have stolen, and having on your arm the prostitutes whom you have kept, or your mistress servants, or your neices, who are most frequently your bastards and your concubines, or the girls whose dowry you have gained for them by impurity, or the mother from whom you have purchased the virginity of their daughters? Go to all the devils, cohorts of thieves and pilferers!

“I know well that in exposing your crimes, I run the risk of being assassinated, as has already happened to those who have desired to reform chapters and monasteries; but the fear of your daggers will not chain my tongue, nor arrest the lightning of my indignation; I will tell the whole truth. Come forward then ye women, who abandon your bodies to official persons, to monks, priests, and bishops. Come forward ye who wear chains and robes with trains, and who say, when I blame your luxuriousness, ‘Why, father, we have seen other women still better dressed than we are, who are neither richer nor nobler than we are. Besides, when we have no money, the prelates give us as much as we could earn by the sweat of our body.’

“Come forward—ye female drunkards and robbers, ye priestesses of Venus, who dare to say, ‘if a priest gets me with child, I will not be the only one.’ Come forward nuns and beguines, who people the cisterns and ponds of the convents with the dead bodies of newborn children. What frightful accusations would you not hear, if all those children which are cast into closets or pits could name their executioners or their fathers. Shall not the rain of fire, which formerly destroyed the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, fall on these convents? Shall not all the priests and bishops be swallowed up as were Korah, Dathan and Abiram? Yes, my brethren, the time is approaching in which God will do justice on all this brood of idlers, of mute dogs, of ignorant wretches, of lechers, robbers, and murderers.’” (pp. 182, 183.)

Were I to transcribe the whole history of *Leo* from

De Cormenin, it would but give a true picture of one of the vilest wretches that ever breathed the atmosphere and trod this earth.

REMARKS ON LEO X.

Doctor Schaff will recollect the two conclusions which he drew from his papistical and sophistical reasonings, and which we have exposed. One is,

“Nay, we believe, that ever since the Reformation, the pope, as such, that is, in his official character, is not anti-christ, but the legitimate head of the Roman church, &c.” (See p. 130.)

We have shown that, by this absurd conclusion, while he professes to be a Protestant, he has *knowingly* set himself in opposition to the whole Protestant world. (See pp. 130–136.)

LEO was the first pope after the Reformation. I therefore invite S. to look at him as he has been faithfully portrayed by *Mosheim* and *De Cormenin*. A man destitute of all religious principle,—whose education was wholly worldly, without even a tinge of religion,—who obtained his election to the papal throne by intrigue and simony, and by an accidental circumstance that would have driven away from the conclave a man of common honesty, rather expose the older Cardinals to infection and disease by remaining.

Professor Schaff, behold the man! An *atheist*—a *debauchee*—*excessively covetous*—*capable of committing any CRIME*,—bent on aggrandising his family relations—grinding the face of the poor by authorizing pawn-brokers to take usurious interests, on condition of giving one half to his treasury,—his court the seat of atheism, and exceeding in magnificence the courts

of Europe,—decreeing the soul to be mortal as well as the body,—publishing a bull on purpose to prevent the circulation of knowledge, while he professed to patronize men of learning.

Behold your man, Dr. Schaff! your first legitimate head of the Roman Church since the Reformation! I am not going to sketch the character of popes who succeeded this monster.

I know the effect of the Reformation upon the Romish church, upon popes, cardinals, arch-bishops, bishops, priests, monks, &c. In subsequent times, they became more decent in public. They concealed their debaucheries. But in spirit, the whole church has been infected with the same spirit of anti-christ.

How has the confessional revealed to confessors the secrets of females, that has tempted priests to make them a prey, by depriving them of their honor!

If the secrets of the Inquisition in Rome, and other Roman Catholic countries, since the Reformation, were revealed, what a scene of iniquities would be brought to light to shock and astonish every pure mind!

No essential reformation in the head and members has yet taken place, though so long desired, nor will it occur till the Romish hierarchy is destroyed.

The papacy has now existed since the reformation commenced in the *sixteenth* century (1517) to this year, 1856, *three hundred and thirty-nine* years.

During that time it has met with many severe shocks. Still, however, it survives, clings to its essential life, and will struggle hard to preserve its wicked life; and will not surrender its anti-christian principles, till the Lord of glory come to assert his prerogatives and rights, so long usurped by wicked and impious men!

Look at the insult offered to the Son of God our Redeemer, and to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, by the late convention of the present pope and cardinals, and archbishops (one from our own country) in Rome.

I cannot, however, pass by PAUL III, the *third* pope after LEO, who established the execrable society of *Jesuits*,

“ by a bull, dated the 27th of September, 1540, but upon condition that it should not exceed the number of sixty persons. This restraint the same pope took off by a second bull, of the 14th of March, 1543, leaving them at liberty to admit as many as they pleased. Thus they became, in the space of one hundred and thirty-six years, a very numerous and formidable body. For, in 1543, the whole order consisted of no more than eighty persons; and in 1675, when their last catalogue was printed at Rome, they were increased to the number of seventeen thousand six hundred and fifty-five, and are supposed to be, at this time, in all about twenty thousand. It may be said with truth, that this order alone has contributed more than all the other orders together to confirm the wavering nations in the faith of Rome, to support the tottering authority of the high pontiff; to check the progress of the reformation, and to make amends for the losses their holinesses had sustained in Europe, by propagating the Gospel; and with it a blind submission to the holy see, among the African, American, and Indian infidels. The Jesuits are hated by most other orders, especially by the Benedictines and the Dominicans; by the former, because they have been enriched at their expense; by the latter for snuplanting them, and engrossing to themselves the favor and confidence of sovereign princes. For, till the institution of this artful and insinuating order, the Dominicans alone directed the consciences of all the kings and princes of Europe,

“ In the pontificate of Paul III, and at his instigation, the emperor attempted to introduce the inquisition, which he had established in his Spanish dominions, into the kingdom of Naples. But the Neapolitans of all ranks and conditions flying to arms upon the first steps that were taken towards the execution of such a design, obliged the viceroy, Don Pedro di Toledon, to drive out of Naples all who belonged to that bloody tribunal. The same attempt was made by the court of Rome during the reigns of Philip III, Philip IV., Charles II. and Charles VI. But it was always opposed with the same resolution and vigor; and the kingdom of Naples is the only state in Italy where the inquisition has not, to this day, got the least footing, all causes relating to faith being tried there by the archbishops and bishops, agreeably to an edict of the emperor Charles VI., dated at Barcelona, the 15th of September, 1709.

“Paul III. is said by Onuphrius to have been well versed in most branches of literature, and a generous encourager of learning. He wrote a comment upon Cicero’s Epistles to Atticus before his promotion to the pontificate, and after it some letters, in a polite Latin style, to his particular friend.

“In the first year of his pontificate he laid the foundation of the sumptuous building in Rome called the Palazzo Farnese, one of the most stately edifices in all Europe. It was begun by Antonio Gallo, a celebrated architect, and finished by the famous Michael Angelo Buonarota.” (See *Bower*, vol. iii. pp. 316, 317.)

PIUS III. had indeed the wicked spirit of the *pontificate*.

In regard to INNOCENT XI, extracts from De Cormenin have already appeared that expose his hypocrisy in his contest with LOUIS the *Great*. But to present his character in a stronger light, as well as to expose the despotism of the great monarch, I shall present further extracts from this history of the popes.

“Whilst appearing to have only the interests of religion in view, it was easy to perceive, that the pope thought only of re-establishing the omnipotence of the Holy See; it was also evident that Louis the Fourteenth, under pretext of maintaining the rights of his crown, wished to make himself master of the ecclesiastical benefices, make the clergy dependent on him, and use them to rule the people.

“Innocent the Eleventh had already divined Louis the Fourteenth, and the latter had penetrated the secret hopes of the holy father; the struggle then commenced between royalty and the papacy.

“Never had a prince governed his empire more despotically than Louis the Fourteenth, and been more entirely the master of his subjects; all, nobles, priests, and burghers were trampled like vile slaves beneath his feet, and the prince of Conde, to paint the subjection of the clergy, said, ‘that if the king should take a fancy to embrace protestantism, the priests would be the first to imitate him.’ Father la Chaise himself, the great nephew of Father Cotton, who had become in his turn confessor of the king, and who for fifteen years directed the conscience of Louis the Fourteenth, had joined in the views of the monarch concerning the regale, and though a Jesuit, opposed the Holy See. Some historians accuse the good father of having contributed to inspire his august penitent with the desire to break entirely the yoke of the court of Rome, in order to have the list of livings in the king’s gift at his disposal.

“Instead of obeying the injunctions of the pope, Louis the Fourteenth assembled the principal prelates of the kingdom in council, in the palace

of Monseigneur Marca, the metropolitan of Paris, and placed the matter before them. They who followed the lead of Father la Chaise, were careful not to contradict him, and confirmed the right of regale over all the churches of France. The archbishop of Paris even wrote a very badly digested work on the subject, called 'The Agreement between the Priesthood and the Empire.' Innocent the Eleventh immediately ordered his canonists to refute this book, and renewed his remonstrances to Louis the Fourteenth to abandon his pretensions to the regale. The monarch, finding himself sustained by the clergy, stood firm, refused to submit, and using as a pretext that the liberties of the Gallican church were in danger from the encroachments of the court of Rome, convened a national council to defend the rights of his crown.

Bossuet, the illustrious bishop of Meaux, who had been gained over to the cause of the king, opened the sitting in an extremely skilful discourse; he affected the most respectful deference to the Roman church, called it the mother, the nurse, the mistress of all the churches, insinuating, however, that it was necessary to examine the fundamental rights of civil power and religious authority. After five months of deliberations, the assembly published the four following propositions, which comprehended what is called, in our days, the liberties of the Gallican church:

"1. 'The pope and universal church have no authority, direct or indirect, over the temporal concerns of princes, and cannot depose sovereigns; nor free their subjects from the oath of fidelity.

"2. 'The authority of general councils is above that of the popes, as was decided in the fourth and fifth sessions of the council of Constance, a decision which the church of France recognises as universally approved of, and applicable even to times in which there is no schism.

"3. 'The authority of the see of Rome in matters of discipline, receives its force from the consent of the other churches, and the exercise of supreme ecclesiastical power should be regulated by the canons.

"4. 'On questions of faith, the decisions of the pope are not infallible; they only become so from the approval of the church.'

"These propositions which were principally the work of Bossuet, were signed by eight archbishops, twenty-six bishops, and twenty-four deputies of the second order of the clergy. The king ordered them to be accepted and taught in all the universities, in the faculties of theology and the canon law, by a perpetual and irrevocable edict. Innocent the Eleventh was so indignant at them, that he immediately assembled the sacred college, and pronounced in full consistory an excommunication against all the prelates who had assisted at the council, and caused the four propositions they had decreed, to be burned by the hand of the executioner. His holiness did not confine himself to that; comprehending that his powerless thunders would not intimidate the French clergy, he determined to create for himself defenders even in the ranks of his enemies, and to corrupt, instead of threatening.

“In conformity with his instructions, the legate sought to reconcile himself with the Jansenists; he even made overtures to the theologian Arnaud, and to some other solitaries of Port Royal, and offered them the hat of a cardinal, if they would embrace the cause of the pope, and defend the omnipotence of the Holy See. Arnaud rejected the proposals of the legate, and wrote in favour of the maxims published by the French ecclesiastics. But some of the disciples of the abbot of St. Cyran proved to be better disposed, among others the monks Sfondrati and d’Aguierre; they were decorated with the Roman purple, gratified with rich benefices—and in exchange, they declaimed against the national council of 1682.

“Louis the Fourteenth, on his side, distributed sees and abbeys to the signers of the declaration, so as to prevent defections; and as his holiness refused to grant canonical institution to the proteges of the king, it resulted in the churches having pastors who could neither receive ordination, nor exercise any spiritual power. Thus the difference between the courts of Rome and France became every day more serious.” (pp. 337, 338.)

“Louis the Fourteenth did not content himself with approving of the conduct of his ambassador, he wished then to attack the pope in the exercise of his spiritual power. He declared, by an edict, that the bulls published in France by the court of Rome, concerning the franchises, were null and abusive; he caused the parliament of Paris to decree that a general council should be convened to judge Innocent the Eleventh; and the advocat general Talon, before the assembled great chamber and criminal court, in the name of all the subjects of the king, accused the pope of troubling Christendom, and declared that, Innocent not putting the concordat into execution, they were no longer obliged to conform to it in France.

“‘And, oh, strange thing,’ added the advocat general, ‘the head of the church, whose chief care it should be to preserve the integrity of the faith, has not ceased, since he has been seated on the chair of St. Peter, to carry on intercourse with dangerous men, who have declared themselves the disciples of Jansenius, and whose doctrines his predecessors have condemned; he loads them with favours, he has openly praised them, he has declared himself their protector, even against kings; and this faction, which is subversive of all political and religious authority, which has not forgotten how, during thirty years, to sap slyly all spiritual and temporal powers which were not favourable to it, which wishes to substitute a republic for the throne, freedom of thought for the Christian faith, erect altars to the pope, because he sustains and foment the schisms. What would have become of the peace of the church, if the foresight and indefatigable cares of the great king, to whom he even gave birth, to be the defender and buckler of religion, had not stricken the heretics with the sword of his justice? A singular spectacle, given to the world by a prince whose piety, intelligence, and faith render him infallible, when the pontiff of Rome, the successor of the apostle, pre-

cipitates himself into the abyss of error. Thus, France, Europe, the Christian world, hearsech by my mouth, the oldest son of the church, the descendant of St. Louis to save the belief of our fathers, by using his power, not only to maintain the franchises in their full extent, but also to put an end to the disorders which the vacancy of the bishoprics, in the kingdom produces, to prohibit his subjects from sending away money to the court of Rome, and to overthrow the unworthy priest who soils the pontifical throne by his abominations.' Louis the Fourteenth, who had thus decreed himself to be the supreme arbiter, in his difference with Innocent the Eleventh, did not hesitate to follow the injunctions of the advocate general; he first seized on Avignon, confined the cardinal Ranucci, the apostolic nuncio at St. Oleron, and announced that he was about to appoint Monseigneur de Harley, archbishop of Paris, patriarch of France.

"Although these threats were of a nature to inspire serious fears in the sovereign pontiff, he still persisted in his resistance, and was unwilling to listen to any arrangement or any concession. If we should seek on what assistance he relied in daring to enter upon a strife with the most powerful monarch of Christendom, we will find that it was not on the hope of producing a reaction by his censures, nor on the authority of his apostolical power, nor on the zeal of Catholic princes for the interest of religion, but upon that general hatred which was beginning to be felt towards Louis the Fourteenth, and which was to be so fatal to France. Still, Innocent the Eleventh had not the satisfaction of seeing the defeat of his enemy; for he died on the 12th of August, 1689, broken down by old age, and worn out by sickness." (pp. 343, 344.)

Let it be remembered, that INNOCENT the Eleventh was the *thirteenth* pope after the Reformation; and, in Schaff's view, a legitimate head of the church.

Behold the man, grossly ignorant of fundamental doctrines of the gospel, provoking LOUIS to persecute and murder Christ's saints, by assuring him of heavenly glory, as a reward of such horrible crimes!!!

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE PAPACY OR ROMISH CHURCH GUILTY OF HIGH TREASON
AGAINST THE LORD OF GLORY, AND THE
MURDER OF HIS SAINTS.

Paul speaking of "the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory," says, "Which none of the princes of this world knew; for if they had known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." (1 Cor. ii. 7, 8.)

In view of all that has been urged against the Romish church, from *scripture predictions* and historical facts, well sustained, no intelligent reader can be surprised that, in the nineteenth century, the accusation stated above should be brought against the Romish church.

A SUPPOSITION.

Suppose that, in one of the monarchies of Europe, a portion of the subjects were to combine together, and actually throw away their allegiance to their monarch, by establishing a republican form of government; and should endeavor, with zeal and activity to persuade many other of his subjects to unite with them under their new government; what would follow? How would their forsaken monarch feel? What would he do?

Would he not feel indignant, as soon as he heard of the rebellion of his subjects? and would he not devise means for reclaiming them from their errors? Would he not issue his proclamation, warning them of the consequences of their rebellion, urge them to abandon their dangerous project and return to their allegiance, under pain of his majesty's displeasure? Would he not prepare to enforce his proclamation, by military power, if necessary?

To pursue this supposition any farther is unnecessary, for it has recently been realized by facts occurring in *Hungary*, A. D. 1848.

That people, oppressed for a long time by the tyranny of Austria, but enlightened by the publications of KOSSUTH, became acquainted with their rights. Thus prepared for asserting them, they resolved to free themselves from the oppressive dominion of AUSTRIA, by establishing a republican government, in 1849. Kossuth was chosen their President.

The time seemed propitious. A revolution had taken place in France, which resulted in the establishment of a republican government.

The whole soul of their president was engaged in the noble enterprise; and to sustain their cause, he employed all the great powers of his mind. Providence seemed for a time to smile upon the enterprise; and Hungary might have become a free and independent Republic; had not Russia interfered and sent to Austria's aid 150,000 troops, by which the small armies of Hungary were overwhelmed. Resistance became unavailing. Submission was compelled.

And why did the northern *despot* send his armies to crush the infant republic? The czar was prompted by ambition and pure despotism, to extinguish all

ideas of liberty in Europe, and to remove every obstacle against his aspirations for universal empire.

The subsequent conduct of the court of Vienna towards Hungary is well known. The exemplary punishment of many Hungarians,—the blood shed by her general *Haynau*, that butcher of humanity,—and the degraded state to which poor Hungary was reduced, form already many dismal pages of history.

Kossuth escaped by fleeing to Turkey for protection. The Turks granted it to a professing Christian. He afterwards came to this country to enlist the U. S. A. in behalf of down-trodden Hungary. But here he proved that, great as his mental powers, and brilliant as his eloquence, certainly are, he lacks judgment, and is far from being a judicious and practical statesman. His project to involve this country in a war with the nations on the eastern continent for his beloved country, was perfectly visionary.*

Now for the application of the supposition and illustration.

Jesus Christ has proclaimed himself, according to the decree of his Eternal Father, to be THE LORD OF GLORY, THE SOLE HEAD AND KING OF HIS CHURCH, TRIUMPHANT in *Heaven*, and MILITANT on *earth*. (Heb. i. ii. iii. x: 14–23.)

NOTE.—Our mission on this Western continent, is manifestly a mission of peace. Here a place of refuge was provided by God for his saints persecuted in Europe, to flee to and enjoy religious liberty.

Congress wisely withheld their patronage from the eloquent Hungarian's visionary project, and determined to leave the example of a republican government, established in the U. S. A., to continue to operate on the world, as heretofore, by its MORAL influence.

This is our true policy. Let us persevere in it. We have difficulties enough to contend with, in order to preserve the peace and unity of our multiplying States.

Jesus Christ, when he ascended into heaven, directed his apostles to remain at Jerusalem, till the descent of the Holy Ghost to qualify them for their mission. (See Acts i.) On the day of Pentecost the promise of the Father was fulfilled. (See Acts ii.)

Being now qualified for their great work, the apostles immediately entered on the discharge of its important duties, by preaching the gospel, and by baptizing three thousand, who made a profession of repentance and faith in Christ, on that memorable day.

Under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, the apostles founded a church at Jerusalem, in conformity to the platform of their LORD and MASTER; and afterwards in other parts of Judea; and then, as they were led by divine Providence, in the Gentile world.

This platform, and the instructions under which they acted, are found recorded in the New Testament. Such churches were every where in different parts of the world, established by the apostles during their life-time. Their successors preached the gospel in purity, and formed churches after apostolic example.

Christianity flourished; its influence soon became apparent in the Roman empire. The spirit of opposition was awakened, and bitter persecution ensued. The seeds of heresy too were soon sown by satan, the great enemy of the church. Against these the churches had been warned by *Peter, Paul* and *John*.

Notwithstanding all opposition from pagan philosophers, heretics of every kind, and great and terrible persecutions of Roman emperors, designed to overturn and exterminate the church, Christianity still flourished; Christians so multiplied in numbers, that *Constantine* felt it to be his interest to profess the true

religion, to put down paganism, and declare the Roman empire christian.

This remarkable event delivered christians from the bitter and long continued persecutions of Pagan Rome; but, as we have shown, (pp. 176, 177,) proved highly detrimental to the progress of gospel truth, and the simplicity of Christian conduct and worship. Moreover, the assumption of authority, by the first christian emperor, being an encroachment on the prerogatives and rights of Jesus Christ, the sole Head of the church on earth, was so offensive to God Almighty, that it brought on the western part of the Roman empire his frowns; which, in its consequences, resulted in its ruin, and prepared the way for the great apostasy so clearly predicted by the prophets both of the Old and of the New Testaments. (See ch. xvi. pp. 191-203.)

How abundant the proof that the Romish church is guilty of high treason against the Lord of glory!

Equally abundant is the proof that she is guilty of the murder of multitudes of his saints! (See chapters xviii. xix. xx. xxi.)

A CAUTION.

I wish my views to be distinctly understood. The charge of high treason against the Lord of Glory, and the murder of his saints, lies against the Papacy, as such, and not the common people.

The Papacy, from the time when it first entered the church, in the early part of the *seventh* century, was and is, an *impious usurpation*, destitute of every right, either divine or human.

It entered the church in opposition to the will of Jesus Christ, clearly revealed in the New Testament. And in the Old, as well as in the New Testament, it was clearly foretold, as the *great apostasy*. (See chap. xvi. p. 191-194.)

CONSTANTINE the *Great*, who put down paganism, and declared his empire *Christian*, erred grievously by interfering with the arrangements of the Christian church; so as to encroach on the prerogatives and rights of her exalted and divine Head, and bring down upon his empire the displeasure of the Almighty. The result was its ruin, and opening the way for the *Papacy*, in the seventh century.

What possible right, then, had PHOCAS, the murderer of the emperor *Mauritius* and his family, to constitute BONIFACE III. *universal bishop*, which Gregory the *Great* regarded as the forerunner of *anti-Christ*? (See p. 193.)

The doom of the Papacy or Anti-Christ is predicted in Rev. xix. 17-21. Such will be the end of the hierarchy, or of the *beast* and the *false prophet*.

But when this fearful punishment shall have been inflicted on them, and their final ruin sealed, by remarkable displays of God's righteous displeasure, we are authorized to believe that multitudes of Roman Catholics, now deluded by the Papacy, will, by the preaching of the gospel, be delivered from their ruinous delusions, converted by the Holy Spirit, and united to the Protestant church.

Then, too, will the Protestant church become purer in faith, more united in their views of the truth, and labor with more fervent zeal and increasing liberality for the conversion of the whole world; and bring on, in the appointed time, the millennial glory, or the

reign of light and truth, love and peace over the four quarters of this miserable globe. Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly, and reign as LORD, acknowledged as Redeemer and King, by all nations and their civil rulers. Amen.

PART III.



FIVE CONTRASTS,

WITH

TWO GERMAN DEVELOPMENTS.

CONTRAST I.

The first contrast is between the doctrines of the German Reformed Church in 1832, and what they have since become through the corrupting agencies of *Professors NEVIN and SCHAFF.*

For this I am indebted to the Rev. ALBERT HELENSTEIN, Senior, of Lancaster.

On sending to him a copy of my "Antidote to the Poison of Popery" in Schaff's history, he was induced to translate the address, which, by appointment of the Synod, he delivered at the inauguration of the Rev. Dr. *Rauch* into his office as principal of the "contemplated classical school, and as Professor of Biblical Literature." I had no knowledge of its existence till I received it, accompanied with a letter dated June 22, '54.

In that letter he expresses his thankfulness on receiving my "Antidote," and says he sends the translation of his address "by way of contrast with the present theological aspect of our church." He expresses high approbation of Dr. Proudfit's review of S.'s history; mentions the violent sensation produced by it in the editor of the *Messenger* and others; and remarks, "When a man proves or attempts to prove too much, we are apt to say he proves nothing. This is the case with their tirade on the Review." He "hopes Dr. Proudfit will valiantly do battle for the cause of truth."

THE TRANSLATION OF HIS ADDRESS.

“This truly was and is a highly important—a very solemn day. This forenoon, Mr. F. A. Rauch, Doctor of Philosophy, was dedicated to the sacred ministry by the imposition of hands: and now, in the after part of the day, we are about to instal him as principal of the contemplated Classical School, and as Professor of Biblical Literature.

“It has become my duty to deliver the introductory address on this interesting occasion. It, therefore, will be necessary to take into consideration the two-fold relation which Dr. Rauch will sustain, and to communicate such views as are deemed most appropriate on this subject.

“It would scarcely be necessary to occupy our time with remarks on the necessity of establishing a Classical School, as a preparatory institution; presuming this to be self-evident to every intelligent person acquainted with the peculiar relation in which our church stands. But considering that few, comparatively, reflect that our church is German, and still, in most places, employs the German language in communicating religious instruction, it may not be superfluous to make a few remarks in regard to this matter.

“Classical Schools, in which the rising generation are prepared for the higher branches of learning, are indeed found in every respectable town or neighbourhood;—nor is there a deficiency of colleges in which the youths of our land may lay the foundation to qualify themselves for any of the learned professions; but among all these institutions we discover none that are adapted to the peculiar demands of our church;

bécause, in all of them, so far as we are acquainted, the English is the only language used in communicating instruction. By educating our youth in these institutions, they indeed may come forth well furnished with science; but generally they are not prepared to enter our Theological Seminary for the purpose of becoming useful and efficient pastors in our German congregations. If we take these circumstances into consideration, the necessity of connecting with our Seminary a Classical School, in which the German language and literature occupy a prominent place, must appear evident to every unbiassed mind.

“When I speak of a Classical School in connection with the Seminary, I therefore do not mean one of an ordinary character, in which the learned languages are taught exclusively; but a gymnasium, in which the higher branches of science are gradually introduced;—so that in process of time such an institution may be reared as will prepare perfect materials for the Seminary. It indeed cannot be expected that the services of one man can accomplish these designs; but we hope to realize them at some future period, as we have full confidence in the discernment, ability, and high standing of the principal, and calculate on the active support of the church.

“A Classical School of this description must not only be highly important in regard to the youth, but also in relation to the church. The lads or youth, having become acquainted with the elementary books, are subsequently taught to read and study the higher classics, such for example, as Virgil, Horace, and Homer, in poetry; and Cicero, Tacitus, Demosthenes, Longinus and others, in prose. The charms of song, the brilliancy of wit, the refinement of taste,

have immortalized the names of the former ; while commanding eloquence, admirable ethies, deep historical research, and eloquent sublimity, have secured unfading celebrity to the latter. In order to enter deeply into the spirit of these authors, and to separate the beautiful and the good from those parts in their compositions which might make unfavorable impressions upon the mind, it is necessary, not only to be intimately acquainted with these works, to possess a discriminating judgment and a cultivated taste, but also to have a familiar acquaintance with the geography of the countries in which these men lived, with the antiquities of their customs and manners, and with the mythology of their religion. But while the professor is thus engaged in teaching his students the art of entering into the spirit and age of those far famed authors, how easily might they imbibe the sentiments and feelings of a heathen, rather than a Christian, if the teacher himself be not acquainted with the incomparable excellence of the Christian religion—does not appreciate its superlative value—and experience its blessed influence in his own heart. Should therefore the church not be concerned to have a man of this character at the head of such an institution ?

“ The other relation which commands our attention with increasing interest, is the Professorship of Biblical Literature. Here is opened to our view a very extensive field of learning, which is best appreciated by him who has explored and made himself intimately acquainted with it. I will merely offer a few hints, for the purpose of recommending, in some measure, its high value and great importance. This field of theological science requires that the sacred text be ascertained and explained, to discover what is scripture

and what is its meaning. With this view it is requisite to investigate critically, the writings of the Old and New Testaments, to determine the principles which should be applied to their interpretation, and to illustrate their language and import, from the various sources which philology and history so amply afford. It is easily perceived, that this general view embraces much within its limits. Our design, however, is merely to suggest some hints, that we, in some measure, may perceive and appreciate the importance of the professorship to which our attention has been called.

“The intimate connexion between the Classical Institution and this professorship, therefore, will appear evident to every impartial person. No student could obtain the full benefit that is to be derived from the latter, who had not acquired the preparatory knowledge which is communicated in the former. The propriety of having this chair occupied by a man who is acquainted with biblical literature, in its various branches, is equally evident. It is desirable that he not only should be a learned Philologist, who is familiar with the grammatical structure of the oriental languages, but who also possesses a correct knowledge of Hermeneutics and Archeology. Philosophy and Metaphysics also command our high consideration; yet it is to be lamented that the learned of modern date, instead of employing these sciences to illustrate, have applied them to darken and degrade the sacred volume. If men attempt to explain the bible by reason, inflated with the pride of science, and require that divine revelation shall pay homage to human logic, instead of reason and logic bowing with reverence and submission to the warning declaration, “Thus saith

the Lord;" it is no wonder that the pure church of Christ mourns over so large a number of rationalists and nealogians.

"The German Reformed Church expects better and holier things of the Rev. Dr. Rauch. His excellent testimonials, together with his own candid and unequivocal declarations, are to her so many pledges that he is a genuine friend of divine revelation, and that her doctrines, as they are essentially exhibited in the HEIDELBERG Catechism, are, in his estimation, worthy of respect, purely biblical, truly acceptable, and objects of faith.

"This confidence the church has expressed by her representatives, who met in session as an ecumenical Synod, in Frederick City, Md., in Sept. 1832, when the Rev. Dr. Rauch was elected to the important office into which he presently will be *formally* and *solemnly* inducted.

"The speaker having communicated his views in relation to this highly important office, suffer him, Rev. Dr., in conclusion, to propose some considerations, which he trusts will make a direct appeal to your heart.

"As the Principal of the Classical School, we would commend the youth to your special and affectionate regard. You, doubtless, know how much depends upon the first impressions that are made upon the youthful mind. If these impressions are good, a happy result may be expected in relation to their future mode of thought and action; but if they are the reverse, evil consequences may be apprehended. We think we say not too much, when we assert that, by education, the youth can be moulded almost into any character except one—I mean the "clean heart and

right spirit," which is peculiar to scriptural regeneration, and is produced by the blessings of grace. But if we, as christian teachers, conscientiously perform our duty in educating them, we are encouraged to hope that God will co-operate, by his grace, and thus enable us to attain this high, holy, and christian purpose. Endeavor, therefore, so to regulate, purify, and decorate the classical instruction you impart, as to create in us the confidence that our youth shall acquire the character of enlightened and well educated christians, and become the ornaments of our church.

"As Professor of Sacred Literature, it would be needless, perhaps, to commend to *your* consideration the bible, as a holy, divine, and invaluable book, did not duty place me under the obligation. When you examine the bible, as a learned theologian, you stand not in the same relation which the classical scholar occupies, who is engaged in making glosses on Virgil and Homer. The latter may be satisfied with the impulse of the same spirit which animated those heathen bards; but the former should be endowed with the spirit of grace which inspired those holy men who spake and recorded the word of God. O, surely! when we engage in examining the bible, we approach a "burning bush," in which divinity dwells, and stand on "holy ground," where, in the most profound reverence, we should "put the shoes off from our feet." When we examine the bible, we indeed may wish to behold the full glory of the Lord; but we must be content with a view of his "back parts," instead of seeing his face. When we examine the bible, we stand in the temple of God, wherein is the sanctuary of the Most High, into which none may enter with safety, but such as have been consecrated. I

mean, the bible contains mysteries which dare not be profaned, and which appeal to our implicit faith. Whoever, therefore, undertakes to educate priests of the living God, should be firmly established in biblical truth.

“ We then take for granted, Rev. brother, that there is no discrepancy between your views of the doctrines of faith and those of the church. Let it, however, not be supposed that we desire to cramp your spirit of research in the investigation of truth;—yet it must be conceded, there are general principles of evangelical doctrine, from which a man, in your circumstances, may not essentially deviate, if he would not disturb the peace of the church. But we trust you are a man whose religious sentiments are so firmly fixed, that you will not be “ carried about by every wind of doctrine ;” and whose moral integrity and christian sensibility will not suffer him to depart from the essential doctrines of our church, and, in his official capacity, communicate his new views to the students, *without having announced them to the higher judicature of the church.*

“ As you, Rev. Dr., belong to the Faculty of the Seminary, whose duty it is to watch over the moral deportment and religious and pious sentiments of the students, you will also attend to this concern, that the expectation of the church may be realized. It follows, of course, that no immoralities of any description can be tolerated among the students. But how soon may the proper sense of religion and piety be extinguished, if it be not nourished, revived, and sustained by religious and devotional exercises. Even the most diligent student, who will spare no time nor application for any other purpose than to advance

and perfect himself in science, may, by these very efforts, become, so much the sooner, cold and dead in the divine life. It is indeed customary to have religious exercises in the Seminary, as well as social prayer meetings; but if the student neither has the right disposition, nor will spare the proper time to hold private intercourse with God, he is in great danger of losing the pious sentiments and feeling he may possess, notwithstanding all other religious exercises in which he may engage. The necessity, therefore, of encouraging the students to cultivate genuine and practical piety, you no doubt fully appreciate.

“Permit me to make one more remark, which perhaps may appear superfluous to some, but which to me is important. The student should endeavor so to qualify himself for the pastoral office, that the polished man of the world may find no just cause of offence in his intercourse with society. Crude, uncultivated manners, in a minister of the gospel, are indeed unpleasant and disgusting, respectable as may be his attainments and talents. On the other hand, a timid, bashful, reserved deportment is disadvantageous. Should therefore our youth be censured for seeking occasional relaxation in refined society? It is, however, not our intention to say anything further on this topic, than merely to remark, that it affords us sincere pleasure to know that the students have so fair an example of polite refinement in the deportment and manners of their professor.

“Thus far have I communicated my views, together with such remarks as appear to me appropriate, in relation to the important office which the church, Rev. Dr., has entrusted to your care.

“Do I say that this office is important? It cer-

tainly is,—particularly as our church, at present, has arrived at a very important crisis. It now must appear, whether she shall decline or improve. But, with the help of God, she shall and must rise. This, however, can be accomplished only by united and christian effort. United we stand; but divided we must fall. Not selfishness and party spirit, but fraternal concord must prevail. Not his own, but the interest of the church, each and all must seek; then are we united. If we, to whom the interests of the church are committed, are governed by these principles, then will your arduous office be rendered comparatively light. And if all the true friends of the church unite and say, with the help of God she shall come forth in full bloom, by the blessing of God she will and must, not only blossom like the rose, but yield the rich fruit of an abundant harvest. We therefore say, Rev. Dr., be encouraged. Discharge the duties of your office with faithfulness, with dignity, with firmness, with a christian and independent sense of your rights, and in full reliance on the promise of Him who hath said, “The gates of hell shall not prevail against my church.”

“Thus will we, hand in hand, each in his place, and in proportion to his influence, his ability, his strength, in humility and faith promote the work of the Lord. Then will this important and solemn day be to you, and to us, and to the church, a blessed day. We will, if it be the good pleasure of the Lord, in advanced old age, look back upon this day, and pronounce it blessed. Our children and children’s children, to the remotest generation, will speak of this day, and pronounce it blessed. And when the present economy shall have terminated, and divine pur-

poses shall be fully accomplished, through the mediation of the great and adorable head of the church, and God shall be all in all; may we still experience the unspeakable mercy of remembering this blessed day:—and, in company with the glorified multitude who see face to face, and know even as they are known, sing the celestial hallelujah.”

A very excellent address. I thank my brother for it. May it open the eyes of those who have gone astray, and bring them back from their delusions and apostasy.

CARE OF THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH TO PRESERVE
PURITY OF DOCTRINE.

“ART. 4. No person can be elected a professor, who does not profess the doctrine of the German Reformed Church.

“ART. 5. At his inauguration, a professor elect shall solemnly affirm the following declaration, as by an oath, in the presence of God, in a public assembly:

“You, N. N., professor elect of the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church in the United States, acknowledge sincerely before God and this assembly, that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which are called the canonical scriptures, are genuine, authentic, inspired, and therefore divine scriptures; that they contain all things which relate to the faith, the practice and the hope of the righteous, and are the only rule of faith and practice in the Church of God; that, consequently, no *traditions*, as they are called, and no mere conclusions of

reason, which are contrary to the clear testimony of these Scriptures, can be received as rules of faith or of life. You acknowledge farther, that the doctrine contained in the Heidelberg Catechism, is the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and must, therefore, be received as in accordance with divinely revealed truth. You declare sincerely, that in the office you are about to assume, you will make the inviolable divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, and the truth of the doctrine contained in the Heidelberg Catechism, the basis of all your instructions, and faithfully maintain and defend the same, in your preaching and writing, as well as in your instructions; you declare, finally, that you will labor, according to the ability which God may grant to you, that, with the divine blessing, the students intrusted to your care, may become enlightened, pious, faithful and zealous ministers of the gospel, who shall be sound in the faith.'"

CONTRAST II.

DR. NEVIN will furnish this contrast.

It will lie between the solemn avowal of his faith and most solemn engagements, when he accepted the office of Professor in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church, and the subsequent disclosures of his belief.

NOTE.—I transcribe from the Constitution, APPROVED by the Classes, and adopted by the Synod of the Ger. Ref. Ch., &c., in 1846. Printed at the "Weekly Messenger" office, in 1847.

That Dr. Nevin was educated in the Presbyterian Church, and was afterwards inaugurated as a Professor in their Western Theological Seminary, is well known.

At his licensure to preach the gospel, at his ordination to the ministry, and especially when inducted into the Western Seminary, he made avowals of his faith, and sacred engagements to teach and preach doctrines widely different from what he has since taught.

What a wonderful revolution has taken place in his mind!

When he left the Presbyterian Church, no change in his views of scriptural truth was known to have occurred. He was elected a Professor in the German Reformed Theological Seminary with great unanimity; and his letter of acceptance gave universal satisfaction to that church.

Let the reader turn to pp. 293-294, and he will there see the solemn avowal of his faith, and sacred engagements to teach, and preach; and defend the doctrines contained in the *Heidelberg Catechism*.

How is it possible for Dr. Nevin to reconcile the faith he then avowed, and the solemn promises he then made, with his subsequent conduct, and teachings, and publications?

May, 1840, he was installed at Mercersburg, Professor in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church, and entered on the discharge of his duties; and I have been informed that the church remained in peace and harmony till 1843. The Rev. Dr. Mesick has shown that his publications in "The Weekly Messenger," up to Nov. 25, 1840, were Protestant and anti-popery in a high degree. (See p. 159.)

Now they are so notoriously different, that I need not specify his different anti-Protestant publications.

In my "Antidote," in pamphlet form, I merely referred to the page of his sermon preached before the triennial convention, to show his papistical tendency; but now I shall transcribe it, to let the reader see whither Dr. N. has gone in his downward course.

"The whole humanity of Christ, soul and body, is carried over by the process of the christian salvation, into the person of the believer; so that his glorified body, no less than his glorified soul, will appear as the natural and necessary product of the life in which he is thus made to partake."

Here is a clear popish development—the result of German philosophy run wild; which he in vain attempts to sustain by quotations from Calvin, whom he does not understand. He might as well attempt to quote from Calvin's writings to prove that he upheld the abominable mass.

And as he mistakes the meaning of Calvin, so he did grossly misunderstand the views of the leading brethren of the Dutch Church, as having "given explicit testimonies in its favor." (See Appendix to his sermon, p. 192.)

I am authorized by Drs. Ludlow, Van Vranken, and How, the three leading brethren of the Dutch Church, who attended the triennial convention, to state that they did not (by voting for the publication of his sermon, if they voted, or in any other way) express their approbation of any sentiments differing from the confession of faith contained in the Heidelberg Catechism; and one of them said: "I thought the sermon *mystical*; I did not understand it; I wished to see it in print." Shortly after this, the Dutch

Church withdrew from the convention, lest they should countenance serious errors.

The sentiments contained in this sermon, designed to sustain Schaff's heterodox views, by being published in connexion with his "~~Principle of Protestantism,~~" were contrary to the doctrines of the Heidelberg Catechism. Dr. Nevin has too much intelligence not to know the fact. He knows they were not the views he entertained, when, at his inauguration, he adopted the Heidelberg Catechism, as required by the Constitution of the German Reformed Church. Was there not here a manifest departure from that standard of doctrine? Was there no violation of promise in this? If so, such conduct was wrong; for the violation of a solemn promise can never be right. David states it as characteristic of a righteous man: "He sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not." (Ps. xv. 4.)

We may be asked, must not a minister study the Holy Scriptures, and if he find them not in accordance with that infallible rule, change them? Doubtless. But in making the change known, he must not do it so as to violate a solemn promise.

Dr. N. having adopted a different standard of right and wrong from what I hold, we cannot reason together. But, however far he may be involved in the mists of popery, he cannot deny himself to be a sinner; and I may be allowed, in conclusion, to ask him this question: "Have you adopted, as part of your creed, the *mass*, as one of the seven sacraments of the Romish church, that impart grace? The mass, which the Heidelberg Catechism stigmatizes as "at bottom a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry?" Alas! you once knew the truth; for you adopted this catechism.

The German Reformed Church seemed not to be aware how soon Dr. Nevin's departure from the truth began. The Princeton Review detected it as early as the year 1841. After speaking of the "Eulogy on the Life and Character of the late Rev. Dr. Frederick Rauch, &c.," by John W. Nevin, D. D., with due praise, the article says,

"We wish we could pass in silence one feature of this discourse, which we noticed, we confess, with more pain than surprise. There is a tone of apology for some of the worst systems of German philosophy, a designating of destructive errors by the respectful appellation of 'foreign forms of thought,' which we think unworthy of the stedfastness and fidelity of a teacher of Christian doctrine. We know very well that nothing we could say on this subject would have the least effect upon the author of this Eulogy. It would be set down to the score of ignorance and bigotry; and thus be pitied and forgiven. But we think it should excite some misgivings in the minds even of those who have made the profoundest attainments in German philosophy, to find that good men in Germany itself, men not restricted by the trammels which are supposed to confine all English minds, regard with disapprobation and even abhorrence the systems which are directly or indirectly eulogized in this discourse. A man should be very well at home in his subject, and very sure of himself, to be able, without uneasiness, to find himself fondling as scientific forms of truth, doctrines which German scholars of the first eminence regard as atheistic. Dr. Nevin we know, and have known long, and doubt not he has in his American education and in the grace of God, an anchor which will prevent his being carried over the cataract to whose fearful brink, attracted by the rainbow tints of the mists which overhang the 'hell of waters,' he seems to us to be drawing perilously near. We have not courage to follow in his wake." (Princeton Review, vol. xiii. 1841, pp. 463-464.)

As Dr. Nevin once knew and professed to love the truth, we may express a hope, and put up a fervent prayer, that he will review his wandering from the sheep-fold, and return from his departure, and embrace the truth again with all his heart and soul. God grant it. Amen.

NOTE.—Here P. Review acted well. But we shall have occasion to show hereafter, that the P. Review failed to fulfil its high vocation.

CONTRAST III.

DR. SCHAFF will furnish it.

By birth he was a German. He lived in Prussia. He had spent much time in studying history, especially ecclesiastical history. He had studied MOSHEIM, and esteemed him very highly; and was a pupil of Neander. All this appears from his own history, recently published in the English language.

The call to become a Professor in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church, was presented to him in 1843.

As an honest, intelligent man, on receiving the call, he would naturally inquire, Who are the German Reformed Church? From what parts of Germany did they go to the United States? and for what purpose? Their very name, German Reformed, would, at once, suggest to him that they must have migrated, not from the portions of Germany occupied by the Roman Catholics; nor from those where the Lutherans lived; but from those where the Reformed lived.

Any information he needed, it was easy for him to obtain from those who were appointed by the Synod of the church to present and prosecute the call.

In a matter of so great importance, it is reasonable to suppose, their leading and most influential men, who loved their church, its purity, and best interests, were appointed. Nor is it to be doubted, they took care to put Dr. Schaff in possession of all needed information, that he might know who they were, what

was their great *standard of doctrine*, whence their forefathers had come; that they had fled from persecution, and come to this country to enjoy civil and religious liberty; to live in it, and worship God according to the dictates of their own minds, and retain the true, scriptural, and blessed faith, for which their ancestors in Germany had bled and died, as well as suffered the loss of all things, under the persecuting tyranny of LOUIS the Great, who, in 1685, revoked the edict of Nantz.

All this information, Dr. Schaff, we may suppose possessed before he made up his mind to accept the call of the church in this country.

He arrived here in 1844; and delivered his INAUGURAL ADDRESS at Reading, on the 25th of October, 1844. So we are informed, by DR. NEVIN, in the first sentence of his INTRODUCTION of Schaff's "Principle of Protestantism," published in 1845. And in that sentence he also tells us, "the work has grown out of that Address, and still retains, to some extent, its original form." He adds in the next sentence, and two following, "Only a part of the Address, however, as previously prepared, was spoken at that time; and it has been since considerably changed and enlarged in the way of preparation for the press. It is now, accordingly, more like a book than a pamphlet. If this may be supposed to require any apology, it is to be found in the difficulty and importance of the subject, and the anxiety of the writer to have his views with regard to it fully understood by the church which has called him into her service." See the next sentence closing the first paragraph.

The third paragraph is a most singular one, and shows how much DR. NEVIN was already *Germanized*,

is infected with the *poison* of popery. He was prepared to depart from the faith of the Protestant religion, nearly as soon as Schaff arrived in this country. When I read it, after its publication in 1845, I wrote on the margin, with a pencil, this sentence: "The Bible is the same among all nations. Everywhere it teaches the same truths."

And now, to give the reader some idea of this singular paragraph of DR. NEVIN, I add, that a German need not change his "constitution," and become an American, to understand the Scriptures as an American does.

The ancestors of the German Reformed Church interpreted the Bible in Germany, just as their descendants in this country did, one hundred years afterwards; and just as the sound part of the church did in 1844, when Dr. Schaff delivered his *Inaugural Address*, October 25th of that year; and just as DR. NEVIN did, when he wrote his letter of acceptance of their call to be a Professor in their Theological Seminary, which gave the church so much pleasure. Had Dr. Schaff been really and truly a German Reformed Protestant, he would in Germany have understood the *Heidelberg Catechism*, just as he would understand it if he were to live *thirty years* longer in this country, and lay aside many habits peculiar to *Germany*, and in these respects become *American*.

This may be illustrated by referring to the case of Dr. Nevin himself. He has never lived in Germany, and yet he has imbibed many erroneous German ideas in regard to the Christian religion; and were he to go to Germany, he might, the week after his arrival, deliver an address prepared in America, exhibiting the very views of truth entertained by Schaff, so

far as he has imbibed them ; though his accent, tone of voice, and pronunciation of the German language, would much differ from his teacher.

He has never lived either in Italy or in Rome ; and yet how far has he gone in adopting the great and ruinous errors of the Romish church ; and even advanced in a downward course that would have startled many an ancient advocate of that apostate church !*

Professor Schaff has no excuse for publishing errors, so discordant from the standard of truth he had solemnly avouched to be his belief, and so solemnly promised to teach, and to maintain against opposers, *on the very day of his inauguration, and afterwards more at large, as soon as he had time to swell his address into a "book," in 1845.*

The Minutes of the German Reformed Church for 1844, has, on page 26, this record :

"The Committee appointed to hold a *Tentamen* with the Rev. Dr. Schaff, report

"That they have had satisfactory evidence of his being in regular ecclesiastical connection as a minister with the Evangelical Church in Prussia, having been ordained in the Reformed Church of Elberfeld last April. They have satisfied themselves also that as he was born in the bosom of the Reformed Church, so he continues to be still true to its faith as exhibited in the Heidelberg Catechism, and that he is prepared, moreover, to conform to the constitution and order of the same church as exhibited in this country. They recommend, therefore, that he be received as a member of this Synod. Respectfully submitted,

JOHN W. NEVIN, *Chairman.*†

* In proof, see his publications ably reviewed by Drs. Hodge and Prondft.

† Dr. N., already a Papist, and others like him, were on this Committee.

“The report was adopted, and Dr. Schaff instructed to connect himself with the Classis of Mercersburg.”

On page 51, is this minute, “The Committee appointed to attend to the inauguration of the Rev. Dr. Schaff, in case he accepted of the Professorship to which he was elected, reported that they have made arrangements to have his inauguration take place at Reading, Pa., on Friday the 25th instant. The report was accepted, and the Committee continued,”

Dr. Schaff was inaugurated at the appointed time, and delivered his address, which afterwards grew into what Dr. Nevin calls a book.

No wonder the sound part of the church became alarmed. No wonder that the Classis of Philadelphia complained to the Synod against his “Principle of Protestantism,” as militating against their standard of doctrine, the Heidelberg Catechism. (See Minutes for 1845, page 23, No. 14.)

True, the Committee of Synod brought in a report, which was carried by a large majority; against which Dr. Berg entered his protest. In my opinion, the vote of Synod only goes to show how far the poison of popery had been already diffused in that denomination by the united labors of the two Professors.

No wonder the Board of Visitors of the Theological Seminary, alarmed by the representations of Dr. Schaff's erroneous views, felt constrained to request him to appear before them at the meeting of the Synod, at Carlisle, October, 1846.

Having heard his statements and explanations, the Board stated in a resolution, which was afterwards adopted by the Synod, “that they could not endorse the views of Dr. Schaff; but they did not deem it of sufficient importance to call for any special action.” (See Minutes.)

Here the maxim was forgotten: "*Obsta principiis.*"

How is it possible for Schaff, or any intelligent man, to reconcile his laudation of the state of the church during the Middle Ages, with historical truth, and especially with the Holy Scriptures, when, in fact, it was in the most corrupt state, both as to doctrine and worship! He had solemnly received the Heidelberg Catechism, which so plainly teaches that there are only *two* sacraments, *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, and the Mass to be "a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry," as the confession of his faith. How then, can he, or any man, reconcile this declaration with the praise which he immediately after bestowed on the *seven sacraments* of the Römish church, in his inaugural address, enlarged as it was afterwards, and published in a book, in 1845, *without excepting the Mass, that accursed idolatry!*

I feel the reconciliation to be impossible.*

CONTRAST IV.

BETWEEN GERMANY ENLIGHTENED AND VIVIFIED BY THE
REFORMATION, AND WHAT GERMANY BECAME AFTER
THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, SHROUDED AND
PARALYZED BY FATAL ERRORS.

Both professors boast of modern Germany, as the seat of science and theological knowledge; and seem

* Let the reader compare the extract from his "*Principle of Protestantism*," in Part I. pp. 17-19, with his oath, p. 293.

to think no one is capable of interpreting the Bible, unless he has sat at the feet of some German teacher.

We, therefore, take the liberty of reminding them of an important passage of Holy Scripture, which should never be forgotten: "The natural man (as all are born) receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Cor. ii. 14.) A natural man may, from reading the Scriptures and hearing the gospel faithfully preached, form a correct speculative creed; and yet being *unenlightened* by the Holy Spirit to discern the truth in a spiritual manner, and unrenewed by his saving grace, remain in an unconverted state, destitute of spiritual life.

Such, alas! was my own case, till I had entered my twentieth year. I had, in the parochial school of the Reformed Dutch Church, taught by Mr. Steenbeck, in Garden, now State Street, after my father's return to New-York, on the conclusion of the peace in 1783, been indoctrinated in the Heidelberg Catechism, before I went to the grammar school to learn *Latin* and *Greek*, required for entering *Columbia* College. It was my privilege to sit under the ministry of orthodox, evangelical ministers. Hence, while studying in College, my speculative views of divine truth remained correct; and I was prepared, in disputes with my Episcopal classmates, to contend for the doctrine of election, &c. But I remained in a natural, unrenewed state till January, 1794, when, on the first day of the new year, it pleased God to visit me with sickness. I was advised to leave the church and go home. I declined following the advice, the thought occurring, by remaining I may obtain instruction and profit.

On the conclusion of the service, of course I went home; and immediately took to my bed. It proved to be the *scarlet fever*. In the evening I became greatly alarmed at the prospect of death. Convictions of sin and guilt seized on my mind. I called for a religious book. The colored woman put into my hands a psalm book. I read it. So great was the agony of my mind, that I was thrown into a violent perspiration. The physician came and ordered my linen to be changed. The disease was broken and my life saved. My convictions did not cease. The good work went on, and resulted, I trust, in a change of heart and living faith in Christ.

My purpose was changed. Instead of studying medicine with the attending physician, I resolved to study for the *ministry*.

This our German philosopher may sneer at as *pietism*. Be it so. Such a change he must experience, or he will never be saved, with all his German theology.

But we return to the contrast.

How vast the difference between the portions of Germany enlightened by writings of *Luther*, and *Melancthon*, and *Ursinus*, and many others, great and pious men, during the Reformation, through the enlightening and vivifying influence of the Holy Spirit accompanying the instrumentality of the word printed or spoken, and those same portions of Germany since the council of Trent, now covered with a dark shroud, by rationalism,—neology,—pantheism,—infidelity, and atheism;—the natural, legitimate brood of the Papacy or Romish church, unenlightened and unvivified by the Holy Spirit, who will not use the heretical dogmas of Rome, which have been substituted for

God's word ; and who has left them to darkness and barrenness,—the certain consequence of being deprived of the light and warm beams of the sun of righteousness. This contrast cannot be denied without contradicting all history.

In support of the position I have taken, I shall offer the testimony of two eminent divines ; one of whom Dr. S. will be much surprised to find, at the close of his life, bearing his testimony against German theology, after having experienced in his own mind, its baneful influence.

First, hear the venerable DR. DANA, of Newburyport, in a sermon entitled, "THE FAITH OF FORMER TIMES." Text, HEBREWS xiii. 7—" *Whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation.*"

The sermon was delivered August 1, 1847, on "the hundredth anniversary of the South Church of Ipswich, the author's native place. It has been subsequently preached, with some omissions and variations, in several places. By the advice and request of judicious friends, it is now submitted to the public." (See Preface.)

He writes : "Look at Germany ; the birth-place of Luther ; the cradle of the Reformation ; the abode, for ages, of great and pious ministers, of pure churches, of truth-loving and ardent Christians. Who would not have hoped that this distinguished country would have continued, for many an auspicious century, the blessing of Europe, the light of the world, the champion of pure and primitive Christianity ?

And what is Germany now ? The seat of learning, of science, of philosophy, of metaphysics, of boundless investigation and discussion, of religious theories without number, of expositions of Scripture without

end—the seat of every thing, in short, but truth, and reason, and common sense. If there is a country on earth, in which philosophy, breaking away from the Bible, has pre-eminently displayed its weakness and folly, it is Germany, If there is a spot on the globe which has been a *radiating point of darkness* and error; of false religion, false and corrupting morality, and universal skepticism, it is Germany.

“With truth it may be said, that there is not a doctrine of the Bible, from its first to its last page, which has not been, by scores of its learned men, distorted, denied, vilified, and held up to the public scorn. With equal truth it may be said, that there is not an error which has infected the church, from its earliest birth till now, which has not been gravely defended by scores of its clergy; men who have even put to the blush the absurdities of former ages, by still greater absurdities of their own invention.

“But can there be any danger of such awful degeneracy and corruption among ourselves?—My brethren, let us not shut our eyes. There is real and great danger. The very writings which have been described have already found admission to our country, have received a wide circulation, and are eagerly devoured by thousands of readers. The minds of multitudes of theological students have come into contact with them; and not a few have imbibed the sweet poison. Others, it may be hoped, have remained uncontaminated. But is there no danger in breathing infected air?

“It is often suggested that many German writers, possessed of fine powers and great learning, exhibit likewise a portion of orthodoxy, together with the substantial of piety. It is said, likewise, that in the case of many of these writers, there is a great retroces-

sion from errors which have long prevailed in that country. Let these facts be admitted, and let them be rejoiced in. But the question still arises: Is the dimness of twilight to be preferred to the splendor of day? Or must we gravely plunge into twilight, in order to reach that day which shone upon us long before a single ray of light from modern Germany had dawned upon our land?

“It cannot be denied that in the best of the writers referred to, there are generally found notions too indistinct and vacillating, of essential gospel doctrines. We may give them the praise, of great and varied learning; of refined thought; often of tender, and apparently pious sentiment. But for clear and accurate statements of Christian doctrine, we ordinarily look to them in vain. Generally, too, they are indecisive, at best, in regard to the proper and plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. And here, in this very spot, is found the baneful and productive source of most of the errors and heresies which prevail throughout our country. The minds of our people have broken loose from the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures: And what is the consequence? Truths, doctrines, which beam from their pages with overpowering light, are by thousands doubted, or disbelieved, or ridiculed, or set at defiance.

“And what, my hearers, if the same experiment which has been made in Germany, should be repeated in our own country? What if our Theological Seminaries, (and I say it with grief, it is in Theological Seminaries that error and heresy have been apt to commence their deleterious course,) what, I say, if our Theological Seminaries should become scenes of heresy—fountains of error—schools in which every

thing shall be taught, rather than the pure, unadulterated doctrines of the gospel?—Most of these seminaries, it is believed, are furnished with scriptural and orthodox creeds. But what if their instructors should turn their back on those creeds? What, if by a strange hallucination, they should think it right to inculcate doctrines essentially diverse from those which they have solemnly professed to believe, and promised to teach? And what if their pupils should come forth to the churches, surcharged with learned error, with false philosophy, false metaphysics, false theology; and teaching every thing but the pure doctrines of the word of God? What hope could we then indulge for our country, for the Church of God, for the souls of men, for the cause of pure religion?

“We advance, then, to a new thought. *Unless we return to the faith of our fathers, the pure faith of the gospel, the interests of vital and practical piety must languish and die.* Truth and piety have a natural connection. God has joined them. Every attempt to separate them must be at once impious and abortive. There is a *world* of instruction in our Saviour’s prayer, *Sanctify them through thy truth.* It is the truth, and not error, that sanctifies. Wherever, by an individual, or a church, or a community, the truth is unknown, or forgotten, or disregarded, or trampled down, *there*, as surely as night follows day, a countless host of evils will enter. Insensibility, worldliness, impiety, neglect of God, of Christ, of prayer, of the soul, of eternity, will soon make themselves manifest.

“The reasons of this may be easily assigned. If God has distinctly declared to his ministers, what doctrines they shall deliver, and these doctrines are

actually preached, it may be hoped that he will sanction and seal such preaching by the accompanying influences of his Holy Spirit. This is natural. And this is ordinarily the fact. Rarely is the gospel preached in its purity, without some saving effect. But what if the gospel be withheld? Or what if it be mixed and corrupted?—and all human mixtures are corruptions. Can a blessing be expected in such a case? Will the Most High solemnly prescribe to his ministers the doctrines they shall preach, and will he sanction, by the influences of his Holy Spirit, doctrines materially diverse. It would be wonderful indeed if he did.

“The matter may be considered in another view. The doctrines we have briefly detailed to-day, exhibit man not only as a sinner, but as in himself, wholly lost, undone and helpless. They lay him at the footstool of sovereign mercy. Without the interpositions of that mercy, he is undone—undone forever. These, my dear hearers, are the doctrines which break the slumbers of the human intellect, and lay a strong grasp on the inmost heart. All other doctrines are feeble and inefficient. We may preach our own fancies, and our hearers may be amused. But they will be neither sanctified nor saved. They will not even be greatly interested or alarmed. Human depravity, human pride and stupidity, strong in their intrenchments, will laugh at our puny assaults. While the pure doctrines of the gospel, simply delivered, will, by the grace of heaven, arouse the conscience, subdue the heart, and save the soul.” (See pp. 15–18.)

“On one point, I must be indulged a free remark. Much is said and preached, in our day, on the subject of men’s *natural ability*. And the object probably is,

to deprive them of all excuse for neglecting their souls and religion. But many hearers, not comprehending the philosophical distinction, turn from it in disgust, and from whatever of gospel truth may be connected with it. Many others accept the *flattering unction*; and learning that they can *change their own hearts*, if they please, resolve to do this disagreeable work *when* they please; that is, at a future time; a time that, with most, never comes.

“Thus, by a philosophical subtilty, not to say, a gross error, the soul is lost.

“On the whole, we may set it down as an unquestionable truth, that until we return to the faith of our fathers; to the pure, unsophisticated doctrines of the gospel, little can be hoped in favor of religion. Indeed, of the real religion which remains among us, a great portion is the fruit of those old-fashioned, neglected doctrines; and not of the superficial and modish opinions, which have usurped their place.” (See pp. 18, 19.)

The paper of Dr. Moses Stuart I shall publish entire, from the AMERICAN MESSENGER for January, 1854; because ANDOVER SEMINARY was injured by him. Where is it now?

“DANGERS OF GERMAN THEOLOGY.”

“The late Professor Stuart, whom none will accuse of undue prejudice against modern German theological writers, gives the following warning as to their rationalistic tendencies in one of the last articles from his pen.

““Could their position in regard to the Scriptures

be received by the indiscriminating multitude of men, both learned and unlearned, without the most absolute hazard of all belief in the Bible as divinely authoritative—of all belief in its doctrines, its precepts, and its facts? Impossible, altogether impossible. The ground once abandoned which Paul has taken, that ALL SCRIPTURE IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD, every man of common attainments will feel at liberty to say whatever his own feelings may dictate: to say, ‘This is unimportant, that is unessential; this is a doubtful narration, that is a contradictory one; this is in opposition to science, and that to reason; this may be pruned, and that lopped off, while the tree may still remain as good as ever.’ In a word, every one is left wholly, and without any check, to be his own judge in the case, how much of the Bible is consonant with his own reason and feelings, and how much is not; and these feelings are of course the high court of appeal. What now has become of the book of God, true, authoritative, decisive of all duty and all matters of faith? Gone, absolutely gone, irretrievably gone, as to the mass of men who are not philosophers in casuistry and in the theory of religion.

“‘If any doubt remains as to the effect of such doctrine, I appeal again to the religious state of the great German community—to their Sabbaths, to their lonely sanctuaries, to their lack of missionary spirit, and to their general indifference as to revivals of religion, such as produce and foster warm-hearted piety. The *Pietists*—as in the way of scorn they name all warm-hearted and practical religious men—are merely ‘a smoke in the nostrils’ of their scholars and their statesmen. No man can rebut the force of this ap-

peal, for the truth of it is too palpable. The worst of all is, that the mass of the Germans look with secret scorn on a man who claims that a practically godly, prayerful, humble life is essential to religion. One question sums up the account. Where is the *family altar* for prayer and praise in the German community? Even in the so-called *religious* community? If what I have often heard be true, such altars are not more numerous among them than were the righteous, whom Abraham was requested to find in a devoted city of old. I do not say there can be no piety where this is the case. There may be some sevens of thousands—I hope there are—who do not ‘bow the knee to Baal;’ and doubtless the Redeemer has sincere followers and friends there. But that active spirit of piety which fills the church and the conference-room with humble and anxious inquirers after the way of salvation, which sanctifies the Sabbath, which builds up religious schools, which sends the gospel to the destitute in one’s own country, and raises up missionaries, and causes them to go forth unto the ends of the earth, that ‘the dead may hear the voice of the Son of God and live’—such a spirit cannot breathe strongly and freely, where there are no family altars, and no Sabbath.

“‘To the same position or state, or one much like it, must we also come ere long, unless this tide can be averted from us. But this must be done, if it can be accomplished. On the present generation in our country it rests to decide the question, whether we shall follow in the footsteps of Germany. The spirit of every Christian pastor in the land, and of every private Christian too, ought to be roused up to meet this great exigency.’”

Let *Dr. Schaff* and the portion of the German Reformed Church he and *Dr. Nevin* have led *astray*, read this article of *Dr. Stuart*, written at the close of his life.

Dr. Schaff, and all the ministers of Prussia, have, and do feel the influence of the court of Berlin. They cannot free themselves from it. We owe no thanks to Prof. S. for striving to introduce German nationality into this country. The German Reformed Church were purer in the faith before he came to this country than they are at present.

Neither he nor *Dr. Nevin* seems to know that when Jesus Christ comes to claim his prerogatives and rights, that have been usurped, not only by popes, but by the despots of Europe, he will not only prostrate the Roman hierarchy, but rebuke all who have drank of *the wine of her fornication*.

This sermon of *Dr. Dana* was preached *two* years after the publication of *Schaff's* "Principle of Protestantism," and *three* years after *Dr. Nevin* had delivered his sermon in 1844, bound in connexion with *Schaff's* pamphlet.

At the close of his introduction, this excellent and venerable divine says, "He is willing that this discourse should be regarded as his dying testimony to the *truth as it is in Jesus*."

I cannot close without referring to what was said, in a preceding paragraph, about European despots, and the influence of the *court of Berlin* on all ministers who live in Prussia. *Dr. Schaff*, undoubtedly, felt it there, and came to this country under its influence, and has not, to this day, shaken it off. All recommendations of German Reformed ministers, without exception, are to be received *cum granu salis*.

Alas! how feeble the expression. The king of Prussia is one of the despots of Europe who have committed fornication with "the great whore that sitteth on many waters;" and he has drank deep of the wine of her fornication (See Rev. xvii. 1, 2); and to sustain his despotism over his subjects, the court of Berlin exercises such a deliterious control over the theological views of professors in her literary and theological institutions, and preachers, that they dare not write nor speak fully what they believe. This will account for the change that is said to have occurred in Dr. Krummacker, when he became chaplain in Berlin.

Let me recommend to Drs. S. and N., the perusal of a little book entitled,

"FOREIGN CONSPIRACY *against* the LIBERTIES of the U. S. The numbers, under the signature of BRUTUS, originally published in the New-York Observer, revised and corrected, with notes, by the author, SAMUEL F. B. MORSE, A. M., &c. *Seventh edition.* New-York A. and F. Christian Union.

The king of Prussia sent with Prof. S. 1500 rix dollars as a present to the German Reformed Church! This reminds me of the TROGAN HORSE.

Dr. S. will have to breath American atmosphere a long time to expel from his lungs the atmosphere of *Prussia*; and still longer time to get rid of *Berlin theology*, or PAPACY!

TWO SPECIMENS OF GERMAN DEVELOPMENTS.

Dr. Nevin will furnish the FIRST.

He was once a decided warm-hearted Protestant, and a decided anti-Romanist; but he has for some

years past developed into an avowed Romanist, and consequently into a warm and belligerent anti-Protestant. Dr. Schaff would call this a development of Christianity. A sad perversion of terms! As well might he call the extinguishment of light a development of it! or death a development of life!

No, no! It is like the papacy, and partakes of its nature, which we have elsewhere described, as an exchange of light for darkness—of truth for error—of the pure worship of God and his Son, for the worship of saints, and the Virgin Mary, and pagan idolatry!

And will the road he has chosen conduct him to heaven? The apostle Paul will answer the question. (See 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.)

Dr. Schaff furnishes the SECOND.

We call him a PROTESTANT *by profession*. We dare not call him a real Protestant. He, himself, (in his inaugural address, expanded afterwards, as Dr. Nevin says, in his Introduction, into a book,) cautions us against such a mistake. He has been developing himself, and we have looked at this wonderful German development.

By carefully examining his description of popery in the middle ages, manifestly designed to beguile the German Reformed Church, who had called him to a professorship in their Theological Seminary; because he professed to be a Protestant, willing to adopt the *Heidelberg Catechism* as the profession of his faith, and to teach, and preach, and maintain the truth contained in it as scriptural truth.

By contrasting the erroneous views disclosed in one passage of his "Principle of Protestantism," with the testimonies of *Mosheim* and *Edgar*, credible ecclesiastical historians, my faith in his profession of Protest-

antism became shaken, and I regarded him as a semi-papist; and after having examined his bulky history, and especially his note not published with his German edition, and discovered so much poison of popery in them, my faith in his profession was more rudely shaken by this second development of his views, and I set him down as a *Papist*.

I am now waiting for a third development. Were he to follow his friend and pupil, I should not be greatly surprised. But he has more caution; and although he has endorsed his writings, yet he remonstrates on his precipitancy. Different influences probably operate on their minds; and Dr. S. may refuse to reveal himself, and keep us in the dark as to his real character.

But before he is pleased to make a full development of himself, I must be permitted to say, there will be no development of *Christianity* in it, but of the opposite, unless he greatly change. I wait in patience; rejoicing that JEHOVAH JESUS reigns; assured he will come speedily to purify his church, and commence that work which will issue, in due time, in the universal reign of *truth and righteousness, peace and love*, over all the world.

CONTRAST V.

This will be seen by placing the church of Christ, as described by the apostles Paul and Peter, in oppo-

sition to the papistical church, reared by the popes and cardinals.

The one is instinct with life; the other is dead, both *spiritually* and *judicially*.

PAUL.

Hear what Paul has written of the church.

“Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.” (See Ephes. ii. 14–22.)

Again: “But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in love.” (See Ephes. iv. 15, 16.)

One more: “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies: he that loveth his wife loveth

himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh ; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church : for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery : but I speak concerning Christ and the church." (See Ephes. v. 22-32.)

PETER.

Now hear Peter : " WHEREFORE, laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypoërisies, and envies, and all evil-speakings, as new-born babes, desire the sincere (unadulterated) milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby ; if so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious : to whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious : and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe he is precious : but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, *even* to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient ; whereunto also they were appointed. But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people ; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of

darkness into his marvellous light: which in time past *were* not a people, but *are* now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy. Dearly beloved, I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; having your conversation honest among the Gentiles; that, whereas they speak against you as evil-doers, they may, by *your* good works which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation." (See 1 Peter ii. 1-12.)

Behold the temple, the church of God, described by Paul and Peter, full of life. The head Jesus Christ, a fountain of life, sending forth streams of life through all the members of his body.

The apostles and prophets had spiritual life; they were sanctified, pardoned, and justified while they lived, and when they died, they enjoyed spiritual life, expanded into perfect love, sinless obedience, uninterrupted peace and communion with God in heaven.

The same is true as to every true believer, who has died and gone to heaven, in every generation to the present time. And at the end of time, the bodies of all true believers will be raised from the dead and united to their glorified souls;—forever freed from sin—perfectly holy and happy—glorifying God—expanding in knowledge—increasing in holiness and nearness to God, through the endless ages of eternity.

Behold the church described by Paul and Peter—redeemed unto God by the obedience and death of his Son Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour. What life! what love! what holiness! what happiness! what glory!!!

Believers, gaze at the church of Christ, in heaven—in eternity.

Alas! how different the church erected by the Papacy—by the popes and cardinals, &c.

To present this contrast in a clear light, it will be necessary to lay down scriptural truths, that ought to be admitted by all who believe in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.

1. All men are born in a state of sin and condemnation, or, in other words, they are dead, *spiritually* and *judicially*,—destitute of spiritual life, and under the wrath of a holy God.

The following passages, I think, are sufficient to establish these principles :

Paul writes, (2 Cor. v. 14, 15,) “For the love of Christ constraineth us ; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead : and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.”

The apostle's judgment settles the following points : (1) That all men are dead ; (2) that Christ died for all men ; (3) that it is the duty of those who live by him, to live not unto themselves as heretofore, but unto him who died for them, and rose again. Can this be disputed ?

This interpretation is confirmed by what the same apostle teaches, in the *second* chapter of his epistle to the *Ephesians*. There he teaches—

1. That those who are made alive by grace, were formerly dead in trespasses and sins—enslaved by the world—by Satan—by the lusts of the flesh—by the vain desires of their unrenewed minds ; and, as a consequence, “were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.” (See vs. 1–3.)

2. That true believers owe their spiritual life—

their repentance—their faith—their conversion—their covenant relation to God—their forgiveness—their justification—their adoption into God's family—their future prospects;—all to the free, and rich, and sovereign love of God, displayed through his own Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord and Redeemer, for his own glory, in the salvation of believing sinners. No true christian, I think, will deny all included in this sentence. (See vs. 4-19.)

Our Lord himself has taught, most distinctly, the miserable condition of all impenitent, unbelieving sinners; for he says, (John iii. 36,) "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

In the light of these certain principles, let us look at the proud and arrogant *Papal* or *Romish* church. Dr. Schaff has brought forth, for our consideration, her splendid and magnificent buildings; and says, "The most magnificent and beautiful buildings of the period, are the cathedrals; those giant stone flowers, with their countless turrets, storming the heavens, and bearing the soul on high, and their mysterious devotional gloom, visited never by the light of the natural day, but only by mystic irradiations poured through stained glass; domes, the authors of which stood so completely in the *general life of the church*, and were so occupied only with the honor of God in their work, that with a divine carelessness they have left even their own name to perish in oblivion."

All imagination, as already shown; form instead of true *spiritual devotion!*

In the erections of the cathedrals, there was, we admit, a display of natural intellect,—a great exertion of bodily muscles, in the use of the hammer and

chisel, by the artist, and a vast expenditure of treasures heaped up by *Leo X.*, who, "wanting to continue the magnificent structure of St. Peter's church, begun by his predecessor Julius, but finding his coffers drained, chiefly by his own extravagance, in order to replenish them, granted, by his bull, a 'plenary indulgence,' or remission of all sins, to such as should charitably contribute to that work." (*Bower*, vol. iii. p. 259.)

Did the *general life* of the church, in the Middle Ages, I ask Dr. Schaff, consist in erecting cathedrals with stained glass, and filling them with images of saints and maddonas? What life was there in huge dead stones, on which giant flowers were wrought, by the hammer and chisel, at a vast expense of the artist's bodily muscles?—and the purchase of a plenary indulgence, or full remission of sin, for his encouragement to labor, by a *wicked pope*?

Alas! In these cathedrals and their worship I can see no spiritual life, no pure devotion, no true holiness.

Surely Prof. S. will not refer me to the mind of LEO, and bid me consider what disposed him to collect and expend such vast treasures in the erection of St. Peter's cathedral, as an evidence of a holy life! Could such a man, an *atheist*, living in debauchery, have had any regard to the honor of God? Did he manifest this, by the *impious sale* of indulgences? (See Prov. xxi. 27.)

Or will he refer me to INNOCENT XI. of the *seventeenth* century, another legitimate head of the church after the Reformation, for evidence of spiritual life?

He did some things for which I do not condemn him; for example, "he suppressed the enormous

emoluments paid to the nephews (bastards?) of dead popes or their creatures; he abolished a crowd of useless offices, and restored order to the administration of the finances, &c." I go no farther, because I am not prepared to approve of other particulars in the enumeration. But I ask for the evidence of piety in all this. Does a merchant discover piety by keeping his accounts correct? That is a proof of honesty, but not of piety. What was INNOCENT'S motive in all this financial arrangement?

De Cormenin answers the question: "When the skilful pontiff had placed things on a good footing, he resumed his plans against *Louis* the Fourteenth." (vol. ii. p. 336.)

Without the quickening grace of the Holy Spirit, no sinner can be made alive and be united to Christ; and surely no intelligent man will believe that those popes who figured away in the Reformatory councils, as Prof. Schaff calls them, and who defeated their great design of Reformation, by their cunning, breaches of *solemn promises*, and *shameful perjury*, were holy men, or were in Christ, as INNOCENT the Eleventh said of *Louis* the Great, when he wickedly addressed to him a flattering letter, to excite him to murder his best subjects, calling him, "Our dearest son in Christ."

I cannot avoid noticing JULIUS III., that infamous pontiff, the *fourth* pope after LEO X., and the *fifth* after the Reformation. He was elected A. D. 1549, and is another of the legitimate heads of the church, in Prof. Schaff's estimation.

Let our German divine and wise philosopher look at the infamous wretch, and hear him acknowledge his own vileness, and what he and the cardinals really deserved. He was one who had to do with the council of Trent, which he dreaded.

Hear what *Bower* says of him (vol. iii. p. 317): “Julius was scarce warm in the papal chair, when, to the great astonishment of all, he preferred a boy, named Innocent, to the dignity of cardinal, though he was come of the very scum of the people, and had no other employment in his family but that of his monkey-keeper. Such a promotion was looked upon by the cardinals as a gross affront offered to them. But when they complained to his holiness of his introducing so unworthy a member into the sacred college, one quite destitute of all virtue, learning, and merit, he confounded and silenced them, asking ‘what virtue or merit they had found in him that could have induced them to prefer him to the pontifical chair?’ His extraordinary and unaccountable kindness to so mean and despicable person gave just grounds to suspect, that he was kept by the holy father for other uses than that to look after his monkeys.

“Paul III. had removed the council from Trent, where the plague broke out, or was said to have broken out, to Bologna. But Julius, at the pressing instances of the emperor, ordered the fathers to return to Trent; and the council was there opened a second time on the 1st of May, 1551. But the war that was kindled in Germany the following year, between the emperor and Maurice, elector of Saxony, afforded the pope a plausible pretence for suspending it; and he suspended it accordingly, for the space of ten years. And now Julius, delivered, for the present, from the apprehensions he was under from the council, abandoned himself wholly to his diversions and pleasures, rioting and feasting in his gardens with some select friends; men of the same stamp with himself. This indolent and voluptuous life he continued to lead till

death put an end to it; which happened on the 23d of March, 1555, when he had held the see five years, one month and sixteen days. He left behind him a most infamous character, branded with the most flagrant debauchery, with the sin against nature, and blasphemy."

De Cormenin confirms the testimony of *Bower*.

He says, "In fact, during his whole reign, Julius thought more of enjoying the pontificate, than exercising it. 'At the court of his holiness,' says a grave historian, 'the days and nights were passed in feasting and saturnalia. It frequently happened that the pope, after having become intoxicated in company with his cardinals and loose women, threw off his garments, compelled his guests, male and female, to do the same; then putting on an under vest, which descended scarcely below his breast, he placed himself at the head of this strange dance, and traversed the gardens of the Vatican, singing and dancing. When the holy father was tired, he re-entered the palace to continue the orgies.' 'Well,' said he to his cardinals, 'what do you think the people would do, if in the day time, with candles in our hands, we went in this accoutrement to the field of Flora, singing obscene songs instead of hymns?' 'Stone us,' replied a cardinal. 'Then,' replied the pope, 'we owe it to our dress that we are not stoned, as we deserve to be.' Nothing can give an exact idea of the impurities committed at the court of Julius the Third; the writer adds, 'his holiness was almost always drunk, and passed his nights in orgies with courtezans and his cardinals.'" (vol. ii. pp. 217, 218.)

"Finally, he (cardinal Caraffa) added, turning towards Julius the Third, 'I appeal to the pontiff him-

self to be a judge in his own cause ; is not his minion, from his vices and ignorance, unworthy of the cardinalate ?

“ At this apostrophe the holy father could not restrain his rage, and exclaimed, ‘ By the womb of the Virgin, I swear my minion shall be cardinal. What have you to reproach him with, to refuse his admittance into your college ? His vices ! Are you not all devoured by shameful maladies, and plunged into all kinds of abominations ? Let him among you, who has not prostituted himself carnally at least once in his life, cast the first stone at him ! Ah ! you keep silence—do you admit then that we are all of us a disgrace to humanity ? Commence with me ; what great virtues, what prodigious knowledge did you encounter in me, to make me pope ? Am I not an execrable priest ? Am I not a thousand times more infamous than my minion, the keeper of monkeys, whom I corrupted ? Well then, should he be better than I, who am, thanks to you, sovereign father of the faithful ; how dare you refuse to make a cardinal and a bishop of him ?’

“ These reasons appeared so conclusive to the sacred college that all opposition ceased ; the promotion of the Ganymede passed unanimously, and on the same day his holiness sent the hat to Bologna, with a draft for twelve thousand crowns on the apostolic treasury. Innocent set out at once for Rome, where his arrival gave rise to public rejoicings, which lasted for several days. From that moment the young cardinal never left the Vatican, now passing his days in the private apartments of his holiness, extended upon soft cushions, and contemplating the antics of a favourite monkey, whilst courtezans burned soft perfumes, and

poured out enervating liquors about him ; now filling the functions of head of the church, which had been surrendered to him with the title of first minister, and dispenser of grants, benefices, and prebends." (p. 218.)

Behold the vast contrast between the church of Christ, as described by the apostles Paul and Peter in the Holy Scriptures, and

The Papal church erected by popes and cardinals, &c.

The former all life, spiritual, holy, and judicial, both in time and eternity.

The latter dead, *spiritually* and *judicially*, both here and hereafter ;—from BONIFACE III., in the early part of the *seventh* century, to the present pope, in the *nineteenth* century :—for it is impossible that a pontiff who has usurped the prerogatives and rights of the Lord of glory, Jehovah Jesus, and dares to set aside his laws, and pretends to forgive sins, and holds himself up as an object of worship, and receives the adoration of cardinals and others, should have a spark of spiritual life.

The apostle Paul has pronounced their doom : " Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God ? Be not deceived : neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." (See 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.)

Peter too has pronounced their doom : " But there were false prophets also among the people, *even* as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves

swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not. For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; and spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly." (See 1 Peter ii. 1-6.)

Professor Schaff should abandon his vain attempts to infuse life into the papal church by talking of her stately cathedrals—her turrets storming the heavens—her stained glass—her mysterious devotional gloom—her saints and Madonnas.

By artful descriptions, prompted by a morbid imagination, he cannot infuse life into *dead* stones. Nor can he, by any contrivance, quicken into *spiritual life* dead souls; such as the souls of popes and cardinals have always been during the Middle Ages, so highly lauded by him. Equally impossible for him is it to turn idolators into worshippers of a holy God, who requires to be worshipped in spirit and in truth. Nor can he change *debauchees*, such as filled the papal court during those ages, on which he delights to dwell, into men of *piety* and *chastity*, who loved to honor God.

Such was "the general life of the church" during the middle ages,—wicked, impious, impure, debauched

in the extreme! And was it possible for any artists to stand "so completely in the general life of the church, and yet be so occupied only with the honor of God in their work, that with a divine carelessness, &c." Impossible!

Such praise we have shown to be false,—the fruit of a vain imagination!

Ah! had Professor Schaff felt as he ought to have felt toward a pure and holy God, how differently would he have written from what we took from his "Principle of Protestantism," as the foundation of our Contrast!

It would, I believe, do him no harm, were he to put this question to himself, Is there no danger of my being found among the false prophets of whom Peter speaks, and of being involved in their just doom?

Before I close, I may be permitted to address a word of exhortation to the ministers and elders of the German Reformed Church, who have followed the Professors in their erratic and dangerous course.

You know the very solemn profession of faith in the Heidelberg Catechism you made, when you were inducted into your respective offices; and the sacred pledges you gave to the church, to maintain that faith, demanded from every minister and elder by her Constitution.

Should you not recall your confession of faith and solemn promises of fidelity to the church, and placing yourselves in the presence of a heart-searching God, inquire, have I fulfilled my promise, and kept my oath? They are recorded on high.

Allow me to exhort you to meditate on, and pray over, those remarkable words addressed by Paul to the Galatians:

“I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel :

“Which is not another ; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.

“But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

“As we have said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that which ye have received, let him be accursed, &c.” (See Gal. i. 6–12.)

Oh ! how infinitely important it is for *you* and *me* to build our hopes for eternity on the rock of ages, and not on a sandy foundation !

I would not exchange the foundation on which my hopes for eternity have been resting, more than sixty years, for that recommended by your deluded professors, for *ten thousand worlds* !

Papists talk of the merit of good works ! Good works performed by sinful mortals, unenlightened and unrenewed by the Holy Spirit ! Oh ! what a delusion of Satan to ruin the souls of men !

Judged by the perfect law of God, I confess that I have no merit at all ; and therefore, I rely, for acceptance with God, and for salvation, *simply* and *entirely* on the finished righteousness and all-sufficient atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ, regarding my own righteousness, in the matter of justification before God, as *utterly unworthy of notice* !

I know what Paul has written (Heb. vi. 10) : “For God is not unrighteous, to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have showed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do

minister." I know that the blessed Redeemer, in infinite condescension, identifies himself with his saints, and that he will, in the day of judgment, say, in reply to their inquiry; "Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." (Matt. xxv. 40.) Nor have I forgotten that it is written (Dan. xii. 3): "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever." But I cannot forget the true connexion between our imperfect works and the reward which God is graciously pleased to confer on us for them; that it is all of grace, and not at all of merit.

Our salvation is all of grace, from beginning to end, as we are clearly taught *in the Scriptures*. (See Rom. iii. 20-28, v. 20-21.)

I regard my salvation as the effect of God's rich and sovereign grace, and therefore, I do now, and will forever hereafter, ascribe it to PURE GRACE.

And yet I may, with all humility, to the praise of the same grace, say, that since the year 1802, a painful doubt of my being in a state of acceptance with God has not crossed my mind. All this time I have, through God's good pleasure, enjoyed sweet peace and undisturbed tranquility; for which I ought to be very thankful.

But let me add, I have been careful to guard against *self-deception*; and for this purpose, I have examined myself, not only before each communion season, but hundreds of times besides, and almost every week. To God be all the glory. Amen.

And here, were space left, I should like to address my country, and show, from the facts of our past his-

tory, and from the language of prophecy, why I entertain the *hope* that God designs to purify His church in these U. S. A., and, by reviving pure and undefiled religion throughout our extended States, to prepare our country for being used, in his hands, as an instrument of great good to the *world*—for spreading the gospel and its civilizing influence, and happy and beneficent results on human society over the four quarters of our globe.

But I must content myself, at present, with this hint.

To what I have written I wish to make two additions.

The first is, that I might here unfold my views of the operations of the *sixth vial*, which I believe to be pouring out, as to its effects on Turkey, as well as to its effects on the papal hierarchy. But this would enlarge the present volume beyond my design. My intention being to reserve this for a subsequent publication, if it shall please God to prolong my life, and continue my intellectual faculties long enough to prepare the work. I, therefore, for the present, content myself with this remark as to Papal Rome, That she is mustering her forces from the *whole world*, to bring on that terrible conflict that is to take place in *Palestine*, denominated, “The battle of that great day of GOD ALMIGHTY,” that which will produce such a destruction of human beings, and result in the conversion of the Jews to the Christian faith, and their final establishment in the land of promise.

The other addition is, that having read over again Article VI.—*History of the Apostolic Church, &c.*, by

Philip Schaff, &c., in the *Princeton Review*, p. 148, Jan. 1854, if I understand the writer of the article, he has proved Dr. Schaff to be standing on Pantheistic ground.

David N. Lord, Editor of the THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL, in No. XXIV., April, 1854, has, in a clear and forcible manner, shown that Schaff, with all his evasions, occupies the ground of *Pantheists*.

If he be a *Pantheist*, he cannot, in my judgment, possibly, by any contrivance, reconcile such a character with the profession he made when he arrived in this country, and presented himself before the Synod of the German Reformed Church, that met at Allentown, Lehigh County, Pa., that he was a Protestant of the Reformed Church in Prussia, and by the report, signed by Dr. Nevin, was ready to adopt the *Heidelberg Catechism*, and to conform to the Constitution and order of the same church as established in this country. See p. 26, Minutes of 1844.

As reference is made to "Hope for the Jews," in our discussion, notices of it by the press will very properly be here published.

From the Albany Argus, March 23, 1854.

“HOPE FOR THE JEWS.”

By J. J. JANEWAY, D. D.

The venerable Dr. Janeway, now bordering upon eighty years of age, has in this little volume discussed a great subject, with great care and ability. He maintains that the Jews are not only to be converted to the Christian faith, but to return to the land of their fathers, and to be re-organized in a distinct, national capacity! The work shows a familiar and profound acquaintance with prophecy; and is so clear, consecutive and earnest, that it cannot fail to be read very extensively and with great profit. It is surely the production of a mind whose faculties have not yet begun to wane. W.

From the Christian Intelligencer, March 30, 1854.

“HOPE FOR THE JEWS.” By J. J. JANEWAY, D. D. A 12mo. volume of nearly 250 pages. Published by J. Terhune & Son, New-Brunswick, N. J.

Some time since we referred to an ingenious little work of the Rev. Mr. Williamson, of Chester, N. J., the leading object of which was to show that the Jews as a distinct people are cast off, and no more to expect a national existence.

In the work before us, the venerable Dr. Janeway, in a spirit of deep earnestness, and with sound research, controverts, as we believe with entire success, Mr. Williamson's theory. He at the same time, takes occasion to go into an ample discussion of the covenant relation, actual condition, and future prospects of the Jewish people. The object of Dr. Janeway's work is to prove the perpetuity of the Abrahamic covenant, and that the Jews will be converted to the faith of Christ, and settled and reorganized as a nation in the land of Palestine. The subject is practical in its bearing, and the discussion of it is lucid, able, and interesting, and such as will well repay a careful perusal.

K.