

no 23

W. L. M'CALLA'S

DEFENCE

OF HIS

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTION

ADVERSE TO

Clerical Titles

OF

DISTINCTION,

OFFERED TO THE SYNOD OF PHILADELPHIA.

PHILADELPHIA:

WILLIAM S. YOUNG, PRINTER, 50 N. SIXTH ST.

1853.

same of the rest of letters
in this address would be
worthy of a Swift an
Address ——— A C

W. L. M'Calla's Defence

OF HIS

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTION

ADVERSED TO

CLERICAL TITLES

OF

DISTINCTION,

OFFERED TO THE SYNOD OF PHILADELPHIA.

PHILADELPHIA:

WILLIAM S. YOUNG, PRINTER, 59 NORTH SIXTH ST.

1853.

REMARKS

PRELIMINARY TO OFFERING THE MOTION AGAINST

THE CLERICAL DOCTORATE.

MR. MODERATOR,

It is believed to be consistent with order and usage, when offering an orderly motion, to make a few preliminary remarks relating to the subject. Mine shall not be unduly protracted. They are intended to secure a second, a hearing, and a place on your records. Those records show that a motion accusing me of a false pretence secured a second, a hearing, a decision, and a place on the records, without the accused being heard, or the document read upon which the decision was based. My motion contemplates the same imputation of false pretence, among other objections brought against the highest institution of the church. I ask not the least advantage over the multitude of my opposers, but desire them to be heard, and the document to be heard, upon which, in part, the objections are founded.

My motion is in favour of the gospel ministry; and against what claims to be a promotion to a higher clerical degree than that of the ministry. If my motion should transpose these two degrees, and say of one what it has said of the other, such a motion would claim a hearing and record as the ground of

charges which would justly depose and excommunicate the mover. Why is it innocent to reprobate the *gradum amplissimum*, the most noble order, in a manner which would amount to infidel profanity, slander and falsehood, if used against the lower order? I ask leave to exhibit to you such an enigma. The God of truth and honesty, and the candour of the church and nation call upon you for an explanation. If I had it I would give it.

The time was when this subject divided our church courts into parties. This is no longer so. The late action of our presbytery is a significant intimation that the doctoral deluge has covered the mountains. Who is now consumed by the zeal of God's house? Its most important interests are merged in devotion to honorary distinction. What I ask, therefore, is not the favour dispensed to a member of a party, but the justice and equity due to a member of the house. If these are accorded, all impartial judges may see which paper is blotted with the guilt of false pretences, the one which is honourably produced and read, or the one which is condemned without being read. If we be true ministers of Jesus, nothing can be more worthy of our attention than the removal of an imposture which defiles our records, and which, while serving the father of lies, profanely invokes "*salutem et pacem in Domino.*"

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTION

On Clerical Titles of Distinction.

MOVED BY W. L. McCALLA,

BEFORE THE SYNOD OF PHILADELPHIA.

For the reasons contained in this preamble, it is proposed to pass the appended resolution, adverse to clerical titles of distinction; as the inspiration and obligation of the authority given is admitted, and its application not seriously denied.

1. It is conceded that it is lawful, honourable, and commendable, for clergymen to labour after all attainable superiority in learning, theology, piety, and usefulness.

2. It is not denied that some men of high attainments in literature and theology, piety and usefulness, have worn titles of distinction, honorary, literary, theological, prelatial, and political, with silent patience.

3. It is believed that the number and eminence of those who have borne these titles, whether with pride or patience, are far exceeded by the number and eminence of those who have not received them.

4. The titles of doctor, prelate, and pope are prohibited by the letter and spirit of God's holy word, our "rule of faith and life."

5. As now used, these titles are a slander upon the divinely appointed, superior office of the gospel ministry, over which they aim to be a *promotion* to an *amplissimum gradum*, and, of course, a more noble order.

6. These titles are not what they aim to be; but are without any proper substratum; and are, therefore, like the high-sounding titles of Odd-Fellowship, among the (to use not my own word, but the word of archiepiscopal and doctoral authority, as we will show,) *humbugs* or false-pretences of the day; and are, on that account, unworthy of the true dignity and candour, simplicity, sincerity and purity of Christianity, protestantism and presbyterianism.

7. The sophisms used in favour of these titles are unscriptural, untrue, and contradictory.

8. The truth and importance of the foregoing positions, in regard to confirmation and refutation, will appear still more plainly, from reading and weighing the diploma itself.

Therefore, Resolved that the clerical doctorate be considered a calamity and an evil; as it is considered by the Presbyterian, and by our Saviour in Matt. xxiii. 6—10.

MR. McCALLA'S DEFENCE

OF HIS

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTION ADVERSE TO CLERICAL TITLES OF DISTINCTION.

Mr. Moderator:—In the memory of our aged ministers the question of the doctorate has been frequently agitated in Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies. I am not aware that I ever participated in any of those discussions; so that, instead of being pragmatically forward on this disagreeable subject, I put in an humble claim to forbearance and patience, in waiting so long for my turn to speak.

My tardiness may, in part, be owing to the difficulties which encumber all attempts at reformation; especially in the clergy. The feeling is that we are the great sons of the grand reformation; and it is a settled matter that we are reformed enough already. If the mere name of reformation will make us faultless, then the man of sin is perfect too. The canons of Trent cover many pages "*de reformatione*," professing to set their own clergy to rights. As the views of Christ and Antichrist differ on our subject, the Council have one chapter favourable to "honorary titles or particular privileges." Now if we lust after Popish privilege, and slip a chapter of Tridentine title into our Presbyterian parity, we partake of their guilt, and should share in their reproof.

Infallibility is no more an attribute of Protestants than of Popes; of preachers than of princes. Magnificent as the temple of Solomon was, it fell into decay, and needed repairs: and they are unwise architects or mariners who grudge the time, labour and money required in repairs. The best ships may spring a leak, and they who refuse to repair in port, may have to pump at sea, and perish miserably with company, crew and cargo. Clergymen are as liable to corruption as the laity. As they take the lead in reformation, so they are the first to become proud and ambitious, cold, selfish and treacherous. Shall not the declensions of Christendom be resisted, because clergymen are the guilty authors? If they are faith-

ful, they spend their life and labour in opposing the sins of others; and if they adopt and propagate those sins, shall they be cut off from reproof and warning, argument and entreaty?

This duty, however, can never be performed to them, in important matters, without danger of an ungracious requital. A member of the lower house who questions the validity of that promotion which titles give, may be deprived of a hearing, or be punished with a disrespectful hearing. This will appear not only an unjust but an impolitic course, to all men, whose holy regard to divine authority is accompanied by a cool and sound judgment. Why did the Lord Bishop of Jersey and his adherents refuse, for years, to hear even his titled accusers? Because they knew that he had violated the laws of Christ. Yet not one of his delinquencies was forbidden so expressly, unequivocally and emphatically as the doctorate.

If they have never read this prohibition, or not understood it when read, how can they be "*versatissimi*, most skilled in the sacred scriptures," as their degree certifies, and what will men think of their shrinking, like the pope or the prelate, from a fair investigation of their claim? If Christ has spoken, we have a right to ask why he is not obeyed.

1. It is conceded that it is lawful, honourable and commendable for clergymen to labour after all attainable superiority in learning, theology, piety and usefulness.

That clerical titles gain nothing by this concession is plain from the fact that they were not worn by the apostles, martyrs, reformers, and the great body of God's best servants, who have made the greatest proficiency in these valuable attainments, while the great body of their possessors make little or no proficiency in them.

2. It is not denied that some men of high attainments in literature and theology, piety and usefulness, have worn titles of distinction, honorary, literary, theological, prelatial, and political, with silent patience.

This should satisfy all concerned, that I am not engaged in the unprofitable and ungracious task of wounding the innocent, nor of wantonly wounding the guilty. Some persons present may recognise an allusion here to the Presbyterian, (of August 20th, 1853,) a paragraph of which reads as follows, namely, "We understand that the Rev. Stuart Robinson of Baltimore, declines the D.D. conferred on him by Centre College. Mr. Robinson would have acted more in

accordance with our notions of his usual good judgment, if he had done as so many others of his brethren have done, just submitted quietly to the calamity. The less said about some things the better." This usual argument for titles seems to work the other way. It is quite a left-handed proof of their lawfulness or value to say, that with a judicious quietness and silence, great and good men have borne them as a calamity.

3. It is believed that the number and eminence of those who have borne these titles, whether with pride or patience, are far exceeded by the number and eminence of those who have not received them.

Were the Jewish doctors as eminent as the apostles? Are the Antichristian doctors as eminent as the martyrs whom they murdered? Are they as eminent as the reformers and confessors whom they desired to murder? The judgment of the English Newton and Scott refused to submit quietly and silently to this calamity: were they inferior to neighbouring butterflies, who gladly received it, and sported it gaily? Dr. Miller speaks of Whitefield and our apostolical Tennents, of Dickinson and Davies, Burr and Edwards, "and a long catalogue of similar men," to whom a doctorate was never offered; and then complains that it is lavished with an amazing frequency, "on juvenility, on ignorance, and on weakness." I need hardly ask which of those catalogues is the most eminent.

4. The titles of doctor, prelate and pope, are prohibited by the letter and spirit of God's holy word, "our rule of faith and life."

The spirit of Christinnity was exhibited by Paul and his brethren when they spoke and acted "in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom." Dr. Miller's testimony shows that the spirit of the doctorate is more conformable to that of Paganism; which has an *esoteric* for the initiated, and an *exoteric* for the ignorant multitude. The *exoteric* of the doctorate represents the bearer as a gentleman of literary and theological attainments of a high order: the *esoteric* certifies to his ignorance and weakness. The one would make him a wise man with a sheep-skin: the other makes him a wisacre with an ass's head; a title given to some of the fathers in Martin Luther's table-talk. This is exactly like the "fleshly wisdom" of Pagan philosophy, with its political mythology; but very far from Paul's "simplicity and godly sincerity."

It was long ago that Dr. Miller told the world that this honour was lavished upon ignorance and weakness. For one titled ignoramus of that day, there are ten now; so that we may declare more emphatically than he could, that it is empty praise. This is what Paul called "vain glory," of which he was not "desirous;" though he foretells perilous times, when "men shall be lovers of their own selves" and "boasters," that is, self-conceited and arrogant. This is the very spirit of the doctorate among Jews and Gentiles, ancient and modern. Notwithstanding some honourable exceptions, they have, in all ages, loved "the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, (or forums or chief places of concourse,) and to be called of men, doctor, doctor."

This exposure of the spirit of the Doctorate is immediately followed by a literal prohibition of the titles Rabbi or Doctor, Master or Lord, Father or Pope, in the sense attached to the words by Papists and Protestants. "But be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your 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."

Can language more plainly convey the sentiment that the wearing of the titles, Pope, Prelate, and Doctor, is a self-exaltation, and that Christian humility requires their repudiation? Are murder, adultery, and theft forbidden more plainly in the decalogue than the Papacy, Prelacy, and Doctorate are forbidden here? The examination of these several titles confirms this conclusion concerning each of them. They are all claimed by Christ as his peculiar property; and Rome's usurpation of them is one proof of her Antichristian character.

This is proved more clearly from her own Greek and Latin translations, than from our English, with which she finds so much fault. The Pope claims to be the father of the Christian church or dispensation. The Christian church or dispensation is denoted in their Latin Vulgate, published by order of Sixtus V., by such expressions as *seculum superveniens*, *seculum venturum*, *futurum seculum*. On that account *Pater futuri seculi* is a more perfect description of the title Pope than even *Vicarius Filii Dei*. Now, God has so

ordered that this remarkable title *Pater futuri seculi* is given not to a mere man, but to Christ, "the Mighty God," in the Latin Vulgate of Isaiah, where we call him "the everlasting Father." With this agrees exactly the Septuagint of Aldus, published from manuscripts, in 1518, at Venice, and dedicated to a most reverend Cardinal and Legate *de latere* of the Apostolic See. It calls Christ "PATER TOU MELLONTOS AIONOS: the Father (or Pope) of the future world or age;" that is, of the Christian church or dispensation. In our Saviour's discourse, quoted above, he claimed this title along with Prelate and Doctor to himself alone; and instead of making Peter a Pope (or father of the church,) and James a Prelate, and John a Doctor, he placed all the apostles upon an equality, and prohibited them and all men from usurping or receiving either of the three titles.

5. As now used, they are a slander upon the divinely appointed superior office of the gospel ministry, over which they aim to be a *promotion* to an *amplissimum gradum*, and, of course, a more noble order.

Although the title is forbidden of God, and hurtful to man, it is not denied that it gives the possessor a power and influence which his untitled neighbours of superior merit do not attain. It is on this account that many a weakling is doctorated through the management of partial friends who wish to give him a lift. But this lift is at the expense of the ministerial office, which is degraded by a prohibited imposture; and it rests upon popular ignorance, which is increased by those who ought to remove it.

This conclusion cannot be escaped by facetiously representing the doctorate as a calamity so defiled by juvenility, ignorance and weakness, that it is now too unseemly to be mentioned in decent company. Defiled as Cleopatra was, Mark Antony loved her to the last. Our Egyptian queen is still the darling of our clerical Antonies, whether they be juveniles in weakness, or Samsons in strength. But Samson also had his love, and the loss of his honour, his eyes, and his life, showed that he loved her too long.

Attachment to these Romish goat-skins is among the dregs of Popery, which are still found in some otherwise good protestants. A striking fact on this subject was given me some forty years ago, by Samuel J. Mills, a blessed philanthropist, of colonization memory. On his first journey through the West, he showed me the constitution of the Andover Seminary. It had two provisions which have never been

blotted from my memory. In their character, the one was Christian, and the other Antichristian. As faithfully as the synod of Dort, the Christian article precluded from the professorships all Arminianism, and every other heresy. The other article made the doctorate indispensable to a professorship. Puritanical Samsons bound these provisions upon them with solemn religious obligations. They then enjoyed their eyes, but were feasting them upon the beauties of Delilah. Being now blind, they faithfully maintain the superiority of the doctorate to the ministry, while they perfidiously embrace those heresies which they abjured.

But the vainglorious, self-conceited, arrogant spirit of this forbidden badge of superiority, naturally works that way. The divinely appointed office of the ministry, which should follow piety, study, examination and trials, must play second fiddle to an empty plaything, which is often conferred upon a sciolist, not on account of any sort of merit, but through the potent smiles of some female friend. As this is the most innocent and inoffensive source of this high literary distinction, I will confine myself to it in a brief illustration of the Andover constitution.

A juvenile had the happiness of furnishing his old president with a second wife of fine accomplishments. She felt grateful to her young patron, and got her husband to reward him with a doctorate.

An ignoramus let a president choose a wife for him. In this case the grateful wife claims from her presidential patron a taste of fuss and feathers, for her new husband. A doctorate was cheap and was easily obtained.

A weakling was fast losing caste, and to keep him from losing place, a couple of professing ladies got their wealthy, mercantile, non-professing brother, to procure for him a doctorate from a distant college.

Before obtaining their titles the first of these gentlemen was only a fox, the second a goose, and the third a bear. But the constitution of Andover would allow three professorships to be distributed among them. Whitefield and Davies were the greatest pulpit orators of their day; but as they had only the inferior office of the ministry, they were not fit to teach pulpit eloquence in Andover: this burden must devolve upon the titled young fox. Dickinson, with all his orthodoxy and acumen, could not sit in their theological chair: this incubation must be assigned to the titled goose. Edwards, the Newton of intellectual philosophy,

could not teach moral science there. The *ursus major* must suck his paw in that chair.

We may be told that instead of enforcing the demands of the Andover constitution among us, the doctorate is now considered a calamity. But why is it that the poor suffering victims are so judiciously quiet and patient under this calamity? Because they know that what is written, constitutional law in Andover, is unwritten common law almost every where else. I will not say that a person ignorant of this must be verdant, but I can claim a fair advantage over him in a knowledge of the church and the world. I have not lived in the seclusion of a clerical band-box; and wherever I have been, the Protestant clergy have aided the Popish, in putting upon the community a spell of mediæval darkness on this subject. As the Papists consider the deified wafer infinitely above Christ's own elements of commemoration, so they and the Protestants place the Antichristian doctorate far above Christ's own ministry. When the Pope is inaugurated into his Antichristian fatherhood, his attendants place his feet upon the altar, which was a type of Christ: so men place the feet of the Antichristian doctorate upon the ministry of Christ's appointment.

The more closely this is scrutinized, the more flagrant will it appear, as in the examination of a diploma under the eighth item. There a man whom Christ has appointed as a religious doctor or teacher, is taken in hands "*PROMOVERI—to be promoted*" "*AD AMPLISSIMUM DOCTORIS GRADUM—to the highest order of doctor or teacher:*" thus impiously and presumptuously placing a human imposture above a divine institution.

You need not be told that a preference of human to divine institutions is characteristic of the Jewish and Popish apostacies; but it is possible that Christianity, Protestantism, and Presbyterianism, present a greater contrast to them on the subject of the doctorate than you have been in the habit of observing. After Christ prohibited this honorary title, let me ask you which one of all his apostles, or their Christian successors, was judicious and patient enough to wear it? Can you trace it farther up toward the apostles than the Antichristian apostacy? This shows that when it is treated according to its real merits it is trampled down by biblical and historical Christianity.

In the sixteenth century it was an article of commerce in Rome, like every thing else; and Frederic had to pay the

cash for Luther's doctorate, although it was professedly conferred upon merit, displayed in services rendered. But as this took place before he dreamed of a reformation, this merit and these services were Popish, like those of Henry VIII., when he received his title of Defender of the Faith. Moreover, the doctorate was conferred by the peremptory order of the Vicar-General; and Luther received it with the implicit obedience of a slave, contrary to his own opinion and desire; and when he became an enlightened Christian they took it away, with his hearty approbation; and being a Protestant, neither he nor his Protestant friends had it renewed.

Papists never flattered Calvin with such a title, and Protestants never degraded him with it. So it was with his disciple, John Knox, and his followers, those true Protestants and Presbyterians with whom we claim affinity. We do not deny that their children called them *father*, *papa*, or *pope*, as Peter's children did him, and as Paul's spiritual children did him. Neither do we deny that among them pupils called their teachers *masters*, and even *doctors*; *doctor* being the Latin of *teacher*; and be it remembered that for ten of the best years of their lives, Melville's students spoke Latin as we do English; and they knew that in pure Latin, *doctor* meant a school-master.

In 2 Tim. i. 11, the word *magister*, in the Latin Vulgate, is rendered *teacher* in the Douay Bible: and the same thing is true of the word *doctor* in 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Eph. iv. 11; 1 Tim. i. 7—thus showing that among Papists and Protestants, these words which Christ has prohibited as honorary titles, may be innocently used as ordinary appellatives. But then they designate a reality—a useful reality—though inferior, instead of superior, to the gospel ministry. This may be seen in the fifth chapter of Andrew Melville's Second Book of Discipline, which makes Doctor of Divinity a designation of school-masters, whose business it was to be literal *teachers of divinity* in the Bible and in the catechism, “without such application as the ministers use.” Modern Protestants and Presbyterians have left this Protestant Presbyterian ground for that of Popery and Judaism.

6. These titles are not what they aim to be; but are without any proper substratum; and are, therefore, like the high-sounding titles of Odd-Fellowship, among (to use not my own word, but the word of Archi-episcopal and doctoral authority, as we will show,) the *humbugs*, or false-pretences of the day; and are, on that account, unworthy of the true

dignity and candour, simplicity, sincerity and purity of Christianity, Protestantism, and Presbyterianism.

To our promoted superiors I would say, "Where is your foundation? Is it in Christ?" "No; the inferior office is from him." "Is it in a presbytery of competent judges?" "No; but a board of incompetent judges." "Is it after examination?" "No." "Is it on account of genius and acquirements, labours and merit?" "No, for the great body of these remain untitled, while the degree is lavished "on juvenility, on ignorance, and on weakness." "

Its pretensions are as groundless as those of the relic lately sent by Pope Pius IX. to the Duke of Brabant, as a part of the manger in which Christ was cradled. On this imposture the "Presbyterian" of last week, (October 1, 1853,) speaks as follows: "Will the Pope never cease to humbug the public? If he did not know that this wood was not a piece of the cradle of our Saviour, what a dolt must be this head of the church! If he did know it, and still represented it to be what he knew it was not, then what shall we say of him?"

Now, let us be impartial in this matter. The Pope claims the forbidden paternity, and the Protestants claim the forbidden doctorate. Genuine Popery is a religion of lies: genuine Protestantism abhors deceit. The Pope rewards villainy with chips from the cradle or the cross: the Protestants distribute skins which turn ignorance and weakness into talents of the highest order. If the Pope believes his cradles and crosses to be genuine, I agree that he is a dolt: but are the doctors any better if they confide in diplomatic fables? And what difference is there between them, if they impose their humbugs of wood and skin upon the community, knowing that their pretensions are like the baseless fabric of a vision?

There is more or less foundation for a license to practise law, or the title of M. D. The candidate is examined, and a judgment passed upon his merits. But there is no more substratum, proper to a D. D., than there is for the universe of German Idealism; which some scholar has fitly described in the language of the schoolmen, as "*Chimera bombinans in vacuo*—an idle fancy fiddling in empty space."

There is actually less foundation for the doctorate than for the Papacy; for the council of cardinals see and know the Pope, and pay an ostensible regard, (and Martin Van Buren says they pay a real regard) to his merit.

The same thing may be said of the vastly higher titles

given to Free Masons and Odd-Fellows. In the company of a dozen clergymen, a distinguished D. D. declared to me that there were some parts of scripture which none but a Free Mason could understand. Then, of course, well educated D. D's., out of the lodge, cannot understand those Scriptures which an uneducated Infidel, in the lodge, can understand. Then, his titles of Master and Royal, and Arch and Knight, must give him a literary and theological distinction, which soars above the D. D. by several important degrees, without insisting upon the forty-five degrees of the Masonic *Illuminati* of the last century.

As we have coloured doctors and coloured Masons, and the degrees of the latter are conferred upon merit after examination, their rising titles have a better foundation for superiority over the doctorates of Andover, than those doctorates have to superiority over their untitled brethren, whether those brethren be the apostolical Tennents, of Pennsylvania, or Uncle Jack, of Virginia. To our coloured D. D's. of New York and elsewhere, I would say, "Brethren, your titles have no proper foundation in Scripture or any where; but are, like the titles of Masonry, and like the Papacy and the German philosophy, an arrant humbug; depending for every grain of its value upon the ignorance of that community which you ought to enlighten."

But since the abduction of Morgan, Masonry has so declined, that it threatens to leave the world in irremediable ignorance of the Scriptures: and Odd-Fellowship, which is superseding it, rises still higher in its grandiloquent titles and claims of honorary distinction. Under the apparent impression that the D. D's., and Royal Arches and Knights, are not grand and noble enough, they begin above them all, and rise upon the ascending degrees of Noble Grand, Past Grand, Grand Sire, Worshipful Grand Sentinel, Right Worshipful Grand Representative, Most Worshipful Chaplain, and Most Excellent Grand High Priest; to which they or some other society may add Horses and Chariots of Fire, Principalities and Powers, Yankee-Doodle, and St. Patrick's Day in the Morning.

Now begin with the D. D., which is ignorant of the Bible, and step upward through the degrees of Masonry, white and black, and continue rising through the improving degrees of Odd-fellowship, and say, whether each step, by which you scale the Empyrean, is not as truly connected with increasing merit, as the D. D. is connected with increasing merit over

the untitled Christian ministry. You answer, Yes; because you know that it has no more substratum than a Kantein "chimera humming in vacuity:" that is, you know it to be a pious fraud, a humbug which has no substance, and which is as plainly forbidden by the great Head of the church, as the title of the Pope himself. It finds the subjects upon which it is lavished, ignorant and weak, and leaves them weak and ignorant. The standing which they gain by it is wholly and solely artificial, and, therefore, a moral wrong inflicted upon the ignorant multitude for the profit of the favoured few.

When exposing Popery, Dr. Dowling very justly anathematizes what he calls "the endless frauds of those odious impostors, who were so far destitute of all principle, as to enrich themselves by the ignorance and errors of the people." Instead of removing that ignorance, they multiplied religious humbugs which fed and increased and continued it. This is a policy which may do well for Rome; but it is utterly unworthy of the dignity, candour, and purity of Christianity, Protestantism, and Presbyterianism.

These are subjects, however, about which different men entertain different views, and sometimes the same men are found to change their views with a change of circumstances. Prelatical promotion will generally convert a low-churchman; a pension will generally convert a patriot, and a patent of nobility will generally convert a plebeian. No assignable amount of intellectual grandeur can insure a man from the dominion of that moral imbecility which he inherits from fallen Adam. If, after the destruction of the brazen idol, God had left Hezekiah to himself, he would have gathered up the flings, and re-established the worship.

This is exactly what God permitted Dr. Cox to do. He rashly pitched his humbug title into the gutter, as contemptuously as Hezekiah threw the false god into the brook. After reflection, he judiciously, quietly, and silently hooked it out of the gutter, and, without any cleansing operation, adorned his illustrious neck with what he called "the semi-lunar fardel:" dripping with the dirt of his own denunciations.

The other day a clergyman of one of our Presbyterian denominations, declared that the somerset turned by our own favourite Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, was precisely parallel to that of Dr. Cox. My answer was, "You astonish me, Sir; for

I thought that I was the only man in the Union who remembered that fact."

When the high officers surrender, the ranks are conquered. It was upon this ground that the gentleman with whom I was conversing, told me that he had silently received a doctorate himself, although he could conscientiously endorse every proposition of my bill now under discussion. Resistance had been put down by the very leaders of that resistance, and, therefore, "*sauve qui peut*," was all that remained.

The next day a new case occurred in the following paper, viz.: "The degree of D. D. has been conferred on W. L. McCalla, by authority of ———." The two D. D's., who handed me the paper were the authority which I have here suppressed. They stand high in the ecclesiastical literature of our denomination. My Latin diploma is the second one that I have seen. It is a rhyme-and-metre version of the first, which I hope to give you in my eighth item. As the title is from Rome, so the voucher of it resembles some of the prayers to the virgin, recorded in the Breviary. It occupies only three verses of three lines each, as follows:—

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Diotrephes Præminens
Dotibus mentis Excellens,
Pietate Præcellens; | 2. Artibus Peritissimus,
Scripturis Versatissimus,
Illi Gradus Amplissimus |
| 3. Datur; et nos nominamus
Eum Doctorem. Judicamus;
Quare sic Renunciamus. | |

Although I had the honour of being called doctor in the late presbytery, they would not record my preamble and resolution. The only reason given was that the language was exceptionable; and the only thing exceptionable in the language was the word *kumbag*, in the item now under consideration. In a civil court or legislature, such a constructive indecorum would not be noticed, or if noticed, would only excite a smile. Such a parliamentary code would aid the Papists in their war against the Greek scriptures, upon the ground that they are not classical Greek, but marked with the barbarisms of the Hebrew idiom.

This sort of criticism is exactly to the taste of Mr. Hughes, our would-be Cardinal. His objection to meeting me again, after our debate in Zane street, was on account of my language. In an important authority he said that I had made a mistake. His witty manner convulsed the house with laughter. At that time Sam Patch was more famous among

us than half the saints in the calendar; and a great deal more of a saint than some of them. "There's no mistake," was an expression which he repeated much more frequently than the apostle's creed. After I had successfully established my position to the confounding and silencing of my adversary, I answered his defeated wit by saying, "So *there's no mistake*, as Sam Patch says." This quotation from the tutelary saint of the cataracts, he gave as a reason which utterly disqualified me for the honour of giving his lordship another beating.

His stand would have been more plausible, if I had used the word *humbug*. Although this is now used in the senate and the forum, in the pulpit and the press, Webster says that when he wrote, it was a low word. Yet, if you will look into a late number of the *Freeman's Journal*, which this extremely sensitive archbishop controls and reads without a qualm, you will find that in the space of a very few lines he asserts a universal *tendency to humbug*, the universal *impress of humbug*, and the universal *prevalence of humbug*; and the article which contains these assertions you will find to be a genuine specimen of *humbug*.

You all believe that Dr. Engles is one of the most polished editors in the Union, and none of you believe that the accession of Dr. Leyburn has made the "Presbyterian" unworthy to be printed or read; yet no longer ago than last week that paper asks its readers, "Will the Pope never cease to *humbug* the public?"

Would you say that the life of Bunyan, written by Southey, the refined poet laureate of England, was not fit for decent society, simply, because he filled a low place with a low word? He said that there was only one word in the English language, to describe his hero before conversion; and that was the word *blackguard*. This word was introduced into his writing by the same pressure which has brought *humbug* into mine. From all that I have ever written from youth to age, I have excluded this word, until I came to write of the doctorate among Protestants, with all their loud professions of honour and honesty, and detestation of imposture and pious fraud.

The guilt of such things among the benighted Greek and Latin churches is a mere trifle in comparison with the guilt of deception among enlightened Protestants, and especially Protestant clergymen, whose business it is to guard the people from imposition. If there is a low word in the language,

such an offence calls for it: for of all the low things in this lower world, Protestant clerical humbugs are the lowest.

When the Roman see forged the pretended decretals of Constantine, giving "to the chair of St. Peter all the imperial dignity, glory and power," it was in the midnight of the world, while the priesthood were ignorant of the Bible, and "the emperors and the Romans were incapable of discerning a forgery that subverted their rights and freedom."

While Protestantism professes to penetrate this gloom of the grave with light, liberty and religion, what can you say of the shameless infliction of a severe and degrading practical hoax upon the community, founded upon a forged decretal, professing to be based upon competent authority and supported by competent evidence, creating an order of nobility, claiming a lofty pre-eminence over their untitled brethren, when they know that it is as arrant a humbug as those decretals upon which the Pope claims his present power, and has claimed it for ages?

Because Wicliffe exposed these false decretals, the famous council of Constance had his bones exhumed and burnt. When a Roman patriot, Laurentius Valla, took the same ground, he stood alone, as I here stand alone against the Protestant imposture. Though the Papists still enjoy the profits of the fraud, all their historians agree that Valla was right: so, although our nobility still claim the honour and promotion and distinction obtained by their Protestant decretals, they confess that I am right, and only complain that I am twenty years too soon in attempting to beard the lion.

Urge religion upon a young sinner, and it is twenty years too soon; urge it upon an old offender, and it is twenty years too late. To my knowledge, this term of twenty years has become the radius of a charmed circle, by which prudent people keep dangerous duty at a distance, and try to be Christians without the cross. You would be astonished at the parallel cases which I could produce, if time allowed. If I remember aright, Calvin's maxim for opposing error was "*prompté, fortiter et sincère.*" Ours is rather "*lenté, languidé et ludificæiter.*" This is offering a premium upon mischief. It is a promise of immunity to the wrongdoer. And why is it that the public interest must always be indefinitely postponed? Because the public interest requires private sacrifices and sufferings; and these cannot be expected of men who have sacrificed the honour of Christ and the rights and interests of his people, to their own private vanity and ambition.

Not many years ago, one of them said to me, "You cannot expect me to oppose the doctorate during the very honeymoon of my own promotion." Without going so far as to admit that it was immoral, he conceded unreservedly that it was a humbug. His experience and your experience agree in this, that the longer a man hugs his sins, the dearer they are to him. The prodigal son not only refused to reform in the first month of his promotion among harlots and revelers, but continued to refuse until he was promoted to the more honourable office of swineherd, with an empty stomach. He wished posterity to foot the bill of his carousals. So our nobility and the nobility of England spend the blood and treasure of their subjects, and load posterity with a national debt which can never be paid. Their maxim is, Let this generation do the borrowing and the squandering, and leave the next generation to do the paying and the weeping.

Patriots and philanthropists, prophets and apostles, reformers and martyrs, live and labour and suffer and die for posterity: but how comes it that when men are promoted to a *gradum amplissimum* above these, they live and labour for themselves, and leave their children to suffer and die for their neglect?

If this most noble order of clergymen were any thing real, they would give us an array of most faithful and fearless watchmen. Instead of that, the doctorate in Mercersburg led to Prelacy and Popery, and is now actually leading Princeton and the Repertory in the same direction, under the Presbyterian name. The doctors who are multiplying like Pharaoh's frogs, are waiting for twenty years to pass, before they make any manly and efficient opposition to this humbug prelatical Presbyterianism. Give error an inch, and it will take an ell. After the honeymoon of the doctorate, the incumbent cannot help seeing that prelacy is a step higher, and Popery higher still; and that as they are all upon the same moral footing, the advocate of the one may consistently advocate the others. Our synodical records for 1849, at Alexandria, show that the doctors and would-be doctors of our body, are pleased with the taste of what they call "*proper dignity*." All prelates are *dignitaries* of a higher caste: may we not emulate their elevation?

Justice requires me to admit that in our upward progress, our aspirants have exhibited unwonted energy against false pretences, when there is "*dignus vindicæ nodus*." On this subject allow me to hold you to your own acts, in your own

archives, where you acted "*prompté et fortiter*" at least, against a clergyman, upon the untried and unproved charge of false pretence, in presenting a document which you refused to hear then, and have never heard since. The measure was moved and seconded, advocated and carried by the doctors and humble candidates for humbug dignity; when they knew then, and cannot deny now, that the patent of nobility, upon which they based their power and pride, was a pretence as utterly false as ever sent a swindler to jail. This is a policy which may do well for the dignitaries of Prelacy and Popery; but it is below the dignity, candour and purity of Christianity, Protestantism and Presbyterianism: and I call upon the synod to act now against the real humbug, as vigorously as they then acted against a man whom protracted persecution has never been able to drive into a false pretence, nor to keep from exposing one. I do not ask them to do it without reading the document upon which the charge is based; for in our eighth item we offer it in its original beauty.

7. The sophisms used in favour of these titles, are unscriptural, untrue, and contradictory.

Among these the *argumentum ad insidiam* is used quite freely. The opposer of forbidden titles is compared to a fox looking up at grapes, which he calls sour, because they are out of his reach. He is also compared to a fox which has lost his tail, and therefore wishes to deprive his brethren of theirs. God has given the tail to animals, because it is good; and he has forbidden this tail of aristocracy to clergymen, because it is bad. It is placed among the sour grapes of Prelacy and Popery, not by me, but by my divine Master. These witticisms, prove, however, that their authors place a high value upon this tail, when they think the very martyrs maimed without it. They must have a keen gusto for these sour grapes when they think that they place ignorance and weakness so high as to be out of the reach of Whitefield, Davies or Edwards, Zuingli, Calvin or Knox, Paul, Peter or John.

I knew an eminent lawyer, who would never charge an adversary with ignorance, but always called it unacquaintance. If any man were to reproach me with not being worthy or able to obtain so high an honour, I could answer, "I am astonished, Sir, at your unacquaintance with the true state of things. Men are liable to mistake their own deserts, but I am under a strong impression that I am as great a fool as

many that do obtain it; and if that be a recommendation, I could probably get my friends to urge it with success." Some are of the opinion that it would hardly quit cost; and that it is too apt to puff up like fattening hogs on buckwheat. Others may believe that it can turn a simpleton into a Solomon. But a greater than Solomon thought not so, when he warned his disciples against it. For this reason we think these favourable representations unscriptural and untrue.

Moreover, the favourers of the doctorate contradict each other; for while one esteems it an invaluable benefit, another confesses it to be a calamity, and asks the toleration of the evil for merey's sake. The Presbyterian in taking this ground appears to forget that this is the unenviable ground modestly taken by the kindred titles of Pope and prelate. Though they may look and long and labour and intrigue for the office, and spend thousands of dollars in bribery, and even use force and arms to obtain it, they are accomplished performers at playing off the languishing affliction of pious reluctance, either before or after the election. *Nolo episcopari* is sometimes a profitable affectation. Pope Sixtus V., from whose Vulgate I quoted above, gained his election by playing this game during the canvass; and by the same means Pope Hildebrand secured his place, after he had taken possession by an armed force.

After having murdered his predecessor to obtain his place, he says to a formidable rival, "His death has fallen upon me to overwhelm me: it has torn my entrails and precipitated me into an abyss." To a dangerous political power he said, "God is my witness that the Romans chose me against my will, and committed violence in order to enthrone me." To an artful correspondent, he says, "I am come into the depths of the sea, and my forehead is ravaged by a tempest." But he says, "I shall not detain you longer with my afflictions, but will claim from your charity the prayers of your brethren, that God will sustain me in the peril which I wished to shun." He knew that the prelate to whom he was writing had long had an eye upon the Papacy himself, and would gladly relieve him from its afflictions in any practicable way, lawful or unlawful. But relief was the last thing that he desired.

Is this the spirit of the many victims of the doctorate, referred to by the Presbyterian? Let us examine Dr. Scipio Africanus upon this subject. "Brother Scip, I am told that you consider your honorary title a calamity." "Yes, it is

an affliction sent upon me against my will, a peril which I wished to shun. It has brought me into the depths of the sea, and ravaged my forehead with a tempest. It has torn my entrails and precipitated me into an abyss, and overwhelmed my soul." "Poor brother, I sympathize with you, Your sufferings under the doctorate must be as great as those which were inflicted upon you in southern bondage. How did you escape from that dreadful yoke?" "I ran away from my master." "And how did Dr. Brisbane escape from the southern calamity?" "He ran away from his slaves." "Well, Mr. Robinson of Baltimore ran away from the doctorate: and do you go and do likewise; or say very little more about calamities and afflictions, perils and torn entrails, storms and depths, for fear that weak people should think you as judicious and patient as Hildebrand."

But the advocates of these titles have another variety, which is opposed to both the preceding. Instead of believing them a great benefit or a great calamity, they treat them as a matter of perfect indifference, too contemptible to occupy a moment's consideration by a churchman or a church court. To such I would say, "Is our Saviour respectable? Did he give them a moment's consideration? Did he not seriously consider them, and prohibit them as plainly as he has required a church to have pastors, elders and deacons? or required these officers to observe the word, sacraments and prayer? Are the officers and ordinances of the church, matters of contemptible indifference to churchmen and church courts? His injunction gives importance to some things, and his prohibition to others.

That some things greatly differ from others in respect to importance, is not disputed. This is thought to place the doctorate of our Saviour's discourse infinitely beneath its prelacy and papacy; because the doctorate is not constitutionally connected with any definite authority or jurisdiction, rank or power. To this we would answer that although all the commandments of the decalogue are not of equal importance they are of equal obligation. Moreover, our Saviour's objections to the doctorate were of another character. Besides the fact that it belonged to the family of Antichristian usurpation, it taught some to claim and others to accord those fawning flatteries and social deferences and preferences which blind and mislead the people, and corrupt the simplicity and humility of the ministry.

But this argument is not only contrary to scripture, but

it is contrary to common sense, in the technical, philosophical sense of that expression: it is contrary to history and experience, and to the common judgment of the human family on such subjects. When the great Conqueror instituted his Legion of Honour, was it constitutionally connected with any definite authority or jurisdiction, rank or power? No. Was it on that account a matter of perfect indifference, or infinitely contemptible? It was one of the arms of Napoleon's mighty empire. The system is one of the arms of Apollyon's mightier empire, in church and state.

If I mistake not, the British government has dilapidated political titles, which give jurisdiction no farther than a pigeon-roost. The Roman Church has prelatial titles, giving jurisdiction over the regions of fancy; yet leading to facts of a most important character. We once had in Philadelphia a Bishop of Basileopolis. Notwithstanding the apparent emptiness of his title, his case gives strong instruction in the potency of this machinery.

He once lived where his brother probably still lives, in a borough of this state, where I spent a year. There he followed the only truly honourable business that he ever pursued. He made his bread by gardening or breaking stones on the turnpike, or any such jobs or day's work as he could get. A Popish school afterward gave him some instruction, and he became a priest, and then Bishop of Basileopolis. Then he became Bishop of *Democracypolis*. Then Archbishop, with a glorious nibble at a Cardinalate. All this without any regard to talents, or piety, or usefulness; unless you give those names to accomplishments, the very mention of which might be actionable at law. Thus, as ex-priest Hogan afterward remarked, this empty and contemptible title was the instrument of pitchforking a bad man from a potato-hill into a palace.

In his progress he has received the fawning flatteries of the general government and that of the state. He fairly warns us that we must surrender to him our senate, army, and navy. Accordingly our cabinet and senators are becoming Papists, that he may make them presidents; and our navy has already begun to wait upon him and his master at our expense. If he were now to become a convert to Christianity, an advocate of the Bible, and a witness against Antichrist, and lose his title on that account, would our steamers offer him their services, and our government connive at such conduct?

Why did the framers of our federal constitution establish

in its very first article, (Sec. 9, Subsec. 7,) that "*No title of nobility shall be granted,*" at home, "*or title of any kind whatever*" received from abroad by any "person holding any office of profit or trust under" this government? Because history, experience, and common sense prove that these titles possess a dangerous power. For the want of such a charm, the greatest man on earth was treated with contumely by Captain Long, when committed to his care by the general government. With such a charm, foreign, prelatical, Antichristian, liberty-hating princes, received sycophantic and expensive attentions from Captain Bigelow, by an order from the government.

If, in return for the services rendered by Captain Long or Commodore Morgan, the Pope, or the Emperor of France or Austria should bestow upon either of them the title of Lord High-Admiral of the Anti-Hungarian Squadron, would a Republican Congress give their consent? Would they be moved by the argument that there is no such squadron, and that the title is as empty as Bishop of Basileopolis or Doctor of Divinity?

Captain Bigelow commands the steamer Michigan. If the Antichristian princes, for whose sake he disgraced his country, should have him made Marquis of Michigan, would a Republican Congress consent?

Would they agree for the Pope to entitle Judge Campbell Lord of the Post-office Department, or Prince of Patronage; or General Scott Knight of the Wax-candle, or Marshal of the O'Connell Guards; or make Senator Douglass or Mr. Chandler President of the Province of America?

Or suppose that these titles were conferred, not by foreign powers, but by an American Hierarchy, perjuringly swearing to support that freedom which they avowedly mean to destroy; or by an American Democratic Convention obeying the will of the Hierarchy: could a Republican Congress give their consent?

Or suppose that the doctorate which is forbidden by our inspired Constitution, were to be conferred, not by a power foreign to the church, as it now is, but by a presbytery, could our higher courts do less than the synod and assembly did in the case of the Cumberland Presbytery? They repudiated twelve ordinations, unconstitutionally hasty, taken from that large and popular family of juvenility, ignorance, and weakness, from which a Princeton Professor complains that our doctors are taken in late days.

You might find twelve hundred cases in which this unconstitutional title is arbitrarily conferred, to manufacture a quasi-hierarchy in Presbyterian societies. I call it unconstitutional, not because it is a perversion of Melville's doctorate, given to unordained schoolmasters, but because it is as directly forbidden by our inspired, infallible, supreme constitutional authority, as any of the civil, military, or naval titles mentioned above, are forbidden by our federal Constitution; and all the sophisms used to support the doctorate are as flimsy as they would be if they were used to support these civil, military, and naval titles.

This can be easily tried. We will suppose that General Scott petitions Congress to let him be Knight of the Wax-candle, and Marshal of the O'Connell Guards. They show him the constitutional prohibition. He shows them two fables; one about the fox and the grapes, and the other about the fox that had lost his tail. Will this convince them that foreign titles are such sweet grapes, and wax-candles such becoming tails for American generals, that for the sake of them we ought to dispense with the Constitution?

We will suppose that Judge Campbell swears that it was James Buchanan and John Hughes that forced upon him the titles of Lord of the Mail and Prince of Patronage, against his will; that he esteems it a heart-rending calamity; and that he retains it because his spiritual advisers assure him that it is that sort of a calamity to which judicious men will hold fast. Will this relieve the constitutional difficulty?

Captain Bigelow and Senator Chandler may assure us that the one retains his title of Marquis of Michigan, and the other his title of President of the American Province of the Holy Catholic, Apostolic Roman Empire, simply because it is a matter of perfect indifference. Can they persuade a Republican Congress that it is a matter of perfect indifference whether the Constitution is maintained or violated?

Now these are the three sophisms noticed above in favour of the doctorate; and there is less excuse for them in the case of the doctorate, because the constitutional prohibition of these other titles is general, and not special: the book nowhere says expressly, "Be ye not called Knight, Lord, Prince, or Marquis," but our inspired Constitution says, specially and expressly, "Be ye not called *Doctor*;" for while *Rabbi* is a Greek, Latin, and English transcription of the Hebrew, *Doctor* is a correct translation; so that we have a title coming in upon us like a flood, over a special and express

prohibition of our Constitution; while a general provision, of a similar character, in our federal Constitution, has been maintained ever since its adoption.

Republicans see plainly, that when that rule is surrendered, the face of political society is changed. Vast, and before unknown sources of adverse influence and power are opened upon us. New and portentous affinities and antipathies are formed. An arbitrary and unsound, factitious and pernicious standard of merit is established. Has not the violation of this rule changed the face of ecclesiastical society, whenever and wherever the church is guilty of it?

That there are degrees of guilt I do not deny; yet to many this very gradation becomes a snare. The Presbyterian doctorate is cherished, because inferior in guilt to the Anglican prelacy; and the prelatical mastership is cherished, because inferior to the Roman fatherhood. Thus, all the three titles forbidden by our Saviour are in full blast among his nominal followers; and the guilty supports the more guilty, and the more guilty props the most guilty. While prelates are training their disciples for Popery, Presbyterians are training theirs for prelacy. *The Churchman*, a New York Episcopalian paper, (quoted in the *Presbyterian* of September 10, 1853,) boasts of three hundred fugitives from our Rabbism to their mastership, from which there is as easy a road to the Roman fatherhood.

The late lectures in Princeton and the *Repertory*, are to give a new impetus to the work of promotion from ministers to doctors, from doctors to prelates, and from prelacy to popery. "*Vive la bagatelle*—long live humbug."

If congress had paid no more regard to their *jure humano* institution than we do to our *jure divino*, we might multiply revolutions as they do in France. But behold their superiority. The convention which adopted the federal constitution had members of the society of Cincinnati, an American order of knighthood or nobility. When the rule was adopted, it disappeared as completely as the race of mammoths has vanished from the continent. The question of indifference, or calamity, or sour grapes, or fox-tails, was nothing in their eyes: the law was peremptory and they obeyed it: while we hang to a similar evil, the prohibition of which by the Saviour, is as intelligible and peremptory as his injunction for the observance of the eucharist.

Is there a loftier grandeur and sovereignty in the majesty

of the American people whom they obey, than in that divine Majesty whom we have covenanted and vowed to obey? "Behold the nations (and ours among them) are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold he taketh up the isles (the Gentile settlements of Europe, from whom we are descended,) as a very little thing." "All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing and vanity."

Where is the wise man who is competent to improve his Maker's order, or "path of judgment," as Isaiah terms it? "With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him and taught him in the path of judgment?" His wise and sovereign judgment is, that the church should have ministers and not doctors, prelates or popes. Men take the liberty of making arbitrary substitutes and counterfeits, additions and subtractions, distortions and perversions; and when they cross God's path of judgment they call themselves judicious. Saul thought himself very judicious in saving the forbidden sheep and oxen of Amalek, as we retain the forbidden titles of Antichrist. But "Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry." Can any one deny that the Roman Papacy has committed this offence? that Anglican prelacy has committed it? Then what excuse is there for our Rabbinical hierarchy, forbidden in the same way, and in the same discourse?

The countrymen of Samuel and David are destined to return from their apostacy to the service of the God of their fathers. When they do so, will they rebuild popery or prelacy? Just as much as they will rebuild Rabbinism or the temple. Why should we cherish an evil now, which is doomed to utter repudiation in a better day?

But allow me to pay my respects for a moment to an objection which is of almost universal adaptation. Opposition to an empty title may be thought to show a want of spirituality; a pharisaical disposition to tithe mint, anise and cummin, and neglect the weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy and faith. On this subject I would say, "Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or, being his counsellor, hath taught him?" We are informed that the Spirit was poured out upon Christ without measure. Yet that divine

specimen of spirituality is the one from whom I obtained my opposition to Popery, Prelacy and Rabbinism. Instead of neglecting judgment, mercy and faith, his prohibition was addressed to the faith of his people, in mercy to their souls, and in his infallible "path of judgment."

Was it a lack of spirituality to condemn the Amalekite animals in the camp of Israel? to condemn the golden wedge and Babylonish garment in Achan's tent? or to condemn the forbidden fruit in Adam's mouth? Is it less spiritual to condemn the corruptions and usurpations of Popish, Prelatical and Rabbinical hierarchies, than to condemn forbidden animals, minerals and vegetables?

The ancient Pharisees advocated Rabbinism in opposition to revelation. It is our opponents and not ourselves that do this. The Pharisees preferred the doctorate to Christ and his word. We do not so. Let our opponents show that they do not so. The two are as clearly distinguished, and in as clear antithesis as Mount Gerizzim and Mount Ebal, Presbyterianism and Prelacy, Christ and Antichrist. Let us choose the humble, spiritual, apostolical simplicity of Christ, and reject the proud, carnal, Pharisaical usurpations of the Jewish and Roman apostacies.

I have reserved to this late hour that argument in favour of these titles, which is, with some, the most plausible and powerful. I must be allowed fully, fairly and successfully to dispose of it, or with them all that I have said thus far goes for nothing. They consider the doctorate not as a theological, clerical or ecclesiastical title or honour, which might bring it within the range of our Saviour's prohibition; but as an honorary title of *literary distinction solely*: as the gown is not a clerical vestment, but *solely a collegiate badge*.

If the college will thus protect the doctorate as it actually exists, then the British House of Lords will protect prelacy as it actually exists, and the unbounded political claims of Antichrist will protect the papacy from our Saviour's censure; so that his discourse must be wonderfully destitute of point, when he solemnly condemns nothing but creatures of fancy. But all whom I address believe that he does condemn prelacy and popery as they really exist. Allow me to show that the fashionable doctorate is not relieved from the same condemnation by the argument or illustration now before us.

Let it be remembered that the illustration by the gown is no proof, though it may have more force with many than

proof; and on that account should not be passed unnoticed. This, like the doctorate, is one of those things in which great and good men are liable to gross mistakes and mutual contradictions. The position just now stated is not maintained by all the friends of the gown, but is contradicted by as respectable advocates of that vestment as our country contains.

Some dozen years ago the *Ledger* published that the presbytery of New Brunswick had recommended the adoption of "the episcopal habit of wearing gowns in the pulpit." If the presbytery believed that "the gown is not a clerical vestment, but solely a collegiate badge," the *Ledger* gave them a fair opportunity to say it and to prove it. But both their resolution and answer to the *Ledger* show that such a thought did not enter their minds. They recommend to "ministers of the gospel in the exercise of their public offices," what they call "the solemn pomp of gown and bands and wig or small cap," such as Elizabeth compelled her clergy to wear, and such as they say the dissenters in England and the clergy of the Church of Scotland and the reformed churches on the continent wore willingly; with the exception of the colour: for they say that "the stiff quarrel in England, under Elizabeth," was about the colour only, and not the thing.

Now we know that collegiate badges require a discretionary variety of colour, cut, and accompaniments; and that many of them would not be allowed in the pulpit, and that the pulpit gown would not always answer for the college. But allow me to show that the alleged friends of the gown were its conscientious foes; and that, instead of considering it an innocent collegiate badge, they considered it a badge of prelacy and popery, and the evils which were kindred to them and nourished by them.

There is no more respectable authority on the continent of Europe than Calvin and Beza. It was their happy influence that induced some of the London divines to forsake the habits as "idolatrous gear," and to adopt "a book and order of preaching, administration of the sacraments and discipline, that the great Mr. Calvin had approved of, and which was free from the superstitions of the English service." Here we have the orthodoxy and piety of Geneva and London giving their joint testimony that the gown is "idolatrous gear," and that it belongs to the superstitions of English prelacy.

But Beza connects it with popery also when he and seventeen of his Presbyterian brethren of the Genevese clergy say, "As for the popish habits, those men that are authors of their being imposed, do deserve most evil of the church, and shall verily answer it at the dreadful bar of Christ's judgment."

To quote Scotland in favour of these habits sounds strangely to those who know that the great Melville called them "Romish rags," in the presence of habited prelates; and that the Presbyterian clergy of Scotland, writing to their suffering brethren in England, call them "the dregs of the Romish Beast," with which the "rebakers of all superstition" should have nothing to do. Instead of calling them collegiate badges, they call them "badges of idolatry."

We have been compared to a fox looking up at grapes. Fox, the Martyrologist, rejected the apparel as sour grapes, and escaped persecution, while many of their best ministers were punished for the same refusal. They refused too, like the Scotch ministers, upon the ground that, distinguishing themselves by the badges of idolatry, is contrary to the scriptures and the fathers; among whom they quote Tertullian, "*de Corona Militis*," where he says, "If it be a matter of infidelity to sit at the idol's feasts, what is it to be seen in the habit or apparel of the idol?"

In the time of pious King Edward VI., the clergy were "so poor that they could scarce afford to buy themselves decent clothes." While the grapes seemed thus out of their reach, a council of bishops and archbishops declared concerning these habits, that "at best they were but inventions of popery, and ought to be destroyed with that idolatrous religion." Bishop Pilkinton complains that after he and his brethren had been dressed by compulsion, "the blame of all was cast upon the bishops." He thought this unjust; and Bishop Grindal calls "God to witness that it did not lie at their door that the habits were not quite taken away."

Some of Elizabeth's reformers, in a letter to Zurich, observe "that the ancient fathers had their habits, but not peculiar to bishops, nor distinct from the laity." They state that "the Papists glory in this, that these habits were brought in by them, for which they vouch Otho's constitutions, and the Roman Pontifical." On the other hand, the Presbyterian clergy of Zurich wrote to Elizabeth's victims that the habits "carry an appearance of the mass, and are merely remainders of popery;" and approve of the zeal of those di-

vines who wish to have the house of God "purged from all the dregs of popery."

While Bishop Pilkinton observes that "the Papists blew the coals" of this rage for gowns, the Bishop of Durham prayed the Earl of Leicester "to consider how all reformed countries had cast away popish apparel with the Pope." He calls it "the defiled robe of Antichrist," and says, "Since we have forsaken popery as wicked, I do not see how their apparel can become saints and professors of the gospel." Some of Elizabeth's suffering clergy declared "that the surplice or white linen garment came from the Egyptians into the Jewish church; and that Pope Silvester, about the year 320, was the first that appointed the sacrament to be administered in a white linen garment; giving this reason for it, because the body of Christ was buried in a white linen cloth."

Concerning this white linen garment and all other such contrivances, the same clergymen say that "all these garments had been abused to idolatry, sorcery, and all kinds of conjurations; for (say they) the popish priests can perform none of their pretended consecrations of holy water, transubstantiation of the body of Christ, conjurations of the devil out of places or persons possessed, without a surplice, or an albe, or some hallowed stole." They state "that neither the prophets in the Old Testament, nor the apostles in the New, were distinguished by their garments;" "that a distinction of garments in the Christian church did not generally obtain, till long after the rising of Antichrist;" for the whole clergy of Ravenna, writing to the Emperor Carolus Calvus, in the year of our Lord, 876, say, "We are distinguished from the laity, not by our clothes, but by our doctrines; not by our habits, but our conversation."

Take this declaration of the Roman apostacy in its infancy, with a late presbyterial effort to revive "all the solemn pomp of gown and bands and wig or small cap;" and say which sounds most like the scriptural injunctions of humility, simplicity and godly sincerity. Look at the martyrs of Jesus, dragged from their bed of vermin, in a loathsome dungeon, dressed in prison rags; then look at those lordlings, dressed in "all the solemn pomp of gown and bands and wig or small cap." With which of the parties do you hope to stand in the judgment? These are adorned in the white robe of Christ's righteousness: these are marked with the carnal, worldly pomp of Antichrist. These are beauti-

fed with the patience and faith of the saints: those are drunk with the blood of the saints.

It is not I, but the advocates of the doctorate who have clothed this Antichristian title with this Antichristian badge. The one is brought up to illustrate the other; and a most apt illustration it certainly is. They summon England, Scotland and the continent for proof. We follow them to the Protestantism, Puritanism and Presbyterianism of England, Scotland and the continent. We go farther still, to the then unextinguished piety of the bishops and archbishops of Edward VI. and the best prelates of Elizabeth, and even the smouldering embers of Roman Ravenna. Taking their testimony for the basis, the irresistible conclusion is that the habits are stained with Paganism, Judaism and Prelacy: that instead of being solely and innocently a collegiate badge, the gown is a polluted badge of popish pride and pomp, idolatry and superstition.

Instead, therefore, of the doctorate being innocent, like the gown, it turns out that their own witnesses prove the gown to be guilty like the doctorate. If the doctorate be a merely literary distinction, why not give it to learned lawyers and physicians, farmers, mechanics and merchants? I can show you a merchant who has more sense than nine-tenths of our D. D's. Why not call him a Doctor of Divinity? Because it is exclusively a clerical title. Since Andrew Melville's schoolmasters have died out, the clergy have engrossed the title to themselves, and changed its character from Protestantism to Popery—from being a representative of solid and useful accomplishments in the laity, to being a representative of fuss and feathers in the clergy.

When Christ's witnesses in England, Scotland and the continent called the gown the dregs of Popery, and urged that the house of God should be purged from such defilement, they argued that it was contrary to scripture and the fathers. They urged a fair inference from general principles. But suppose that, in addition to these general principles, Christ had expressly said to his apostles, "Be ye not clothed with gown and bands, and wig or small cap; for such people are fond of solemn pomp, or pompous solemnity, and love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be pompous in their names and titles as well as in their clothes and airs;" and suppose that he had put this very intelligible prohibition in company with others against Popery and Prelacy, would you be at a loss to know what he thought of the gown? Just

so it is with regard to the doctorate. No language is plainer, no law in the decalogue more definite.

The last position in favour of the doctorate, but not the least, may be presented in the following words, viz.: "The doctorate is sinking into contempt, by the reckless policy of the dispensing power, and the ignorance and weakness of the objects of their favour. This is an abuse which should give place to a well-regulated dispensation of honorary titles of distinction, according to real merit."

The morality of this institution has been candidly discussed in our Fourth item. We trace it to Antichrist. From his birth back to the apostles we find it not; though the mystery of iniquity was working by prelacy, celibacy and such things. It existed in the Jewish church when Christ came, under the name of Rabbinism. Doctor is a translation of Rabbi. Our Saviour spoke of it clearly. Did he order it to be reformed, as some wish the theatre to be reformed, and converted into a well-regulated theatre? Did he command the colleges to dispense the doctorate with a wise discrimination? Did he forbid fools to receive it? He said, "Be not ye called Rabbi:" and accompanied the prohibition with arguments drawn from the obligation of Christian humility and of ministerial parity.

The position, then, which we are now considering, takes it for granted that it is immaterial whether an institution be Christian or Antichristian, if it be well regulated. Does this principle belong to Christianity, or to Paganism and Popery? Although theft is forbidden by the law of nature as well as revelation, the Pagans of Sparta considered it right or wrong, according to the adroitness or awkwardness with which it was committed. They were for a well-regulated larceny.

This error was at the bottom of one of the most remarkable affairs of modern times, the beautiful establishment and the speedy demolition of the Roman Republic. Some have wondered that the God of light and liberty, the God of Diodati and Gavazzi should tolerate the murder of so admirable a democracy, and that he should allow it to be murdered by another democracy professing their own religion. The cause is to be found in the error which we are now considering. They believed it a matter of indifference whether Christ or Antichrist had the spiritual power, provided it was so regulated as not to absorb the temporal power. God took them at their word; and they now find what a thousand years

of experience ought to have taught them before, that the spiritual power of Antichrist is an unlimited and incurable despotism, beyond the reach of regulation, as no regulation can keep the theatre from nurturing licentiousness, nor the doctorate from flattering fools.

These two democracies knew that God had prohibited adultery, as we know that he has forbidden the doctorate: but instead of obeying the commandment and removing the evil, both France and Rome undertake to regulate it. They have what we consider houses of ill fame put under the supervision of Doctors of Medicine and Doctors of Divinity, to see that the seventh commandment is broken in the most innocuous and regular manner possible. Our doctorate must break the commandment of Christ discreetly and judiciously; and their sisters of charity and sisters of mercy, and gray and black nuns must discreetly maintain the sacred celibacy of the Mother of Harlots. Both parties seem to think that there is no guilt in sin, if it is only committed with becoming regularity.

8. The truth and importance of the foregoing positions, in regard to confirmation and refutation, will appear from reading and weighing the diploma itself.

This shall be a bona fide diploma, except in names and dates, device and motto. The vignette is Paul before Felix. The Latin motto is translated, "As he reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled." It then reads as follows, viz.:-

Præses et Professores Collegii Galatensis omnibus has literas lecturis, Salutem et Pacem in Domino.

Quoniam Vir clarus, Diotrophes Præminens, pietate et ingenii dotibus præcellens, multis modis non solum in linguis et liberalibus in artibus peritissimum, sed etiam in sacris scripturis et in theologia se ostendit versatissimum, propterea eum dignum ad amplissimum Doctoris gradum promoveri judicamus; et pro auctoritate nobis commissa Theologie Doctorem nominamus et renunciamus.

Cujus rei in testimonium nomina subscripsimus et collegii sigillum apponi curavimus.

Datum Bombilania quarto kal. (endarum) Februarii Anno Domini millesimo septingentesimo sexagesimo quinto.

Præses.

Professores.

In testimony of which fact we have subscribed our names, and ordered the seal of the college to be affixed.

Given at Bombilania on the third of the calends of February, in the year of our Lord, one thousand, seven hundred and sixty-five.

President.

Professors.

The signers may be with or without ordination; Christians, infidels, or heretics, of an indefinite variety. If there is any meaning in the language of their document, they claim, and we allow them to exercise the right of forming a distinct order of clergy in our society. A theological seminary ought to be better judges of this higher order; but we do not allow even the illustrious faculty of Princeton, in its best days, to ordain a minister, or even to license a candidate. But we sagely allow a literary faculty, a voluntary association; made of odds and ends; tag, rag, and bob-tail, maintaining orthodoxy, heterodoxy, or no doxy at all, to call our clergy in review before them, that they may judge who is worthy to be promoted to what they call "the most noble degree," that is the highest clerical order; to which they cannot be promoted by such bodies as theological seminaries, or by presbyteries, synods, or general assemblies. We not only allow this extra ecclesiastical and incompetent faculty a discretionary judgment, and power of promotion to an unscriptural order, but we adopt their acts and recognise them in the records of all our church courts.

If our course is not sufficiently preposterous, the Episcopalians can help us out; for although they consider prelatical ordination essential to a noble or more noble order of clergymen, here is an avowedly "most noble degree," which they are glad to receive from a body having no right to create the lower order.

And what right have they to create the highest? They say that it is "by authority committed to us." I suppose they refer here to the authority committed to them by the legislature in their charter. But if presbyterians do not concede to the legislature the right of licensing our preachers or of ordaining our pastors, how can they concede to them the right of promoting these pastors to the *gradum amplissimum*, the superlative order?

Our Form of Government says that the positive and comparative must be, not by the civil authority, but by that of

Christ, the King of saints and King of nations; for it even tells the licentiate, "By that authority which he hath given to the church for its edification, we do license you to preach the gospel." Yet when a competent body has promoted this licentiate to a higher degree, we allow an incompetent body to promote him to what they consider the highest degree, not only without the authority of Christ, but in direct opposition to that authority.

John condemns "Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them." John's Master said to him and his brethren, "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors; but ye shall not be so." These parallel texts to the one in which our Saviour said, "Be ye not called Doctor," are quoted by our Larger Catechism, (q. 132,) as condemning the sin of "usurping pre-eminence one over another."

Keep this word pre-eminence in your mind, while we examine what is said by the college, to be swallowed by the Doctor in the above degree. He is styled "*vir clarus*." I have translated it "a renowned man;" that is, a man celebrated for great, heroic achievements, for distinguished qualities. But it may be as correctly rendered "famous;" that is, much talked of and praised, distinguished in story. It may as well be translated "eminent;" that is, high in public estimation, conspicuous, "distinguished above others," as Webster says.

We, as a court, and as a society, profess, with religious solemnity, that we doctrinally and practically maintain a ministerial parity. An unauthorized body usurps authority to disturb that parity. They pick out a favourite from among many who are not only entitled to the technical parity, but are notoriously and indisputably possessed of a literary and theological, intellectual and moral equality with the favourite.

Yet to keep from being ridiculous, in giving an extraordinary character to a man of ordinary, and sometimes inferior accomplishments, as Dr. Miller declares was done most lavishly, they set the bellows to work, and blow as if they were determined to make a frog as big as an ox. While many equals, and some superiors, are left to unpretending piety and learning, this candidate for pre-eminence must be represented as renowned, famous, distinguished above others; as "*PRÆCELLENS*," surpassing, in piety and literary endow-

ments; "most expert in the languages and the liberal arts;" "most skilled in the sacred scriptures and in theology." To crown these desperate statements, the faculty declare that their hopeful candidate for the highest degree of their nobility, "*shows himself in many ways*" to be thus highly accomplished, when they know that they cannot point out *one way* in which he ever *showed* talents above the humblest of his neighbours.

Unless the dispensers of such flattery to ignorance and weakness, can show a well authenticated dispensation for lying, they had better look sharp, for trouble is before them. If there is any reality in the morals of revelation, this is an offence which is hateful to God, and hurtful to man.

Its hurtful character could be more easily seen by some, if solid property, or political power, instead of windy honour, were the thing to be dispensed. Suppose that these literary faculties were allowed to usurp over the families of the country a power similar to that which they usurp over its clergy? Almost every family of their acquaintance has some member, who, from sycophancy or some other cause, becomes a favourite. To this member they give a quasi-phrenological chart, proving religiously that he is of the regular succession from Solomon; declaring that he has shown himself to be so, "*multis modis, in many ways.*" The chart gravely concludes with the following levity: "Therefore we have judged him worthy to be promoted to the most noble order of primogeniture; and by authority committed to us, we entitle and proclaim him the first-born of the family, and entitled to the whole estate of his father. Let the title *Primogenitus* be added to his name, placed upon the records of all our church courts, and acknowledged by the whole community: *Salutem et pacem reipublicæ*; safety and peace to the commonwealth."

The brother who gets the whole of the property will, of course, consider it a calamity; but his sound judgment will teach him to receive it quietly and silently, as the less said about some things the better. As for his brothers and sisters, who have been robbed to enrich him, their complaints will be suppressed by the fable of the fox and the grapes. Is this consistent with fraternal parity? If one should become rich by fair means, and the rest should be impoverished by folly, this is no infraction of the rights of fraternal equality. So if a minister, by fair means, can rise to greater talents and usefulness than others, this is no infraction

of ministerial parity. But when he resorts to a foreign, unauthorized, intrusive agency to promote him to the most noble degree of Doctor; that is, to a divinely prohibited order of clerical nobility, upon pretences recklessly false, that promotion and its correlative depression are not only at the expense of ministerial parity, but at the expense of truth and justice, honour and honesty. This assertion is made, not in the way of reproach or controversy; for there is no respectable man, in his senses, who will deny it.

This system of deceitful partiality, and oppressive intrusion, exhibits, on a small scale, what Antichrist has practised on a great scale, for numerous centuries. When the literary faculty issue their bull, they say, "By authority committed to us, we entitle and proclaim him a Doctor of Theology." So when the Man of Sin issues his bull, he says, By authority committed to us, as the Vicar of Christ, having the keys of St. Peter, we entitle and proclaim this man as a Doctor, and that as a Prelate; this man as a King, and that man as an Emperor. These all profess to be promotions on account of such merits as our degrees are stuffed with; and they are all consecrated, like them, by "*salutem et pacem in Domino*." Yet every promotion is obtained by sycophancy and servility to the powerful, and by a proportional treachery and oppression of the poor.

This correspondent oppression, which is as inseparable from unlawful promotion in a presbytery, as in a family or a state, is not the only sort of oppression which is claimed and practised, when the usurping power is strong enough. The same power which promoted Luther to a Doctorate, as a reward for Popish merit, claimed the right of degrading him from the doctorate, as a punishment for Protestant demerit. All usurpers profess to plant and pluck up, to build up and pull down, when they are able; and the one claim is as good as the other. If the Galatian College had a right to promote one member of a presbytery to a higher clerical order, for alleged merit, they had a right to degrade another member from the rights of a lower order, for pretended demerit. I need hardly say that my experience shows that this is no fancy.

One characteristic of the above Galatian exemplar has suggested to me a feature of this title which I never heard of before. I do not stand alone when I ask, Are you certain that the word *Divinitas*, in the meaning of *theology*, is Classical Latin? Are you certain that the word *Divinitas*,

in the sense of *theology*, was Popish Latin, when the Papiats connected it with the Doctorate? For with them the title of Doctor of *the Divinity or the Deity*, would be no more shocking than Mother of God, which is not mother of theology, or River of *the Trinity*, which is not river of theology. This is no worse than making a priest the creator and sacrificer of the Deity.

From internal evidence, there is reason to suspect that these questions agitated the minds of the Galatian faculty. They were in a Protestant connexion; and their diploma, copied above, was given to an able Protestant author, and they appear to have had scruples against following in the beaten track of Popish profanity. They therefore exhibit the phenomenon of bestowing a degree which all said created a D. D., a Doctor of Divinity; when, in fact, that title was not contained in the diploma, and therefore not bestowed. Instead of it they say, "We entitle and proclaim him *THEOLOGIC DOCTOREM*," *Doctor of Theology*, which makes him a T. D. instead of a D. D.

For this spurious article, which boggled at Popish profanity, and yet violated Christ's command, he had to pay a small fee, which we will suppose was equivalent to twenty dollars. We will suppose, moreover, that a neighbour of his gave a priest twenty shillings for Latin prayers to pull his grandfather out of Purgatory; and that another neighbour paid twenty picayunes for absolution for murder; and another twenty cents for a Latin amulet or charm to keep away the heretics and the plague; of which I have had a copy. It read in something like the following words. The first sentence addressed to the plague, and the last to the patient: "Procul esto febris flava. Fugite hereticos."

Now of all these four mercantile operations, it is my humble opinion that the last was the best; because the buyer paid the lowest price for the least hurtful nonsense. They all have this serious objection, that they are false pretences, imposing upon the ignorance of the people. Is it not decorous and charitable for me to tell these persons the truth? Your scapulars, and absolutions, and purgatorial masses, and windy patents of nobility, are not worth a cent. I once asked a Doctor, "Why do you not tell the people the true value of a D. D.?" His answer was, "Because it unjustly sets up Dr. A., Dr. B., and Dr. C. above me, and I have as good a right as they have to stand high before the *ignobile vulgus*."

When a Christian is ordained to the ministry, his feelings are tinged with solemnity, humility, and devotion. See how different his feelings when promoted above the Christian ministry by an Antichristian lever. His thoughts then, instead of rising to heaven, and his relation to heaven's Lord, are fixed upon his fellow-worms, and his relation to those above him, and those below him. This honest and undissembled expression of the heart ratifies all that I have said of the doctorate, as an ambitious imposture, and a proud, corrupting, tyrannical, forbidden usurpation.

To this argument about rival elevation, I answer that a Pagan apotheosis unjustly raised Jupiter and Mercury, who were mere men, above the apostles. Yet when the *ignobile vulgus* offered to take Paul and Barnabas for Jupiter and Mercury, these faithful men would rather be stoned to death by that ignorant rabble, than encourage them in their ignorance. If our church is to be divided between the noble Doctors and the *ignobile vulgus*; between an Antichristian order of nobility and their ignorant dupes, what will become of us and our nominal Christianity? May we not hope that God will send some Ezekiel to explore the chambers of imagery? Ezekiel, what do you see in the lowest chamber? "I see the church of God in a state of ignorant and ignoble vulgarity and gullibility, and in bondage to the descendants of Simon Magus." What do you see in the highest chamber? "I see Christ's ministers in bondage to an Antichristian order of nobility." What do you see in the middle chamber? "I see Christ's elders and deacons crushed by worldly usurpers."

If this be true, we ought to know it, and make up our minds in the fear of God to act accordingly. Show me three counterfeits better calculated to depress religion and deprave the church: First, a worldly constituency to elect pastors. Secondly, a worldly faculty to destroy their parity, and regulate their rank, by promoting one over another, upon false pretences. Thirdly, a worldly legislature to control their support. Thus you find a worldly Triad, instead of a church called out of the world.

If you could bring some plausible evidence that these things are promoting the nations to a *most noble degree* of true religion, that would give some relief: but while doctorates are multiplying like the plagues of Egypt, a doctor himself declares, and two other doctors endorse the declaration, in the Presbyterian of last week, (October 1, 1853,)

that the world is "becoming worse and worse all the time;" and this court cannot deny their assertion of the "downward tendency of the moral condition of the nations of the world, our own not excepted." It is of no use to deny the fact that Christendom is fast seeking the level of Israel in Egypt, the Jews under Herod, and of the Pagan world. For these three cases God appointed one and the same remedy. It is called in his word a *visitation*, organization, or gracious and edifying regulation. In prospect of Israel's degradation and bondage "Joseph said unto his brethren, I die; and God will surely visit you, and bring you out of this land unto the land which he swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob." (Gen. i. 24.) Stephen declares the fulfilment of this prediction by Moses, when "it came into his heart to visit his brethren the children of Israel." (Acts vii. 23.) Though other English words are often used in our Bible to translate Joseph's word for *visit*, yet that word runs through all the books of Moses to denote the *jure divino* organization of God's people, intrusted to him. When the father of John the Baptist predicted the immediate appearing of the Saviour, he said, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people, through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the Day-spring from on high hath visited us." (Luke i. 68, 78.) As Joseph and Stephen inform us that the *visitation* by Moses or the Old Testament organization was to bring them out of Egyptian bondage, so Zacharias teaches us that the *visitation* by Christ, or the New Testament re-organization of the church was "that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us;" "that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear." (Luke i. 71, 74.) So concerning the benighted, perishing Pagan world, James and Peter "declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name." (Acts xv. 14.) Thus we see that one and the same remedy was applied for the evils of Israel in Egypt, the Jews under Herod, and the Pagan world: and that remedy was a gracious *visitation* of God, including a *jure divino* organization of a church among men; which the apostles express by saying that it was "to take out of them a people for his name." These words are a plain description of a church. Analogy shows that rigid, correct, heaven-favoured organization, or if necessary, re-organization, is the proper remedy for the

downward tendency of society which all admit at the present moment. A military organization of millions under Xerxes fell before a compact body of ten thousand. A proper view of this subject was connected with Cromwell's greatness. He began with discarding vagabonds and tapsters, and raising his iron-side regiment of praying men. He then re-organized the army, upon a plan which Headley describes in remarkable words: "Republicans in principle, and enthusiasts in religion, they looked with contempt on all earthly distinctions, and feared God alone." It was by this policy that his country arose to the noblest elevation known in its history. How would he describe the church militant of our day? "Aristocrats in principle, and enthusiasts in vanity, they will counterfeit and crush all the elements of the church for earthly distinction, and fear nothing so much as dangerous duty, which they always postpone for twenty years." Could Cromwell have conquered with mercenary soldiers, with usurping aristocrats for officers, and a foreign independent commissariat, chosen by his enemies? Yet the members and officers of God's church militant are bartered for such counterfeits, under the plausible pretext that the counterfeit has more money than the genuine church, and that this greater wealth will carry on our vastly extended machinery for giving the gospel to the poor.

This is what an intelligent policeman or a judge of the Supreme Court would alike call *Gammon*; and Webster does not pronounce it a low word. This vast accession of unblest wealth has accelerated, instead of retarding our downward tendency. It is this which has crowded the doctorate, until a higher distinction is demanded at Princeton: and when these institutions have independent endowments, you will see whether their high aspirations are to be always cramped by hide-bound presbyterianism. Will the old log-college look to the doctors for protection? They are the very ones who are licking their chops for fresh honours.

But what has become of the millions gained by this transaction for the benefit of the poor? They are spent in erecting costly and showy edifices, in coy imitation of the temples of prelacy and popery, with lofty steeples and devotional machinery for praise, under which a poor man cannot buy a seat. The whole arrangement appears to me like that of the Winnebago wisacare, who bartered his rifle and blankets for trinkets and whisky.

God has among us an afflicted and poor people who shall trust in the name of the Lord, and not in ill-gotten gain. With them I wish my lot, and that of the mother synod of the church in which I was born. If my premises are proved, it is not asking anything extravagant of that synod, when I plead for the adoption of the moderate resolution which is a legitimate conclusion from these premises. It is as follows:

Therefore, Resolved that the Clerical Doctorate be considered a calamity and an evil, as it is considered by the Presbyterian, and by our Saviour, in Matt. xxiii. 6—10.