

THE
PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

NOVEMBER, 1851.

Miscellaneous Articles.

THE OLD WAR.

THERE is a certain war which has been raging among mankind for thousands of years. The parties do not use javelins, nor bows and arrows, nor fire arms. They do not use carnal weapons, but spiritual weapons. They fight each other with doctrines, principles, speeches, books, tracts, lives. The one party is God and godliness among men. The other party is corrupt human nature. The grand maxim of the one party is faith in God. The grand maxim of the other party is faith in man. The watchword of the one party is, *Trust in God*. The watchword of the other party is, *Trust thyself*. This is the old war, the revolutionary war of all ages; and it must and will go on in this age also.

This war began in the happy garden of Eden, when man and woman refused, at the suggestion of the serpent, to trust God for the future exaltation and glory of their souls, and desired to be, that very day, as gods, knowing good and evil. God then even hinted a promise of pardon to the rebels. His divine Son was then by him in heaven, as one brought up with him. He was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him. Rejoicing, too, in the habitable parts of the earth; and his delights were with the sons of men. He rejoiced to think that the mountains and plains, that the hills and valleys of the new made earth might be peopled with a race of beings who would reflect some of the eternal rays of God's glory. He came forward and offered an interceding prayer for man. Deliver him from going down to the pit, said he, I have found a ransom. And he offered himself to be born of woman, and to undertake to bruise the serpent's head. God accepted his proposition, and spoke comfortably to man, hinting the covenant just

educate, should not give more than one tenth. If a man has made his own fortune, he has a right to give a larger amount than one who has received his fortune by *inheritance*; because he ought to take into consideration the expectations, and even claims of his children.

Other remarks might be offered; but having already extended perhaps this article too much, I forbear. J.

POPERY.

BELLARMINO'S FIFTEENTH MARK OF A CHURCH.

It is very evident that American Presbyterians owe a duty to their country and to posterity in exposing and resisting popery. The call in providence is clear, and the work to be done is important. The Man of Sin is exerting all his energies, and the friends of truth must not sleep. Nor is it very important what point is chosen for the assault. Popery carries with it its corrupt dogmas, idolatrous rites, superstitious customs, false reasonings, and spiritual despotisms, wherever it goes; and although it does not introduce them all of a sudden, yet it has them ready for use as soon as the public mind will bear them. The Church of Rome is, in a bad sense, "always and every where the same." She is especially fond of arguing about the Church, and lays down her dogmas with great positiveness. But she has nothing new to offer on this subject. It is, therefore, true that he who answers her old writers, disposes of her modern champions also. Bellarmine exhausted the quiver, and left not an arrow for those who should come after him. He was particularly full on the Church, and has told us all that Rome has ever pleaded in vindication of her claims. His *marks* of a church have long been celebrated, and are still pointed to as of impregnable strength. Let us examine one of them at present, viz. the last. He seems to have reserved this as his great gun. His fifteenth mark is, "*Felicitas temporalis divinitus iis collata, qui ecclesiam defenderunt. Nunquam enim catholici principes ex animo Deo adhæserunt quin facillime de hostibus triumpharent;*" that is, the final mark of the true Church is, "Temporal felicity, conferred by God on those who have defended the Church. For Catholic Princes have never heartily adhered to God but they most easily triumphed over their enemies." Here is a mark very boldly asserted indeed; but whether there is not more rashness than wisdom in the avowal we shall see. "Temporal felicity," and political or military "triumphs," constitute a mark of the Church! How is this? Paul, in Heb. xi. 33-39, tells of the people of God of old, that they, "through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the

violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valient in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again." He is speaking of the grand achievements of faith, and says that these things have sometimes been done by faith. But he does not make such successes the marks of the Church; for speaking of the very same class of people, he immediately adds: "And others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: and others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment. They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens, and caves of the earth." Nor can the papist say that these last were bad people, for Paul immediately adds, that they all had "obtained a good report," or, as the Doway Bible has it, they were "approved by the testimony of faith." So the cardinal and the apostle quite disagree. If the former is right, the latter is wrong. Bellarmine's rule excommunicates many of Paul's worthies. We Protestants intend to adhere to Paul's view. Romanists will probably follow the man with the cap "*de notis ecclesiæ*."

Yea, the cardinal's mark would excommunicate Paul himself, and his colleagues too; for he tells us, 2 Cor. vi. 4, 5, that they "approved themselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings." This description of "temporal felicity" would hardly have come up to the ideas of Bellarmine, or of any other cardinal, for a long time past. Yet it was the ruin of Paul's temporal felicity. Nay, in the same Epistle, (xi. 23-27,) where he is maintaining his apostleship against adversaries, who, like the cardinal, were for casting him out, he says, "Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool,) I am more; in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and day I have been in the deep. In journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils of my own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." The cardinal's rule must be given up, or Paul must be cast out of the Catholic Church. This is as clear as day. It is very evident that "temporal felicity" was no mark of being in the true Church in Paul's case.

Indeed the apostles taught their converts directly contrary to the cardinal's doctrine. He says that men must go through "temporal felicity conferred by God," to the kingdom of glory. But they say,

"all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution," 2 Tim. iii. 12; and that "we must, through much tribulation, enter into the kingdom of God." Acts xiv. 22. Moreover, the cardinal's mark is so contrary to the teachings and example of Christ, that one would almost suspect he had not read the gospels at all; for the Saviour said to one, who proposed to be a follower of his: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." This did not promise much "temporal felicity." Yea, Christ said that whosoever would be his disciple, must "take up his cross and follow him." And our Lord, the very Head of the true Church, was poor, was derided, was spit upon, was betrayed, crucified, dead and buried. He was the "man of sorrows."

In fact the cardinal's mark would much better suit the wicked than the righteous; for Christ said: "Blessed be ye poor; for yours is the kingdom of God. Blessed are ye that hunger now; for ye shall be filled. Blessed are ye that weep now; for ye shall laugh. . . . But wo unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. Wo unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Wo unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep." Luke vi. 20-25. Asaph says the wicked of his day had great "temporal felicity." "I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked. For there are no bands in their death: but their strength is firm. They are not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. . . . Their eyes stand out with fatness; they have more than heart could wish." Ps. lxxiii. 3-7.

Besides, what would the cardinal do with the first three centuries? Was there no true catholic Church until the days of Constantine? If there was, where was her "temporal felicity"? If there was not, neither the church of Rome, nor any other church can trace back her history to Christ and his apostles. During those three hundred years the church could say as Paul in his epistle to the Romans, "We are counted as sheep for the slaughter all the day long:" but this kind of "temporal felicity" cardinals do not relish.

If any should say that the cardinal is speaking of princes alone, and not of the common people, still his *mark* would not stand the test of either sacred or profane history. Did not king Josiah profess and adhere to the true religion? yet he was slain by Necho, king of Egypt. If any say, "yes, but this was before the days of Peter:" the reply is, that "temporal felicity" is no more promised under the New than the Old Testament. Besides, Bellarmine himself goes back to times preceding the birth of Christ, and cites the Maccabees, as cases of the prosperity of good princes, who defended the church. But has he forgotten that all the Maccabees lived in troublous times, and that three of them died violent deaths; Judas being slain while fighting Bacchides; Jonathan being slain by Tryphon, and Simon being murdered by Ptolemy, his own son-in-law?

As to grandeur, pomp, success, glory, all that makes up the cardinal's "temporal felicity" of princes, did not Tiglathpileser, Shalmaneser, and Nebuchodonosor outshine any of the kings of God's chosen people? Did not Julian the Apostate have a reign remarkable for its splendour? Were not Henry III. and Henry IV. of France assassinated? Was not Charles IX. of France sufficiently zealous in murdering Protestants, so that the Pope had great joy of him, and struck a medal to perpetuate the memory of the Bartholomew massacre? Did Charles have great "temporal felicity?" Did he triumph over his enemies? In a sense he did, but it was as the Bible says it shall be in such cases, "the triumph of the wicked is short." Voltaire tells us that his mental agonies, after his banishment of his subjects, forced the blood through the pores of his skin. His most christian majesty of Spain sent his armada against the heretical Elizabeth of England. Did he triumph over her? Has not Spain from that day been declining and England rising? James II. of England 'defended' mother Church, but he had to flee before his own son-in-law, and died in exile. Has there been great "temporal felicity" among the princes of Italy since the days of Bellarmine? Do they in our day outvie all the princes of the earth in the happiness of their condition? Is he of Naples very delightfully situated just now?

But the Pope is the great Catholic Prince, who defends the Church. He claims to be supreme among kings: has he a very large share of felicity? Has Pio Nono had a cup very full of sweets? Is he the happiest prince on earth just now, or at any time for the last three years? Were not many of his predecessors poisoned, or otherwise murdered by their own people?

The conclusion is inevitable, either that the cardinal's last, great mark of a Church is not a true mark, or that the Church of Rome is not the true Catholic Church.

W. S. P.

LABOUR FOR REST.

THERE is a *rest in heaven*; a rest for the body and the soul of weary, heavy-laden man; an end of bodily exertion and fatigue, of infirmity, effort, and weariness of mind. It is a release from the burden of an earthly organization; an extrication from the web of worldly relations, in which we are so interwoven by every hair of the head, that, Sampson-like, we must carry upon us the web-pin and the beam. It is a relief from the burden of care, which so often overloads this mortal life, and so often embitters even the pleasures of our natural affections. It is a rest from the sorrows of misfortune, of bereavement, of bodily disease, of mental gloom and dejection; from the painful consciousness of sin, its inward annoyance, its outward vexations, and the experience and the dread