

THE  
BALTIMORE LITERARY  
AND  
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

---

VOL. II.

OCTOBER, 1836.

No. 10.

---

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

As two more numbers will close this volume of the Magazine we would request those who wish their subscription to be stopped at that period, to inform us before that time of their desires, otherwise we shall consider them subscribers for the coming year.

The year begins with January. No subscription for less than a year.

No subscription discontinued but at the option of the publishers until arrears are paid.

Those of our subscribers whose subscriptions for the last year and the present remain unpaid, will confer a favour on the printers, by forwarding it by mail at our risk.

All letters not containing *remittances* must be POST PAID.

---

☞ This month we have omitted the usual Sermon, to make room for other matter.

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL;

BY RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

*Religious Anniversaries in London.—Delegations from the United States.—Exeter Hall.—Lord's-Day Society.—Bishop of London.—Tories.—Members of Parliament, and Clergymen at the Meeting.—Bishop of Chester.—Public expressions of feeling by the meetings.—Political Aspect.—Aristocratical Feasting.—General Profanation of the Sabbath.—Wesleyan Missionary Society.—Gentlemen on the platform.—Chairmen.—Speakers.—Incidents.—Labours of the Society.—Singular Interruption.—London Missionary Society.—Church Missionary Society.*

To an American Christian in London, during that period of the year at which it was my fortune to visit it for the first time, no object can be more interesting than the Spring meetings which are held annually there. These meetings extend over portions of April and June; and occupy nearly all the month of May. They are conducted in various ways, and celebrated in various parts of the city. Taken all together, they cover a great portion of that wide field, which the prevalence of sin, and misery in the world, gives to benevolence to expatiate in. The following list, though not perfect, contains above fifty services; and may help to furnish the reader with accurate ideas of the nature, extent, variety, and importance, of the operations which they were intended to illustrate, and commend to the Christian public.

*Here follows a list of the Public Anniversary Meetings of May, 1836. The time, and place of meeting; the name of the societies, and the preacher, or chairman on the occasion.*

Monday 2d, 10 morn.—Wesleyan Missionary Society.—Exeter Hall.—Sir O. Mosley, chairman.

Monday 2d, 6½ ev'g.—Church Missionary Society.—St. Bride's Church, Fleet Street.—Archdeacon Spooner, to preach.

Tuesday 3d, 11 morn.—Church Missionary Society.—Exeter Hall.—The Earl of Chichester, chairman.

Tuesday 3d, 6 ev'g.—Christian Instruction Society.—Finsbury Chapel, Moorfields.—John Labouchere, Esq., chairman.

Tuesday 3d, 6½ ev'g.—European Missionary Society.—National Scotch Church, Regent Square.—Rev. John Cumming, to preach.

Wednesday 4th, 11 morn.—British and Foreign Bible Society.—Exeter Hall.—Lord Bexley, chairman.

Wednesday 4th, 6 ev'g.—Metropolitan City Mission.—Exeter Hall.—Marquis of Cholmondeley, chairman.

Wednesday 4th, 6½ ev'g.—European Missionary Society.—Percy Chapel.—Rev. Edward Bickersteth, to preach.

Wednesday 4th, 6½ ev'g.—Prayer Book and Homily Society.—St. Dunstan's Church, Fleet Street.—Rev. Professor Scholefield, to preach.

Thursday 5th, 12 noon.—Prayer Book and Homily Society.—Exeter Hall (lower room).—Lord Bexley, chairman.

Thursday 5th, 6 ev'g.—London Hibernian Society.—St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row.—Rev. R. W. Sibthorp, to preach.

Thursday 5th, 6 ev'g.—Sunday School Union.—Exeter Hall.—Edward Baines, Esq., M. P., chairman.

Thursday 5th, 6 evg.—British and Foreign Sailors' Society.—City of London Tavern.—Lord Mountsandsford, chairman.

Thursday 5th, 6½ ev'g.—Home Missionary Society.—Weigh House Chapel, London Bridge.—Rev. James Stratten, to preach.

Thursday 5th, 6½ ev'g.—Trinitarian Bible Society.—Trinity Chapel, Conduit-St.—Rev. J. L. Galton, to preach.

Thursday 5th, 6½ ev'g.—Aged Pilgrims' Friend Society.—John Street Chapel, Doughty Street.—H. Pownall, Esq., chairman.

Thursday 5th, 6½ eve'g.—Society for Promoting Christianity among Jews.—Jews' Chapel, Cambridge Heath, Hackney.—Rev. Hugh Stowell, to preach.

Thursday 5th, 6½ ev'g.—British Reformation Society.—St. Clement Danes, Strand.—Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, to preach.

Friday 6, 12 noon.—Society for Promoting Christianity among Jews.—Exeter Hall.—Sir Thomas Baring, chairman.

Friday 6th, 6th ev'g.—Religious Tract Society.—Exeter Hall.—Marquis of Cholmondeley, chairman.

Saturday 7th, 11 morn.—London Hibernian Society.—Exeter Hall.—Marquis of Cholmondeley, chairman.

Saturday 7th, 12 noon.—Established Church Society.—Exeter Hall.—Lord Ashley, chairman.

Monday 9th, 11 morn.—London Itinerant Society.—Finsbury Chapel, Moorfields.—Rev. A. Fletcher, chairman.

Monday 9th, 12 noon.—British and Foreign School Society.—Exeter Hall.—Lord Morpeth, chairman.

Monday 9th, 12 noon.—Church Pastoral-Aid Society.—Exeter Hall.—Lord Ashley, chairman.

Monday 9th, 6 ev'g.—Congregational Union.—Weigh House Chapel, London Bridge, Introductory Devotional Service.

Tuesday 10th, 12 noon.—District Visiting Society.—Exeter Hall.— — chairman.

Tuesday 10th, 12 noon.—Naval and Military Bible Society.—Freemasons' Hall.—Marquis of Cholmondeley, chairman.

Tuesday 10th, 6 ev'g.—Church of Scotland Foreign Missions.—Exeter Hall.— — chairman.

Tuesday 10th, 6½ ev'g.—Irish Evangelical Society.—Finsbury Chapel.—Thomas Walker, Esq. chairman.

Tuesday 10th, 6½ ev'g.—Newfoundland School Society.—St. Dunstan's Church, Fleet Street.—Bishop of Chester, to preach.

Tuesday 10th, 6½ ev'g.—Moravian Missions.—St. Clement Danes, Strand.—Rev. W. Dalton, to preach.

Wednesday 11th, 10½ morn.—London Missionary Society.—Surry Chapel, Blackfriar's Road.—Rev. H. Grey, to preach.

Wednesday 11th, 12 noon.—Newfoundland School Society.—Exeter Hall.—Lord Bexley, chairman.

Wednesday 11th, 12 noon.—Protestant Association.—Exeter Hall.— — chairm.

Wednesday 11th, 6 ev'g.—London Missionary Society.—Tabernacle, Moorfields.—Rev. Dr. Redford, to preach.

Wednesday 11th, 6½ ev'g.—Church Pastoral-Aid Society.—St. Bride's Church, Fleet Street.—Rev. Hugh Stowell, to preach.

Thursday 12th, 10 morn.—London Missionary Society.—Exeter Hall.—Thomas Wilson, Esq. chairman

Thursday 12th, 6 ev'g.—Seamen and Soldiers' Friend Society.—City of London Tavern.——— chairman.

Thursday 12th, 6 ev'g.—London Missionary Society.—St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row.—Rev. Sanderson Robins, to preach.

Friday 13th, 12 noon.—British Reformation Society.—Exeter Hall.——— chairm.

Saturday 14th, 11 morn.—Protestant Association for Protection of Religious Liberty.—City of London Tavern.——— chairman.

Monday 16th, 11 morn.—London City Mission.—Exeter Hall.——— chairman.

Monday 16th, 6 ev'g.—British Voluntary Church Society.—Finsbury Chapel, Moorfields.—Edward Baines, Esq. M. P. chairman.

Tuesday 17th, 12 noon.—British and Foreign Temperance Society.—Exeter Hall.—Bishop of London, chairman.

Tuesday 17th, 1 after.—Trinitarian Bible Society.—Exeter Hall.—Rt. Hon. Thos. Erskine, chairman.

Tuesday 17th, 6 ev'g.—Home Missionary Society.—Exeter Hall.—Thos. Thompson, Esq. chairman.

Wednesday 18th, 10 morn.—Home Missionary Society.—Crown and Anchor Tavern, Strand.—Sale of Ladies' Work.

Wednesday 18th, 12 noon.—European Missionary Society.—Exeter Hall.—Hon. J. J. Strutt, chairman.

Wednesday 18th, 12 noon.—Irish Society of London.—Hanover Square Rooms.——— chairman.

Friday 20th, 12 noon.—Sailors' Home, and Destitute Sailors' Asylum.—Exeter Hall.——— chairman.

Tuesday 24th, 6 ev'g.—Book Society, (for promoting Religious Knowledge.)—King's Head Tavern, Poultry.—Thomas Challis, Esq. chairman.

Tuesday 31st, 12 noon.—Labourers' Friend Society.—Exeter Hall.——— chairm.

A slight inspection of this list, will show at once, that it is impossible to attend all these meetings;—for if there were no other obstacle it will be seen that several of them are held at the same hour. But the great length of many of them;—the great mental exhaustion resulting from excitement, long and intensely sustained;—together with a variety of minor reasons, which will be apparent in the course of the following statements;—make it neither desirable, nor possible,—nor indeed quite fair if it were both,—for the same audience to be present, at many of the anniversaries. Bearing commissions from four or five of the principal State Societies, in Maryland, with which my brethren and friends in Baltimore had kindly furnished me;—and from several other similar institutions, in other parts of the United States; to represent them in similar bodies in Britain; I was left less freedom of choice than I should otherwise have had. I am not aware that any facilities, are furnished by such credentials;—beyond what any clergyman from America would enjoy without them. Or if there be any, they are so slender compared with the trials and mortifications, into which the general subserviency to rank, and equally general indifference, if not disesteem towards America, which pervades most ranks of English society;—will certainly betray every American who is deputed to stand on an English platform, with English Prelates, and Lords, and Members of Parliament; that I am sure, no one who has once tried it, will be easily persuaded to try it again. I say this, and somewhat more, which I may add, on this subject for two reasons. The first is, to caution my brethren at home, against a very prevalent error. The second is, to direct attention to the subject here; if these lines should be so fortunate,

as to meet the eyes of those who commit, as well as of those who can remedy, the evils hinted at.

Making the best use of the circumstances in which I stood, and of the advice of judicious friends, our party made its selection of meetings to be attended. We determined to attempt one every day; and proceeded accordingly to get tickets for about a week in advance. Admittance in Exeter Hall, is exclusively by ticket; of which there are three kinds. One kind admits to the platform, which is nominally reserved for ministers, and would seat perhaps four hundred; but I have seen it decorated with ladies and deformed by boys. Another kind admits to the elevated seats, as they are called; that is about three quarters of the floor, commencing from the line, where the seats rise towards the end of the hall; and are occupied by *the public*. The third kind admits, to the raised, or reserved seats; which commencing at the same line with the foregoing,—rise towards the front, instead of the rear,—and are reserved for us,—as *all* who can get access to them, delight to say. The Hall itself is in the Strand; a plain, rectangular room, in the second story (as we should call it) of an edifice erected in 1830;—its length 136, its breadth 76 feet; and seated for 2500 persons, exclusive of the platform, a temporary gallery, the narrow aisles, and intolerable crowding. The aspect of the Hall, when full, is very imposing from any part of it; but from the broad platform elevated about eight feet and occupying one whole end of it, with a concave railing in front, the mass of human beings before you seems immense; and the peculiar construction of the seats, springing from a point in the floor, upwards both in front and rear, with elevated side seats, as they approach the wall,—gives an undulating surface, which rather increases the idea of vastness.

The first meeting I attended, was that of the Society for promoting the better observance of the Lord's day. It is not in the list now furnished, having preceded, as did several others, any mentioned in it. I got a ticket for the platform, went early, and had no difficulty in getting a good seat. Neither the hall nor platform was crowded; nor do I think the Society now celebrating its anniversary, is a public favourite. Though nominally Catholic, in its spirit and organization, as are most of the great associations of the day: yet like most of them in England,—it has gradually slid into the hands of a particular party. The very structure of society,—as well of the whole relation of religious sects in this country, apparently forbids, a cordial and sustained union of Christians for any, even the most catholic and simple operations. Following this general tendency, this society has fallen chiefly into the hands of a portion of the Church of England. At noon, the Lord Bishop of London took the chair, and commenced the exercises without any religious service, of any kind. His family name is Bloomfield; on which account he often is confounded, in America with the author of the *Critical Digest*; though this gentlemen's rank as a scholar is very high. He is a handsome, middle aged man; of moderate stature; quite bald; and wore a dark green surt-out, buttoned up, tight in the throat. At all their meetings, the chairman makes the first speech. On this occasion, it was all smooth—clever—and gentlemanlike; but there was nothing spe-

cial in it, except an allusion to a plan for the erection of fifty new Episcopal churches, in London,—which the bishop has proposed and has deeply at heart. When mentioned, it was loudly cheered,—I shall have occasion to speak of it, in another and more appropriate connection.

When the bishop's address was concluded; the secretary, did what I supposed he considered tantamount to reading—a long paper, which I was informed was the annual report. He was an elderly, and most respectable looking gentleman; and was listened to with apparent respect. After repeated attempts, in the exercise of fixed and painful attention, I was unable to catch the import of any single sentence; although I was within thirty feet of him, and could hear distinctly, every sound he uttered. Such tones—such intonations—such mouthing of words, beggars all description. These matters are to a certain degree national; and to that degree, I thought I had become somewhat familiarised. I was mistaken. This at least, I concluded, is unique and personal. I was mistaken again more egregiously than before. I affirm most seriously, that from the highest to the lowest society in England,—and from the most formal speech, down to the answers of shopmen,—I have had constant difficulty to understand what was said. I speak not now, of provincialisms; but of indistinct utterance, and monstrous tones.—And am now lead into these remarks, on account of their peculiar appropriateness, to several of the most prominent speakers, as well as the gentleman already referred to.

Amongst others, Sir Oswald Mosley, M. P., and Sir Andrew Agnew, M. P., Mr. Handle, M. P., Dr. Daltry,—the Rev. Mr. Benson, master of the temple, popular churchman, the Rev. Mr. Cubits, a Wesleyan,—and the Lord Bishop of Chester addressed the meeting. Mr. Harvie had very recently bestirred himself in the House of Commons, against Mr. O'Connell in relation to the Carlow election; in other words, O'Connell having bargained with some one, whose name I forget, to insure his election for the county of Carlow provided he would pay £1,000 in hand, and an equal sum when returned; the affair took wind,—was brought before Parliament—and Mr. O'Connell acquitted of bribery, which was the specific accusation. Mr. Harvie, became at once a favourite with the conservatives—which nearly all churchmen are,—and hence his presence here. He made the best speech I heard that day. The other members of parliament, were the mover and seconder of the bill for the Better observance of the Lord's day; which had been so contemptuously treated at a former session; and which was very shortly after the occasion now spoken of, rejected with every mark of contempt. Hence, very properly their presence now. Sir Andrew Agnew, is a very poor speaker, and said but little on this occasion. Sir Oswald Mosely, speaks pretty well, and spoke at some length—and about all sorts of things; giving a decidedly personal and political turn to the whole. He aluded several times (as Mr. Harvie, and Mr. Cubits did still more pointedly after him) to Mr. O'Connell; and was loudly cheered, at every stroke, and some of them were very loud. In the course of his speech, and in direct connection with a sort of an attack on

O'Connell for his latitudinarian sentiments on the subject of the Sabbath day; he produced quite a scene, by pulling out from his pocket, a recent bull, of the reigning pontiff, on the identical subject. The document was in the shape of a newspaper; printed in Italian, on a mammoth sheet; and dated ROME, February 18th, 1836. Sir Oswald did portions of it extempore, into very good English,—and narrated the progress of the whole affair—which is curious enough. For it seems that the universal and absolute desecration of the Sabbath day, at Rome, had become so dreadful, as to shock the sensibilities of the Pope himself; while the multiplied crimes, to which this state of things led, appealed to him as the temporal head of that city. Upon these and other equally cogent statements, all very well put in the decree; the pope proceeded to command, and did command, the theatres to be shut,—the markets to be closed—the inns to be allowed to serve only their regular daily customers—the shops to shut,—rioting to cease—and the Sabbath day to be truly and really kept as a rest in the eternal city. The detail was heard by us all, with the most profound astonishment. And it was with real sorrow, that when the denouement of the story came, we learned; that the decree had thrown the whole city of Rome into a ferment,—that it was received with universal execration, and not only openly resisted—but immediately canceled. So that after all, the rabble of the city of Rome appear to be the real visible head, of the holy, Roman, Catholic, and Apostolical church,—the practical expounders of faith and manners—infalibly for the human race. The whole affair is very strange. That the Pope of Rome—of all men in the world, should have true, and really evangelical notions on a subject most of all misunderstood by the world; when the world's delusion thereon, was created, and confirmed by the long continued heresies of the popes themselves, on the very subject,—is most singular. That he should spontaneously come forward with a plan of reform, when the same subject is engaging the labours of good men every where, is peculiar. And that, while his myrmidons, are making such great efforts every where else, he should be despised, at the foot of his throne: while he is mighty to do harm, in so many lands, he is impotent for any good, under the walls of his palace;—is perhaps strangest of all.

The only person not of the establishment who took part in the exercises, was the Rev. Mr. Cubits. I have before said he was a Wesleyan; and I have had many opportunities to perceive, the great and increasing desire on both sides, that the breach occasioned by John Wesley,—if it cannot be healed, should not at least be enlarged. This gentleman's speech was barely tolerable; and contained a most severe attack on the majority of the House of Commons,—many of whom he plainly and plumply denounced as beastly drunkards. Speaking of 'that ilk,'—led him, to narrate several pretty pointed temperance anecdotes,—which were rather dryly received. No wonder; for at that moment, several bottles of wine or spirits, were within six feet of him,—behind the seat of the chairman. This is very common: and even in cases where the bottles are excluded from the platform, they are very often introduced into an adjoining room, in which those per-

sons who are to take part in the proceedings of any particular meeting, assemble before it commences. If I should express an opinion, it would be, that none of the meetings use spirits; but that at very nearly all, wine is provided, either on the platform, or in the committee room adjoining.

The Lord Bishop of Chester (John Bird Sumner, D. D.) who besides his bishopric, has the rectory of Waverton, and a prebend's stall in the Cathedral church at Durham,—also made a speech, in no respect remarkable. He is universally respected, and considered an excellent man, and an Evangelical prelate. What is expected of such a person in the establishment, is made the more obvious, by my stating his preferments; which I have done above on that account; from whence it appears that he is a pluralist, holding at least two more preferments than any human being can properly perform the duties of—and deriving from the three probably from fifty to eighty thousand dollars a year;—while four or five thousand ministers in the same church, have no preferment at all, and utterly inadequate compensation for the duties they perform. I say this without the least intention to implicate this individual, in any thing which is here considered wrong in his sect,—or which is not more largely partaken of by his brethren, of equal rank with himself. I will not say of equal excellence; for I believe the public voice here, would say, that number was not large. He is a middle aged man, of slight figure,—with a Grecian face, and wears so much powder that I at first thought his hair was grey.—He was dressed now, and constantly on several other occasions when I saw him, in the costume of his order. The entire dress black,—the old fashioned buckled shoes;—knee breeches;—a Quaker coat;—and to crown all, a black silk apron! Bona fide,—neither more nor less—a black silk apron of the same shape and dimensions—and put on apparently in the same way as a blacksmith's leather apron!—I had never heard of this, and it put my manners, on several occasions, to a most severe trial. How wonderful it is—that superstition, at once so absurd and childish should keep its hold over enlightened minds?

The meeting lasted about four hours; and as it was the first, so it was the shortest, of any I attended. When it was about half over, the Bishop of London retired, and Sir A. Agnew, was called to the chair, amidst great applause. Both these events, are common. At nearly all the meetings, the chairman, and the first speakers leave the platform; and a new chairman, and other speakers generally to the number of eight or ten in all, succeed them. The expression of approbation and disapprobation is constant and boisterous. Hear! hear! they exclaim, when any thing strikes them;—hundreds at once, and at the top of their voices. They clap with their hands,—they stamp with their feet,—they beat the floor with canes and umbrellas,—they deliver themselves in short ejaculations—such as “no! no!”—‘shame’—“Oh!”—&c. &c. They all do it—every where—except in church on the Sabbath. Every where else, I have witnessed its performances, by all ages, sexes, and conditions. In religious meetings (so called,) it is not usual to express direct disapprobation. Sometimes however, it is not very evident what is meant; and sometimes their demonstra-

tions of impatience, are plain enough. I saw several instances, where gentlemen, were clapped down; one where a master of ceremonies interfered and privately asked a speaker to stop; several where the chairman interfered and stopped speakers; and once, where they hissed, or rather hallowed, a speaker down, by crying—"off, off, off."

If I entered this renowned hall with feelings of awe, and profound religious sensibility; I have very imperfectly conveyed to the reader the impressions made on my own mind—if he does not see how unlikely such feelings were to be cultivated or sustained in such circumstances as I have, faithfully, but very imperfectly described.

This meeting was very much more a political, than a religious one. It took place on Friday; and on Monday the leading Ministerial paper of London (the Morning Chronicle) had a violent attack upon the meeting,—and Sir Andrew's Sabbath day bill. In the same paper, was a communication, putting the subject in a very solemn light. It seems that the Monday following the meeting, being the first Monday in May was the day for the opening of the annual exhibition of the Royal Academy. As usual the annual dinner, is eaten on the preceding Saturday, which was the next day after the meeting described above. At that dinner 300 persons,—bishops, lords, officers of state, foreign ministers, gentlemen, artists &c. sat down about eight or nine o'clock, and caroused till about, or perhaps after midnight. The apartments where they dined in Somerset house,—were needed by the body on Monday. So that perhaps forty men and as many women, were employed all the fore part of the intervening Sabbath, in removing the relics, and effacing the memorials, of the reverend and noble festival. The Lord Bishop of London, who presided at our meeting, was a guest at this, in company with many of his reverend brethren. It is needless to say—the feast did more harm than the meeting did good. And nearly as much so to add that it is vain to attempt to sustain a healthy state of public sentiment on this all important subject, when all the fountains of influence are polluted. A large party in the House of Commons openly ridicule all ideas of a religious observance of the Sabbath; and there is now depending a struggle, commenced by Mr. Hume for keeping open the British Museum, on the Sabbath, as a place of public recreation. The principal nobleman and gentry—use the Sabbath as a day of feasting, and parade. And many of the most serious persons I met with in England, seemed to me, to have exceedingly vague and erroneous notions about the nature of those duties which the state can perform towards the just observance of the Sabbath, by all classes of persons. While some of their nominally religious newspapers, disparage the most commendable conduct of Sir A. Agnew—and prate about the pharisaical rigidity of the Scotch churches.

The second meeting I attended at Exeter Hall was that held up by the Wesleyan Missionary Society. I had been requested to take some part in the proceedings, and was called for at my lodgings, by the elder Mr. Entwistle, now Governor of the Theological Institution of the Wesleyans, at Hoxton near London. I met



no one in Britain, who interested me more than this venerable and most interesting gentleman; who for many years the friend and fellow traveller of Mr. Wesley,—for sixteen years president of the conference—and for above half a century a travelling preacher, now in a green old age, presents an inexpressibly delightful picture of Christian life fully matured. Under his guidance, by which I felt myself more honored, than I should have done by that of the King himself;—I entered the hall, and took a seat in one of those benches appropriated for the speakers, an hour before the time appointed for the commencement of the services. The body of the Hall had already been crowded for above an hour; and during two full hours, 3000 persons were willing to endure all the horrors, may I not call them, incident on such a state,—in preference to being excluded by the hundreds that would gladly have taken their places. The tedium was relieved by occasional singing of hymns; and loud greetings, to public favorites, as they entered. Amongst these, was the Hon. and Revd. Baptiste Noel. He seemed exceedingly embarrassed, by the applause with which he was greeted; and sinking down into the nearest seat, happened to get immediately behind me. I was introduced to him. He was the worst dressed man, I saw on the platform—both as to the *manner* and *matter* of his apparel. His features are thin and prominent; and his complexion, eyes and hair very light. The expression of his countenance is composed—and rather cold. He is one of the most popular preachers, in the evangelical part of the Church of England—and respected and beloved, by all who love Christ. This is the more worthy of remark—as it is the candid and upright character of the man, and the sincere and catholic spirit of the Christian, which giveth him his great influence with the Christian public; for all admit his abilities to be moderate. He is said to be openly and decidedly in favor of extensive and fundamental reforms, in the establishment;—and a few days after the occasion to which I now allude,—he delivered a speech, at the City Mission, which in defending the liberal course he pursues, in religion, reveals at once his own principles, and the tyrannical and audacious attempts made by the dominant party in his sect, to prevent the communion of saints, and the spread of the gospel of God. Immediately after Mr. Noel entered, an elderly man, very much wrapped up, and walking with difficulty, came in alone, and quietly took a seat; apparently not aware, that the bust of applause, and the spontaneous rising up, of multitudes of the assembly was meant for him. One taking his hand cordially, said “see, they are glad to see you”—and the old man put his thin hands, over his palid features, and burst into tears. “It is Mr. Gauter,” said my old friend, wiping his own eyes; “one of our oldest preachers. He has had a stroke of palsy, and we feared we should see him no more.” Such incidents go very far, to reconcile one to the extreme improprieties, of the public uproar at these meetings.

At eleven o'clock, Sir Oswald Mosely M. P. of whom I have said so much, took the chair. The Revd. Mr. Reese, now President of conference, whose immense figure cannot have been forgotten by any who saw him during his visit some years ago to America, gave out a hymn, with the singing of which, and a pray-

er by the Rev. Robert Newton the meeting was opened. The chairman as a matter of course made a speech; and as a matter of course also, left the meeting before it was half over. He was succeeded, by old Lord Mountsanford, who from a plain and almost superannuated captain in the navy, suddenly acquired his present rank, by the violent death of the preceding Lord Mountsanford, a lad at Eaton school. He in turn was succeeded by Sir Launcelot Haslope, as the third chairman of the meeting. I have in vain attempted to ascertain the real cause of this procedure; and after having heard a dozen inadequate reasons given for it, prefer to suggest none, as I cannot imagine one, that would account for so general an adherence, to so extraordinary a practice, without at the same time implicating all concerned, in a very unworthy symptom of trickery.

The reading of an abstract of the report occupied more than an hour and a half. It was excellently read by Dr. Bunting, chief secretary of the society—a stout, red faced, bold man; but reputed one of the ablest men of his day, and certainly a great favorite with his brethren, if we may judge by the enthusiastic cheering with which he was greeted, when he presented himself to read the report. The matter of the report too, was full of deep interest. And yet I agreed with the assembly who clapped when the Dr. said '*finally*'; for it was far too long for the occasion; a fault shared by all London societies, perhaps by all every where. It struck me too, as decidedly improper, that the whole of the report, especially of so long a one, should be read by a single secretary, where there were four of them—all present. This last fact, is also common here; though on several occasions, I witnessed a contrary proceeding.

It appeared from this abstract, that the society is in a state of great prosperity; and actively engaged in the missionary work in every quarter of the globe. In Europe, it has missionaries, in Ireland, Sweden, Germany, France, at Gibraltar, (whence a most effectual door, is already opened into Spain,) and in Malta. In Asia, their missions are established, in continental India, and on the Island of Ceylon. In the South Sea Islands, especially in the Friendly Islands, their efforts have been most signally owned of God. In Southern and Western Africa; in the West Indies; and in British America also,—their operations are extensive and increasing. Their stations in all these widely scattered regions, are unitedly 177, each one being generally the head of a circuit of towns and villages around. The missionaries, accredited ministers of the Methodist connexion number 270. They are assisted by 1660, catechists, local preachers, assistants, superintendents of schools, school masters and mistresses, and artizans, of whom 260 receive a moderate salary, and the remainder afford their services gratuitously. The members of societies under the care of the missionaries, (excluding Ireland) amount to about 54,000: and there are about an equal number, in the mission congregations who are not in society. If to these be added the number of individuals under school instruction, it will exhibit a total of more than 150,000 persons, who are directly receiving spiritual advantage by means of the society's missions. In Ceylon, in Southern Africa,

in Tongataboo, and in New Zealand the society has printing establishments. Translations of the Scriptures, and of various other works, have been made by the missionaries; by whom the gospel is preached in twenty different languages, to some of the most remote and barbarous nations of the earth. The ordinary income of the society for the preceding year, was stated at somewhat more than sixty thousand pounds sterling.

There were sixteen or seventeen speeches delivered during the meeting: one of which, was over an hour in length. Amongst the speakers were Sir Andrew Agnew M. P., Mr. Hardy M. P., Edward Baines Esq. M. P., for Leeds (the author of a voluminous History of the Wars of the French Revolution): Colonel Connolly M. P. for the county of Donegal in Ireland; Andrew Johnson M. P. for the University of St. Andrew's, in Scotland; Capt. Pakenham of the R. N., Rev. Mr. Waugh of Belfast; Rev. Dr. John Pye Smith; Rev. Mr. Shaw, former missionary to Caffraria, &c. &c. The five members of Parliament made just such speeches, as would naturally be looked for from men, who knew very little of what they had to speak about, and who had the particular resolutions they were to advocate put into their hands, perhaps some of them manufactured out and out, after they come on the platform. They were members of Parliament, and on 'that hint'—were spoken to. All of them, but one, were conservatives, and all but that one seemed to have a far more earnest desire to conciliate the Wesleyan body, and chain them to the Tory party, than to use the great occasion, for purposes of good, to a lost world. Their speeches were therefore full of the most gross flattery of the Wesleyan body, principles, politics, &c. &c.; and I sometimes smiled, and sometimes blushed, at the simple, undisguised, and cordial gusto, with which, it was all swallowed. Having discharged themselves of this "delightful duty" the privileged body, withdrew, like the light troops that fire and fall back; and left the regular work to be done, by other hands. It is extremely humiliating that Christian men, should participate in so wretched a subserviency to mere place and power; and not only connive at, but contrive, the making of their sacred places, arenas for the display, of some of the meanest and most selfish passions of men.

Of the remaining speeches, some were very happy, impromptu's—short,—pointed and clever;—others equally the reverse—lame,—drawing and meaningless. There were two of very considerable length, which demand some more special notice; and for directly opposite reasons. A Mr. Waugh, a Wesleyan preacher from Ireland—delivered a harangue of an hour's length, which for the irrelevancy and unsuitableness of its contents—and the extreme vulgarity of its manner—exceeded any thing I have witnessed. He was a handsome,—well dressed—dark complexioned—pert looking little man who was received very cordially—and from whom great things seemed to be expected, by others as well as himself. He commenced at the very top of his voice,—got out of breath—stopped, panted—re-commenced—raved away, stopped again, and very deliberately peeled and eat an orange—and resumed and finished his melange. He told anecdotes of Ireland—the interest of one of which turned on his getting into a bag; a second on a goat's

getting into a cabin before him; a third on the unprecedented generosity of a peasant, who at the bidding of his wife, piloted him several miles, in the dark, without any compensation. The argumentative part of the oration, went to prove the ancient civilization and refinement of the Irish nation; which he established no doubt to his own satisfaction from, scraps of ancient laws regarding the preservation of timber now extinct; and scraps of evidence going to show, that the working of coal mines, was of great antiquity in that kingdom.—And yet the speech was received with every mark of favour!

I recall with very great delight, the only remaining address delivered at this meeting of which I will speak. The Revd. William Shaw, was introduced by Dr. Bunting, in the most kind and flattering manner to the meeting. "It is not too much to say"—said he "that he is the apostle to the Caffres, amongst whom he has spent thirteen years." And the vast assembly responded to the statement, by a burst of feeling so unanimous, and sustained—that the meek spirited missionary—lost for a moment all power of utterance.—He then commenced, and for nearly an hour, delivered one of the most simple, modest and delightful narratives,—mixed up with some of the most enlarged views both as a philosopher and Christian—and enforced by several of the happiest appeals, I have ever heard attempted. As a mere speech, it was worth all the rest, delivered on this occasion; and seeing stenographers present, I anticipated the pleasure of possessing a good report of it. I had not then discovered that this is not usually attempted except in the cases of a few very popular speakers—and *all titled ones*.—The rise of the Caffer war—provoked by the British authorities in Africa,—the noble and steadfast confidence of the Caffers in the missionaries;—the ruin of the stations and the turning back of the cause of God, through the passions of wicked men; were clearly laid open. The mode of instructing, a barbarous people; the formation of letters; and the teaching of them for the first time, with the manner and effects of their reception; the first inculcation of the great truths of the Bible, upon an acute, thoughtful, and yet barbarous people, with details of their inquiries,—involving some of the most profound and dark questions of moral and metaphysical philosophy,—were powerfully illustrated. And the detail of his own difficulties, as to the path of duty—was closed with a stroke of real eloquence, that thrilled the whole assembly. It appears, that in the difficulties which have arisen in the Wesleyan body in England, within a few years, and which threaten great ills to it—some who took offence at the conference, suggested as a means of coercing them to terms, the stopping of the supplies of money—embracing, as Mr. Shaw understood those for the missionaries. Being a man with a family—just on the eve of his return to his station in Africa—this threat awakened his attention—excited his alarm—made him waver—and for a time defer his voyage. At length he had resolved to go—in defiance of the threat—and the question was, is the Wesleyan body worthy of this heroic confidence! He did not ask if they were; he said he was sure—for he felt that they were! And appealing first to the mighty mass before him—and then turning quite round and appealing to the five

hundred ministers, and leading men, on the platform—he laid the case upon them with inexpressible pathos. He was responded to, by one long continued and universal burst of enthusiasm.—It was a glorious moment.—

Very extraordinary incidents sometimes occur at the meetings in Exeter hall. On one occasion, the plates were robbed, of a considerable sum of money collected at a meeting,—in the very act of pronouncing the benediction,—and the thief never discovered. During the progress of the last meeting I have been speaking of, two were standing in a dense crowd, near the main entrance, quite within the area of the hall and not far from the platform, commenced fighting each other with their fists. It excited of course a considerable commotion in the immediate vicinage of the combatants; which began to spread—and one or two voices cried out “fight” “fight.” Sir Oswald Mosley who was in the chair—rose, and really misunderstanding, or affecting to misunderstand what was going on, proceeded to say—that he hoped the cry of “fire”—would disturb no one, &c. &c! The hint was taken; order restored; and the thing passed off. On enquiry for the cause of the affray—which was palpable, and pretty severe; some said one thing, some another; but the greater part seemed to agree, that one of the parties had charged the other with an attempt to pick his pocket—or caught him in the fact. I did not learn whether Mrs. Trollop, Capt. Hall, or Mr. Abdy were either parties or spectators of the rencountre.

Every American clergyman will understand the hint I have already given of what he may expect, on a British platform; when I say that having been most kindly treated, and pressed beforehand to take a resolution at this meeting—I attended in considerable bodily weakness—sat six hours—heard nine speakers (exclusive of the chairman and secretary)—and then when compelled from physical and mental exhaustion, to leave the platform—was pressed to stay; with an assurance that my resolution would pretty soon be prepared! I fully believe that not the least unkindness or intentional disrespect was meant; and so thinking apologised for being obliged to retire. The whole explanation I am sure was, first that I was only an American, and a Republican,—and secondly that more churchmen and members of Parliament than were expected having attended—one of them got my resolution.

Before closing this account I will briefly refer to two other great foreign missionary organizations, which have their seat in London, and which held annual meetings shortly after those described already. I allude to the Church Missionary Society, and London Missionary Society; both of which was prevented by sickness from attending. But I think it important to say a few words of each.

The London Missionary Society held this year its forty second anniversary. Its entire income for the past year was above fifty-five thousand pounds sterling. Its missions are in the East Indies—in India beyond the Ganges,—the South Seas, Russia,—various parts of the Mediterranean coasts—South Africa—African islands, and West Indies. There are in all 272 stations and out stations; 111 ordained missionaries; and 223 male assistants of various kinds.

There are 74 missionary churches; 5,239 communicants; 450 school masters; 29,601 scholars. As I shall again have occasion to speak of this noble institution, it is at present only necessary to say, that it is supported, by three or four denominations of Christians; the immense majority however are Dissenters, and the bulk of them at present Congregationalists.

The Church Missionary Society, belongs exclusively to the Episcopal establishment. It held this year its 36th annual meeting. Its income for last year is reported as exceeding sixty-eight thousand pounds; which is hardly equal to one year's income and perquisites of the two English Archbishops. The missions of the society are in the Mediterranean, South Africa, the East Indies, Egypt, Abyssinia, New Holland—and the South Sea Islands. I have not been able to ascertain either the number of their stations, churches, missionaries, church members, schools or pupils. Last year 10 ordained persons and 5 catechists, in all 15 persons, were sent into the foreign field, which is about one to every thousandth minister in the establishment. Considering that these brethren claim to be the only true church on earth—they ought to make a fairer distribution of their gifts, than is imported in this statement.—Else the world will be obliged to conclude, that it is better for the heathen to get the gospel without "*the succession*"—than abide much longer in the double destitution of them both.

---

NO FAITH WITH HERETICS.

*Dispensing with Oaths—Keeping of them, Perjury—Bull of Clement XI.*

It is hard to find the doctrine of the Roman church, when you let a Jesuit Priest be its expounder or defender. One time he will give it in a council, at another in a pope and council, at another in the supreme pontiff. When we poor ignorant heretics find it in all three,—taught in one or two councils, confirmed by another, which is so general that every bishop, priest, and layman, swears to believe and obey it; and then again declared by a pope, to whom every Roman Catholic promises and swears true obedience, it seems as if it might possibly be true and binding. If we can find such confirmation for a doctrine, it may require a little Jesuitical cunning to get rid of it.

The doctrine which we will try to fix upon the holy mother is as follows: "*That it is not unlawful to break faith with heretics; but, the duty of all good Roman Catholics, no matter how they have bound themselves, to break such oath for the good of the church.*"

Our first reference shall be to the decree of the 19th Sess. of the Council of Constance. "This present synod declareth, that by whatsoever safe conduct, granted by the emperor, kings or other secular princes, to heretics, or such as are defamed for heresy, no prejudice can arise, no impediment can, or ought to be put to the Catholic faith, or other ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but that *notwithstanding the said safe conduct*, it may be lawful for any competent or ecclesiastical judge to enquire into the errors of such persons, and duly otherwise proceed against them, so far as justice shall re-

quire, if they shall pertinaciously refuse to revoke their errors; *yea though they come to the place of judgment, relying upon such safe conduct, and would not otherwise come thither*; nor doth he who so promiseth, remain obliged in any thing having done what lies in him."\* John Huss trusted to this promise of being kept safe, and it cost him his life. He being burned to death in spite thereof.—Another section of the sentence against Huss, reads as follows:—"This holy synod of Constance, declares that the church of God could not do otherwise, than leave John Huss to the secular judgment, and decrees that he should be left to the secular arm."†

The *second* is from the Council of Lateran, under Alexander III. in which it is taught, "*That they are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries, which are against the interests of the church, and the appointments of the holy fathers.*"‡

None of the above decrees were revoked by the last general Council of Trent, but their doings all approved and sealed up by its decisions to be the doctrines of the church forever. A declaration to which effect is embodied in the creed in the following words. "I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined and declared by the sacred canons, and general councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent," &c. This profession is again confirmed on oath.

The exposition and declaration of the above doctrine set forth fully, will be found in the bull of *Clement XI.* to Charles VI. of Spain. Those who read history will remember that through the courage and skill of *Gustavus Adolphus*, and the spirit he infused in his successors, and after a war of thirty years in Germany a treaty was agreed upon in which the Lutherans had their religious rights secured to them. This was called the peace of *Westphalia*, which took place in 1648. Then in 1697 was peace ratified at *Ryswick*. In 1707, the treaty of *Alt-Randstadt*. By an article in the treaty of *Utrecht*, all things were settled concerning religion, according to the treaty of *Westphalia*.—Now let us have the pope's exposition of a treaty, when that treaty is to save the lives, and grant the privilege of worshipping God, to Protestants.

"To our most beloved son in Christ, Charles, the Catholic king of the Spains, the illustrious king of Hungary and Bohemia, elected to be emperor of the Romans; *Clement XI.* pope.

"Our most dear son in Christ, health and apostolical benediction.

\*Præsens sancta Synodus ex quovis salvo conductu per Imperatorem, reges et alios seculi principes, hæreticis vel de hæresi diffamatis, putantes eosdem sic a suis erroribus revocare, quocumque, se vinculo obstrinxerint, concesso, nullum fidei Catholicæ vel jurisdictioni Ecclesiasticæ præjudicium generari, vel impedimentum præstari posse seu debere declarat, quo minus dicto salvo-conductu non obstante, liceat judici competenti et Ecclesiastico, de hujusmodi personarum erroribus inquirere, et alias contra eos debite procedere, eosdemque, punire, quantum justitia suadebit, si suos errores revocare pertinaciter recusaverint, etiamsi de salvo conductu confisi ad locum venerint judicii alias non venturi; nec sic promittentem, cum fecerit quod in ipso est, ex aliquo remansisse obligatum."—*Concil: Constan: Sess. 19. p. 1075. Tom, VII.—Concil p. 2. ed. Binii. and Bzov. in Baron.—Vol. XV.—441 page.*

†"Hæc sancta Synodus Constantiensis Johannem Hus, attento quod Ecclesia Dei non habeat ultra quod gerere valeat, judicio seculari relinquere, et ipsum curiæ seculari relinquendum fore decernit."—*Sess. 15. p. 1056. Bzov. in Baron. XV. 426 page.*

‡Non dicenda sunt juramenta, sed potius perjuria, quæ contra utilitatem Ecclesiasticam, et sanctorum patrum veniunt instituta. *Cap. 19. p. 558 tom 3. pars 2. Binii. ed. 1618.*

“The many and zealous endeavors which we know to be incessantly exerted by heterodox princes, in the treaties opened at Utrecht, that whatsoever was added to the fourth article of the pacification of Ryswick in favour of the Catholics and the orthodox faith, should be wholly abrogated; and that, on the contrary, the heads of the peace of Westphalia relating to the affair of religion, which were not only formerly condemned by this holy see, but likewise corrected by the said fourth article of Ryswick, should be reinstated, and carried into execution (concerning which we lately wrote to your majesty at large), recall to our memory *those unhappy and never-enough-to-be-lamented covenants*, which, plainly, with the same design of bringing the Abomination into the Holy Place, the Plenipotentiaries or Commissaries of *Sweden* no less violently than unjustly extorted from the Plenipotentiaries or Commissaries of your brother, the late Emperor *Joseph* of famous memory, and which were entered into by the said Commissaries on each part in the year 1707, in the camp at *Alt Ranstadt*. The great grief with which we were then affected, when we considered with ourselves, that, beside other most grievous detriments brought upon the Catholic religion and the ecclesiastical jurisdictions, by those covenants, so remarkable a number of churches, as well in the three Duchies of *Lignitzberg*, and *Munsterberg*, as in the city of *Wratislaw*, and in the other principalities of *Silesia*, should be torn off and taken away from the true worship of God, and delivered up and assigned to the impiety of an execrable sect, is now chiefly not only renewed, but in a greater measure augmented, and become more intense, while we reflect and foresee how great hope the heretics will derive from thence of perfecting the rest of their wicked machinations and counsels. Moreover, although we are certain that it is no secret to your majesty how averse your said brother was to the covenants above-mentioned; how greatly he grieved that, because of the difficulties in which his affairs were involved, he was obliged to accept of those hard and plainly impious conditions, and how earnestly he desired to repair and make good by proper remedies whatsoever had been corruptly transacted, all which he expressly signified to us by letters written with his own hand, and still more amply and clearly explained more than once to our beloved son Annibal Cardinal of Albano, of the holy Roman church, our nephew, by the father’s side, according to the flesh then residing with him as our agent; and although we can by no means doubt but that your majesty, *from your eminent piety, and the affection you bear to the cause of God and the church, perfectly understands and acknowledges that such covenants HAVE BEEN AND ARE WHOLLY VOID, and, in their own nature, of no force or effect, as your brother, being admonished by us, openly acknowledge and professed, and, on that account, also fully perceives that no regard ought to be paid to them, and that they neither can nor ought to be alledged or observed by any person or in any manner whatsoever; yet, as well that it may more plainly and openly appear to your majesty, what always has been and still is our judgment in that matter, as that your majesty, being more substantially supported by our apostolical decision, may with more alacrity utterly despise the beforementioned conventions, and esteem them as if they had never*



been made; WE, by these presents, denounce to your majesty, and at the same time, by the authority committed to us by the most omnipotent God, declare the before-mentioned covenants of the treaty of Alt-Ranstadt, and *every thing contained in it which are in any wise obstructive of, or hurtful to, or which may be said, esteemed, pretended, or understood, to occasion or to bring or to have brought, the least prejudice to, or any ways to hurt, or to have hurt, the Catholic faith, divine worship, the salvation of souls, the authority, jurisdiction, or any rights of the church whatsoever, together with all and singular matters which have followed, or may at any time hereafter follow from them, to be, and to have been, and perpetually to remain hereafter, de jure null, vain, invalid, unjust, reprobated, void, and evacuated of all force and effect from the beginning, and that no person is bound to the observation of them, or any of them, ALTHOUGH THE SAME HAS BEEN REPEATEDLY RATIFIED OR SECURED BY AN OATH; and that they neither could nor ought to have been, nor can or ought to be, observed by any person whatsoever; and that no right, action, title, colour of title, cause of possession or prescription, is or hath been acquired from them, much less may be acquired or accrue by any length of time; and that they create or have created no estate or quality, but that they ought for ever to be accounted as if they had never issued, and as if they were not extant, nor had ever been made. And nevertheless, for the greater caution, and so far as may be necessary, we disapprove rescind, cassate, make void, annul, and totally discharge of all force and effect, all the aforesaid Covenants, and all other the premises enumerated in these presents which are prejudicial as offoresaid.* Wherefore, our most dear Son in Christ, attend, and wholly rejecting all Covenants of this kind, and rescinding every thing which has in any manner been done towards the execution of them, valiantly defend the cause of the Church, of Religion, and of God; and from that Patronage take the omen of an happy beginning of the government you have undertaken. Make it appear that you are thoroughly persuaded that the chief part you have to act, agreeably to the Majesty of the Empire to which you are elevated, consists in strenuously maintaining the Rights of the Faith and of the Church, which the most religious and renowned Emperors your Ancestors studied to assert and amplify with all their might. So will you derive upon your name everlasting Praise and Glory, and secure to yourself and your august House the blessings of Heaven more and more, as an earnest of which we most lovingly impart to your majesty our Apostolical Benediction, accompanied with a perpetual Prayer for your Felicity. Given at St. Peter's in Rome, under the Ring of the Fisherman, the 4th day of June 1712, and in the twelfth year of our Pontificate."

Here we have a general council of Lateran, teaching that the keeping of oaths when contrary to the interests of the church, is *perjury*. The council of Constance, practically acting upon the same, and burning a man to whom the faith and safe conduct of an Emperor had been given; then we have the last council of Trent conforming and approving of all, and all Catholics swearing to do likewise.—Then a Pope teaching largely the whole doctrine.—With these proofs in his face can any man say it is not a doc-

trine of the Catholic church, "*That no faith is to be kept with heretics.*"

Every one who has read Pascal Letters, or the Secret Instructions of the Jesuits must have learned something of the value they put upon truth, when the whole system of doctrine is to teach men to deceive, and lie with easy consciences. Comment on this doctrine appears needless; and surely it is vain and foolish to trust or believe men who believe it lawful and right to break their oaths with heretics for the good of the Holy Mother Church.

From age to age the Catholic church has practised upon this doctrine, to Protestants they have made professions of kindness, and then in an unexpected hour, robbed and murdered them. The history of the Papacy is one constant history of violated oaths. What better could we expect, when it is so fully, clearly and decidedly taught as a doctrine of the church?

---

#### CONQUEST OF IRELAND.

*The conquering of Ireland, and bringing its inhabitants in subjection to the Papacy by Henry II. of England, under commission of Pope Adrian IV.*

EVERY Roman Catholic that can trace his descent from Irish parentage, is wont to glory in the preservation of the Catholic faith, in his mother country. Not only its prevalency, but its antiquity is the subject of his boast. He has at least been taught by his fathers, and they by their priests, that Ireland was always the land of the church. The impression has become general that it is true, few will dare to question it. In a papist it would be almost sacrilege.

The only way of arriving at the truth is by examining what history—popish history has to say on the subject. It will be interesting to many of our reader to be furnished with an item of history on this point which we came across some time since in *Baronius's History*. (Vol. XII. page 458, year 1159.) "Bull of Adrian IV. to Henry II. of England, for bringing Ireland in subjection to St. Peter, and paying the Peter's Pence."

#### ADRIAN,

*Servant of the servants of God, to his son in Christ Jesus, Henry, king of England, sends greeting and apostolical benediction.*

THE desire your magnificence expresses to advance the glory of your name on earth, and to obtain in heaven the prize of eternal happiness, deserves, no doubt, great commendations. As a good Catholic prince, you are very careful to enlarge the borders of the church, to spread the knowledge of the truth among the barbarous and ignorant, and to pluck up vice by the roots in the field of the Lord: and in order to this you apply to us for countenance and direction. We are confident therefore, that by the blessing of the Almighty, your undertaking will be crowned with success suitable

to the noble motive which sets you upon it. For whatever is taken in hand from a principle of faith and religion, never fails of succeeding. It is certain, as you yourself acknowledge, that Ireland, as well as all other islands which have the happiness of being enlightened by the sun of righteousness, and have submitted to the doctrines of Christianity, are unquestionably St. Peter's rights, and belong to the jurisdiction of the Roman church. We judge therefore, after having maturely considered the enterprize you have proposed to us, that it will be proper to settle in that island colonies of the faithful, who may be well-pleasing to God.

You have advertised us, most dear son in Christ, of your design of an expedition into Ireland, to subject the island to just laws, and to root out vice, which has long flourished there. *You promise to pay us out of every house a yearly acknowledgement of one penny and to maintain the rights of the church, without the least detriment or diminution upon which promise,* GIVING A READY EAR TO YOUR REQUEST, we consent and allow that you make a descent on that island, in order to enlarge the bounds of the church, to check the progress of immorality, to reform the manners of the natives, and to promote the growth of virtue and the Christian religion. We exhort you to do whatever you shall think proper to advance the honour of God and the salvation of the people, whom we charge to submit to your jurisdiction, and to own you for their sovereign Lord; *provided always that the rights of the church are inviolably preserved and the Peter-pence duly paid.* If therefore you think fit to put your design in execution, labour above all things to improve the inhabitants of the island in virtue. Use both your own and the endeavours of such as you shall judge worthy to be employed in this work, that the church of God be enriched more and more, that religion flourish in the country, and that the things tending to the honour of God and salvation of souls be in such manner disposed, as may entitle you to an eternal reward in heaven, and an immortal fame upon earth."

The original Latin will be found as above mentioned. From the internal evidence contained in this Bull, it must be manifest to every reader, that Ireland until this time had not been brought under the Roman church; they had never yielded obedience to the pope. The religion of Rome was not the religion of Ireland, and could not become such until some son of the church would carry his victorious army into her midst. Under the army of Henry, Ireland was brought into subjection to England and the pope.

In the year 1159, the command was issued to convert the Irish to the Roman church, by fire and sword. How much this mode of converting men is like his whose kingdom was not of this world! How much the weapons like those holy Apostles, whose only (infallible) successors they profess to be! How well this Bull of Adrian comports with the language of the Apostle. "THE WEAPONS OF OUR WARFARE, ARE NOT CARNAL."—(2 Cor. 10. 4.)

## POPISH DOCTRINES.

*Power of the Pope making vice virtue, &c.*

"If the Pope should err in enjoining the practice of vice, or preventing the observance of virtue, still *the church is bound to believe vice to be virtue, and virtue vice, unless she would sin against conscience.*

Si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.—Bellarmine on the Roman Pontiff, book iv. cap. 5, page 304; Paris ed. 1605.

*Priests forgive sins.*

"The power with which the priests of the new law are invested, is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but as the minister of God really to absolve from sin." Catechism of the council of Trent, Baltimore 1833, page 242.

*Priests to be worshipped as God.*

"In the minister of God, who sits in the tribunal of penance as his legitimate judge, HE VENERATES THE POWER AND PERSON of our Lord Jesus Christ; for in the administration of this, as in any of the other sacraments, THE PRIEST REPRESENTS THE CHARACTER and DISCHARGES THE FUNCTIONS OF JESUS CHRIST." Page 242 cat.

*No matter how wicked—the same reverence due.*

"However wicked and flagitious, it is certain that they still belong to the church; and of this the faithful are frequently to be reminded, in order to be convinced that, *were even the lives of her ministers TO BE DEBASED BY CRIME, they are still within her pale, and therefore LOSE NO PART OF THE POWER with which her ministry invests them.*" Pages 94, 95, cat.

Comment.—A drunken, lying, swearing, cheating, and gambling priest, has the power of Jesus Christ, and can forgive sins and is to be venerated as the person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

*Pope's power of disposing temporal good.*

"Although the Pope, as Pope, has no direct temporal power, yet for the spiritual good, *has the power of disposing of the temporal goods of all Christians.*"

"Pontificem ut Pontificem, etsi non habeat ullam merè temporalem potestatem, tamen habere in ordine ad bonum spirituale summam potestatem disponendi de temporalibus rebus omnium Christianorum."—Bellarmine de Romano Pontifico. Lib. V. cap. VI.—1. vol. 887 & '8 pages.

*Spiritual power must control the temporal.*

"The spiritual power does not interfere in temporal matters, but suffers all things to go on as they were accustomed, provided, they do not oppose (or hinder) the spiritual design, or are not necessary to its furtherance. But if any such thing happen, the spiritual power can and *ought* to compel the temporal power, by every possible way, which shall be seen necessary to attain it."

"Itaque spiritualis non se miscet temporalibus negotiis, sed sinit

omnia procedere, sicut antequam essent conjunctæ, dummodo non obsint fini spirituali, aut non sint necessaria, ad eum consequendum. Si autem tale quid accidat, spiritualis potestas potest et debet coercere temporalem omni ratione ac via, quæ ad id necessaria esse videbitur."—Page 888, last sec. of page.

*Popes may change kingdoms and depose rulers.*

"The Pope, as Pope, cannot, ordinarily depose temporal princes, although there be just cause, in the same manner in which he deposes bishops, that is. as an ordinary judge; *yet he may change kingdoms, and take away from one, and bestow upon another, as supreme spiritual prince, if it be necessary to the salvation of souls.*"

(*Quantum ad personas.*) "Non potest Papa, ut Papa, ordinare temporales principes deponere etiam justa de causa, eo modo quo deponit episcopos, id est tanquam ordinarius judex: tamen potest mutare regna, et uni auferre, atque alteri conferre, tanquam summus princeps spiritualis, si id necessarium sit ad animarum salutem, ut probabimus."—Page 889.

*He may enact and abolish civil laws.*

"The Pope, as Pope, cannot ordinarily make civil laws, or confirm or annul the laws of princes, because he is not political head of the church; *yet he can do all this, if any civil law may be necessary to the salvation of souls, and kings are unwilling to enact it;—or if any civil law may endanger the salvation of souls and kings will not abrogate it.*"

(*Quantum ad leges.*) "Non potest Papa, ut Papa ordinarie condere legem civilem, vel confirmare, aut infirmare leges principum, quia non est ipse princeps ecclesiæ politicus: tamen potest omnia illa facere, si aliqua lexcivilis sit necessaria ad salutem animarum; et tamen Reges non velint eam condere; aut si alia sit noxia animarum saluti, et tamen Reges non velint eam abrogare."

*He can assume temporal judgment.*

"The Pope cannot as Pope ordinarily judge in temporal things. Nevertheless, in any case, in which it is necessary to the salvation of souls, the pope can *assume also temporal judgment*, for instance, when there is no one who can act as judge, as when two independent kings contend, or when those who can and ought to judge, are unwilling to give their opinion."

(*Quantum ad judicia.*) "Non potest Papa, ut Papa ordinariè judicare de rebus temporalibus. At nihilominus in casu, quo id animarum salutem necessarium est, potest Pontifex assumere etiam temporalia judicia, quando nimirum not est ullus, qui possit judicare, ut cum duo Reges supremi contendunt, vel quando qui possunt, et debent judicare, non volunt sententiam ferre."—Page 889.

*Pope superior to the civil power.*

"*The civil power, is subject to the spiritual*, when each part is of the same Christian republic, therefore the spiritual prince can command temporal princes and dispose of temporal goods in order to the spiritual good. For every superior can command his inferior."

"Potestas civilis, subjecta est potestati spirituali, quando utraque pars est ejusdem reipublicæ Christianæ, ergo potest princeps

spiritualis imperare principibus temporalibus, et disponere de temporalibus rebus in ordine ad bonum spirituale. Omnis enim superior imperare potest inferiori."—Page 889.

*Not lawful to tolerate a Protestant ruler.*

"It is not lawful for Christians (Catholics) to tolerate an infidel king, or an heretical one, if he endeavours to draw his subjects into his heresy, or infidelity; but to judge whether a king draws his subjects to heresy or not, belongs to the Pontiff, to whom is committed the care of religion: therefore it is the part of the Pope to judge whether or not a king is to be deposed."

(*Tertia ratio.*) "Non licet Christianis tolerare Regem infidelem, aut hæreticum, si ille conetur pertrahere subditos ad suam hæresim, vel infidelitatem; at judicare, an Rex pertrahat ad hæresim, necne, pertinet at Pontificem, cui est commissa cura religionis: ergo Pontificis est judicare, Regem esse deponendum, vel non deponendum."—Page 891.

*Heretics not to be tolerated.*

"When the question is, whether heretics, thieves, and other wicked men are to be EXTIRPATED, it is always to be considered, according to the purpose of the Lord, whether it can be done without injury of the *good* (Catholics,) and if indeed it can be done, THEN WITHOUT DOUBT THEY ARE TO BE EXTIRPATED; but if it cannot be done, because they are not sufficiently known, and there is danger of injuring the innocent instead of the guilty; OR THEY BE STRONGER THAN US, AND THERE IS DANGER IF WE MEET THEM IN BATTLE, THAT MORE MAY FALL AMONG US THAN AMONG THEM; in such case we should be quiet."

*Lib. 3, cap. 22. de Laicis.*—Cum autem quæstio est, vel de Furibus, vel de Aliis malis; An sint extirpandi; semper considerandum est, juxta rationem Domini, an id possit fieri sine detrimento bonorum, et si quidem potest fieri, sunt procul dubio exterpendi: si autem non potest, quia vel non sunt satis noti, et periculum est ne plectantur innocentes pronocentibus, vel sunt fortiores nobis, et periculum est ne si eos bello aggrediamur, plures ex nobis cadant, quam illis; tunc quiescendum est.

*Catholic church claims power over the world.*

"Heretics and Schismatics, because they have separated from the church, belong to her only, as deserters belong to the army from which they have deserted. IT IS NOT HOWEVER TO BE DENIED, THAT THEY ARE STILL SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE CHURCH, INASMUCH AS THEY ARE LIABLE TO HAVE JUDGMENT PASSED ON THEIR OPINIONS, TO BE VISITED WITH SPIRITUAL PUNISHMENTS AND DENOUNCED WITH ANATHEMA." The translator has added the word *spiritual*, in the original there is no word for it, (*puniantur*,) literally it is to be punished and condemned with anathema.

Hæretici, atque Schismatici, quia ab ecclesia deciverunt; neque enim illi magis ad ecclesiam spectant, quam transfugæ ad exercitum pertineant; a quo defecerunt. Non negandum tamen, quin in ecclesiæ potestate sint, ut qui ab ea in iudicium vocantur, puniantur, et anathemate damnentur.—Cat: page 94.

*Our thoughts are read in Heaven.*

An old writer says "*our thoughts are read in Heaven.*" Can it be true, that angels and glorified spirits on high, see and know our thoughts? Do they look down from their high abode, and lofty employment, to concern themselves with the doings of men? Do they stop their golden harps, or cease their glorious songs of praise, to mind the things of earth? Ah, No! They *cease not*, day and night, giving glory to him who sits upon the throne, and adoring the Lamb that was slain, to redeem sinners from sin and hell. There are things belonging to us which *they desire to look into*;—even the great mystery of our salvation. They may however gaze upon us here; they may know and feel for us, they are given as ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation, and they cannot minister without feeling for, or knowing something of us. They may then know our thoughts, and thus they will be read in Heaven.

The idea is indeed glorious, to the child of God. The holy angels on high—the redeemed from the earth, are looking down on us, seeing our conflicts, our temptations, our dangers, and as we are in danger of being overcome by some evil spirit (*how glorious the thought!*) a holy angel wends his way, from the throne, and his holy service, to minister unto, and strengthen us. How delightful—how cheering to the Christian that his thoughts, his every act can be seen by those holy beings, and a deep interest taken in his welfare. We have friends above, if we are friends to Jesus. He is our friend, all the redeemed in heaven are our friends.

Whether those heavenly beings of themselves can see and understand our ways and our thoughts is not material. They are ready to come as messengers to the followers of Christ, and were we able to see, we might find many a case similar to that, where the angels of God *were seen, strengthening him.*

There is *one* at least in that holy place who reads our thoughts. He sees, he knows, he takes account of the most minute, as well as the most noble and exalted of all his works. He indeed reads the very secret thoughts, and in his book of remembrance they are all written against that day, when the thoughts of men shall be accounted for, and we receive according to that which we have done in the body.

The sinner who forgets his God, how solemn, and how awful indeed is the idea! His actions are seen—his thoughts are read in heaven. The holy angels—the redeemed from the earth see him; they behold how he dishonors, and trifles with his God; they mourn, if angels can mourn at the ill treatment he receives from the creatures he has made. But they have seen and known our thoughts. What witnesses will they be for God in the day when he shall punish his enemies! They will be swift and ready witnesses against us. Oh! the thought. God and the holy inhabitants of heaven sees—the judge and the witnesses—all know.

Reader would you be willing that your actions—much less your thoughts should be read in heaven?

## ON ANIMAL LIFE OR THE "VITAL PRINCIPLE,"

BY MAXWELL M'DOWELL, M. D., OF BALTIMORE.

THE existence of a *vital principle* in animal bodies has been a received opinion from the earliest ages of the world; although the labours of all the philosophers, even down to the present day, have not eventuated in any satisfactory explanation of its mode of existence, or manner of producing its various effects. It was at first considered a quality particularly connected with the blood; as having observed a body deprived of life by large evacuations of blood from accidental causes, or in the field of battle, it was very natural to conclude that the fluid either possessed this *living principle*; or at least conveyed it out of the body through the wound. This was the idea entertained by the lawgiver of the Jews. In the 13th and 14th verses of the 17th chapter of Leviticus we find it thus written; "And whatsoever man there be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, which hunteth and catcheth any beast or fowl that may be eaten; he shall even pour out the blood, and cover it with dust. For it is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life thereof, therefore I said unto the children of Israel, ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh; for the *life of all flesh* is the *blood* thereof; whosoever eateth it shall be cut off." So that we find the justly celebrated Mr. John Hunter was only the reviver of a doctrine that had prevailed as early as the days of Moses, when he undertook to prove the vitality of the blood. The immortal Grecian *Bard* bestowed upon death the epithet *purple* ("*porphureos thanatos.*") The Mantuan *Bard*, who was a physician as well as a poet, also speaks on the subject in the following manner, in the 349th line of his 9th book of the *Æneid*.

*"Purpuriam vomit animam, et cum sanguine mista  
"Vina refert moriens, hic furto fervidus instat."*

By consulting the opinions of the different sects of ancient philosophers, on the immateriality and materiality of the soul, we might suppose that the immaterialists thought they had discovered the origin of the soul among the subtile and invisible fluids which they considered were not subject to the laws of matter, whilst some of them appear to have confounded the soul with the *vital principle*. Hence Heraclites considered the soul an intelligent principle, as an exhalation or incorporeal; Parmenides viewed it as fire; others thought it proceeded from the sun; whilst others looked upon it as a subtile air. Hippo contended that the soul was a vapour; but this opinion need not be considered strange when we reflect that humidity, in the opinion of this philosopher, was the foundation of all things. Marcus Antoninus, one of the Stoic sect, was convinced that the soul bore a great resemblance to the wind, whilst others imagined that its essence was a fifth substance. Among the moderns not a few supposed that the soul originates from the seminal liquor, and that in the first place it is merely a vegetating principle similar to that of a plant; but on becoming more perfect it acquires a sensitive property, and is at length rendered reason-



able by a Divine co-operation. Such an opinion would not be worthy of being mentioned were it not for the circumstance of its having been advanced by some men of no small pretensions to philosophic acquirements. We are, however, taught one thing by considering the opinion, which is, that many of the modern cultivators of science, notwithstanding all the boasted improvements in the mode of scientific research, can even be *more absurd* in some of their theoretic speculations, than any of their venerable predecessors, whom they are disposed to consider in so diminutive a point of view. Pythagoras imagined that the soul was detached from the air, and he had figured to his imagination an *anima mundi*, whence the souls of men were emanations. Pythagoras held that the soul was immortal, being according to him, a portion of the *æther* which is eternal. He defined the soul to be a self-moving number; so that by number it is evident that he here meant element or principle. He sometimes divided the soul into two parts, the rational and irrational, and sometimes divided the irrational part into two, the irascible and concupiscible. He called the rational *phreen*, the concupiscible *nous*, and the irascible *thumos*; whence it is evident that in the eye of Pythagoras these words had not the same signification as they afterwards obtained, for *nous* came to signify the rational part. But as it was not easy to explain the mutual action of soul and body upon each other, upon the doctrine of immateriality, Plato undertook to improve upon the idea of Pythagoras by the introduction of his *plastic nature*, a sort of intervening principle, which connected soul and body. This principle was received by Hippocrates and Aristotle, the peripatetic who was the scholar of Plato. Aristotle asserted that the soul had the living principle under its control; that it possessed three faculties—the nutritive, the sensitive and the rational. The nutritive principle is that in which life is the operating agent, the sensitive principle is that which gives rise to feeling. The rational principle is peculiar to man, and is that by which he perceives and judges. This intellect they styled an *intellectum agens, vel patiens*, the first of which is separable from the body and is immortal, the other is mortal. According to this philosopher the soul permanently retained the natural heat, and that the principle of this heat is seated in the heart. Among the Arabians, Avicenna and Avenoes were the principal commentators of the doctrines of the Stagyrite.

Democritus, Epicurus and Leucippus were advocates of the doctrine of materialism. In their opinion nothing but body existed, and that the principle of life and intelligence are merely modifications of matter, and arise from the particular disposition of the atoms in organized bodies, in a manner similar to that of the flesh, the blood and other sensible parts. In the opinion of Lactantius, who also maintained the materiality of the soul, the multifarious opinions of philosophers contained a share of truth, though he viewed them as altogether uncertain and unsatisfactory with regard to its essence. He maintained that our soul, or the principle of life, was in the blood, in the heart and in the spirit; though it was impossible to express the nature which was the result, inas-

much as it was easier to view the operations of the soul than to define its nature. The ancients, however, all seem to have had some idea of a living principle that animates the bodily machine. Thus Plutarch informs us that they all acknowledged spirit to be only a subtile matter, and that our soul, which is the air, kept us alive, and that the world in this manner, contains spirit and air, which they viewed as two names to designate the same thing. Hence the *Anima Mundi* of Pythagoras, the *phusis* of Hippocrates, and the *pneuma* of the author de Mundo, also called *calidum innatum*, were all expressions of the *vital* principle. The same opinion was adopted by some of the first votaries of learning, and for a considerable portion of the seventeenth century, a system was prevalent, which viewed the vital principle as the efficient cause of the generation as well as existence in all animals and plants. It afterwards assumed the name of *anima vegetans*. This term was changed by the fanciful mind of Paracelsus for that of *sidereal spirit*, which in his opinion was equally independent of the body and mind; though it descended from the firmament as the rational soul proceeded from the Deity. Van Helmont who believed that he had improved upon the system of his master, suggested his theory of the *Archeus*, without undertaking to assert the unity of the rational and living souls. Stahl afterwards reduced the operations of the *Archeus* to the action of the rational soul. Descartes, however, appears to have been the first among the modern philosophers who rejected the distinct existence of the vital principle under every denomination. The progress which had been made in investigating the physiology of the nerves, a short time before, enabled him to form an hypothesis of the vital functions on the supposition of the animal spirits or nervous fluid. Stahl's doctrine made some progress, and the opinion of a rational power, or *vis medicatrix naturæ*, which governed the actions of the body, in health as well as in disease, universally prevailed. Hence the terms nature, sensitive soul, and vital principle were generally employed. The existence, however, of a nervous fluid was now adopted independent of the sensitive soul to account for the appearances of sensation and voluntary motion. Dr. Whytt of Edinburgh undertook to reform the Stahlian doctrine, which excluded the independent vital principle, at the time when Haller was advocating his theory of *vis insita* and *vis nervea*. He supposes the soul to be present in different parts of the brain, at the same time considering it to be immaterial and unextended. At length it entered into the minds of some philosophers to suppose that matter by a particular organization might acquire vitality, and among the number we find Buffon and Hoffman. At a time when no single hypothesis of the vital principle generally prevailed, two theories were presented to view which commanded a more particular attention. Dr. Momo explains the *intellectus agens* in the body, by alleging that the Creator of all things who gave life to all animals continues to act upon them by the unremitting influence of a living principle which prevades the universe, the nature of which, however, our faculties are not capable of comprehending. The other theory was that advanced by Mr. John Hunter who as we have already observed, revived the doctrine of

the vitality of the blood. Mr. Hunter enumerated many facts in support of his theory such as that the blood unites living parts when effused between the sides of an incised wound—this bond of union becomes vascular like other living parts—its temperature when flowing from a vein is equal in the different temperatures of the body—it is capable of being acted upon by stimuli as in cases when it coagulates—it is also capable of nourishing and preserving life in a paralytic limb. In opposition to Mr. Hunter's doctrine of the vitality of the blood, it is contended that instead of uniting living parts, the blood acts as an extraneous body, and must be removed before the union can take place. The entire blood may not form the bond of union between the sides of an incised wound; but it certainly furnishes the connecting medium which is admitted to possess vitality by those physiologists who deny the doctrine of the vitality of the blood. These physiologists contend that the connecting medium between the sides of an incised wound is a secretion. If it is a secretion it must be separated from the blood, and as they admit that it possesses vitality, it must have had this principle united to it before it was separated from the blood; or the vessels whose office it is to secrete it must have the power of imparting vitality to it. If the vessels which unite the fluid that forms the bond of union between the sides of an incised wound are endowed, by the Creator, with the power of imparting vitality to it, we can see no impropriety in admitting that the *lacteals* whose office, as we conceive, it is to secrete the chyle, also are endowed with the power of imparting vitality to that fluid which becomes blood. We always considered the doctrine of the vitality of the blood as a probable doctrine, and we always thought that it was not disproved by any thing that we have seen alleged against it. But this doctrine is now clearly established, in our mind, by the numerous facts which came under our view during the prevalence of spasmodic cholera; yet we do not conceive that we are brought any nearer to a knowledge of the nature of the vital principle, or of its mode of action upon the bodily system. The vital principle has been considered in a different point of view by Goodwyn. By taking a body after all the visible signs of life had been removed, and applying those substances which restore the evanescent signs of the vital principle, and observing the place and circumstances of their first operation, he was led to examine the essential quality of the principle itself. This physician entertains the opinion that the heart is the great seat of the vital principle in the more perfect animals, and that its contraction by the application of the ordinary stimuli is the only evidence of the presence of this principle; so that when the heart contracts, under such circumstances the body is alive, and when it fails to contract, the principle of life has left the organized material structure. Goodwyn, therefore, defines the vital principle to be the faculty of propelling the fluids through the circulating system of vessels. In his opinion heat and respiration are the external circumstances which excite the vital principle to action, and when the functions of an animal are suddenly suspended and the body begins to assume the appearance of death, we can always determine

whether it be in reality dead by restoring the temperature and inflating the lungs with pure atmospherical air. He is also of opinion, with many others, that the presence of putrefaction is the only decisive evidence that the body is absolutely deprived of the vital principle. With respect to the opinion advanced by Goodwyn, that the heart is the great seat of the vital principle, we would only observe, that this organ cannot be the exclusive seat of this principle. The heart, therefore, possesses this principle only in common with other parts of the living organized body. When the heart is brought to act, after life has been suspended, by the instrumentality of artificial breathing in propelling the blood to the different parts of the system, it does not convey the vital principle throughout that organic structure; but it circulates a fluid whose impression brings into active operation the principle whose action had been suspended. It is true unless the action of the heart is restored in such cases, the life of the system could not be restored; but this fact does not prove the opinion of Goodwyn to be true when he says the heart is the great seat of the vital principle.—Currie says that if he were required to give a definition of the vital principle, he would denominate it that capacity by which the animal retains its proper heat in the various temperatures of the medium in which it exists. That the more perfect animals possess this power in a superior degree, inferior animals in a lower degree, and vegetables in a still lower degree. Some philosophers supposed that carbonic acid gas afforded the principle of life. De La Metherie views the *aura animalis* as the principle of life, in some degree analogous to the *aura seminalis*. Girtanner maintains irritability to be the principle of life. A short time previous to the period when Goodwyn published his "connexion of life with respiration," the revolution which took place in the investigation of chemical science, directed the attention of philosophers to the chemical processes which were conjectured to take place in the animal economy. The vital principle of course received its share of attention. The discovery of oxygen which was ascertained to be that principle which some of the ancients had only imagined to exist in the atmosphere, and which they viewed as a certain something that was necessary to the support of life, had a considerable influence on the speculations upon animal life. This oxygen is the *pneuma* which Aristotle says unites with the blood; and Chrysippus Von Soli expressly declares that it was the *pneuma* which generated life; whilst Praxagoras the physician, says the soul, or vital principle, is strengthened by spirituous air. Let me request your particular attention to the opinion of Praxagoras, which we consider as approximating nearer the real state of the vital principle, or animal life, than any opinion that we have noticed. The opinion of Praxagoras had its supporters in the middle ages, and has been considerably influenced by the discovery of the circulation of the blood. Bacon in addition to the doctrine of the *pneuma*, says that the vital spirit is composed of air and fire, which by their union effect a weak combustion, or as it has been called the *phlogistic process of life*. Thus we find from the time of Praxagoras there seems to have been a similar idea of a *vital principle*, though

somewhat different in its modifications. Townsend maintains that the vital force of an organ is proportioned to the quantity of oxygenated blood that circulated through it. Thornton asserts that a chemical process is going on in the body by means of oxygen.—The same opinion is advocated by Brandis and some others, who say that the vital principle arises from a constant change of animal substance by an union of oxygen with carbon. The opinions of Townsend, Thornton and Brandis cannot be considered as even approximating truth, till it is unequivocally demonstrated that oxygen is received into the blood by inspiration.

(To be continued.)

---

THE TRIAL OF ANTICHRIST.

(Continued from page 335.)

*Philip Melancthon*, sworn.

Q. Was you not once under the Prisoner's authority?

A. I was, but blessed be God, not now.

Q. Did you continue long in his service?

A. Till I was about twenty-four years of age. When about that age, I attended to hear *Martin Luther* dispute with *Eckius*, on the Supremacy of the Pope of Rome, and from that time I was so fully convinced that the Prisoner's power was usurped, that I united with *Luther*, and we became intimate friends.

Q. Do you recollect any of the arguments brought by *Eckius*, to support the Prisoner's authority?

A. All his arguments were derived from the spurious and insipid *Decretals* which were scarcely of four hundred years' standing;\* while *Luther* proved to a demonstration, that the Church of Rome, in the earlier ages, had never been acknowledged as superior to other churches, and combated that church (so called) and the Prisoner, from the testimony of the Scripture, the authority even of those *Fathers* they pretend to venerate, the best Ecclesiastical Historians, and even from the decrees of the council of *Nice* itself.

Q. Do you remember the Prisoner's sending the Dominican Friars to sell his pardons?

A. I do. Some pardons were offered for sins impossible to be committed, and too shocking to be imagined; others for sins future as well as past. Indulgences were often granted to whole fraternities, and sometimes for a thousand years or more. And among the relics exhibited to view, was a plume, said to be a plume of the wing of *St. Michael* the Archangel. *John Tetzel* often shocked me with his awful blasphemies. He, in attempting to describe the efficacy of the indulgences he had to vend, said, "That even had any one deflowered the mother of God, he had from the Pope (or Prisoner) wherewithal to efface his guilt!" And he also boasted that "he had saved more souls out of hell by his indulgences,

---

\* Vide *Seckendorff's Hist. of Luth.*

than *St. Peter* had converted to Christianity by his preaching.<sup>27</sup> He also promised to every one that would put ten shillings into the box which he carried about with him, license to eat white meats and flesh in lent, and power to deliver what soul they would out of purgatory; and moreover full pardon for all his sins, however heinous. But if it was one jot less than ten shillings, he said it would profit nothing.

*Ulric Zwinglius, the Reformer of Switzerland, sworn.*

Q. Was you not once under the authority of the Prisoner at the bar?

A. I was. I was called a Canon of *Zurich* and an Archdeacon in *Switzerland*; but I began to manifest my public opposition to his government in the year 1519. I had previous to that time, been led to suspect, that the Prisoner had usurped his authority, and was really a rebel in disguise; and afterwards I was satisfied that my suspicions were well founded. Soon after this, the Prisoner sent into *Switzerland* an *Italian* Monk, whose name was *Samson*, and his master who sent him, and at last I had the satisfaction of seeing by far the greater part of *Switzerland* reject the authority of the Prisoner at the bar.

*William, Prince of Orange, sworn.*

Q. Do you recollect the Prisoner's conduct to the people in the *Low Countries*, and if it was ever computed, how many were murdered by the Duke of *Alva*?

A. I do. When they were liberated from his shackles by the preaching of the Gospel, he took the most violent measures to re-enslave them. For this purpose he augmented the number of his rebellious Bishops, established that horrid tribunal called the *Holy Inquisition* and inhumanly tortured and murdered by racks, gibbets and fires, many thousands, besides those who perished by the sword. The Duke of *Alva* himself boasted, that in the *Netherlands* alone, within the space of a few years, he had dispatched 36,000 souls, by the hands of the common executioner. The Jesuits, from their first institution, to the year 1560, that is, between thirty and forty years, are computed to have put to death 900,000 Christians who rejected the Prisoner's authority. And in the space of scarce thirty years the inquisition destroyed by various tortures 150,000. One *Saunders*, a Priest, confesses that an innumerable multitude were burnt throughout all Europe.

*John Calvin, the Reformer, sworn.*

Q. Are you not a Frenchman by birth?

A. I was born at *Noyon*, in *Picardy* in *France*, on the 10th day of July, 1509. I was educated in the Church of *Rome*, and ordained in her corrupt communion, but I rejected the Prisoner's traitorous supremacy in the year 1534, when I was about twenty-five years of age.

Q. Did not the Prisoner burn and destroy very many subjects of our Lord the King in *France*, while you resided there?

A. He did. My heart bled to see the slaughter he made daily.

I witnessed many of my friends, who were the blessed subjects of our King, daily committed to the flames by King Francis I. who acted as executioner for the Prisoner, and being filled with indignation against his awful and cruel laws and conduct, I was constrained to protest against him. The excellent Queen of Navarre more than once saved me from the fire. But at last I was obliged to fly from France into Switzerland, to escape the cruel persecution in my native country. I retired to Basil, where I published a book called *Christian Institutions*, which I dedicated to Francis I. with the design to soften the unrelenting fury of that Prince against the Protestants. At Geneva I was chosen to be the Pastor of a Christian Church, that professed obedience to the laws of Jesus, acknowledged him alone for their head, and rejected the Prisoner and all his rebellious orders of Priests. With this church I continued till the year 1564, when I was called by our Sovereign from them into his kingdom.

Cross-examined by Counsellor Quibble.

Q. Do you think that the Prisoner acted wrong when he put those to death who would not acknowledge his religion?

A. I certainly do.

Q. Did you not take an active part in the persecution of *Serretus*, and was you not accessory to his death?

A. I confess I did; and I then attempted to justify the act.—This was one of the awful effects of being educated under the Prisoner. I learnt this doctrine at Rome, and it made too deep an impression upon a mind, which was too much beclouded with Popish error. I knew not what spirit I was of.—It was too much the prevailing opinion of all parties at that time, that incorrigible heretics ought not to live; and I was led astray. *Serretus* was certainly a violent enemy to the doctrines of the Trinity, and of the Deity and Atonement of Jesus Christ. His positions were singularly daring, and his language grossly indecent on these subjects. I therefore thought that it might lead some to conclude that I gave encouragement to rebellion, though I rejected the usurped authority of the Pope of Rome, if I did give my sanction to his punishment.—But I was evidently wrong.

*Peter Martyr of Naples*, sworn.

Q. Did not the Prisoner at the bar endeavour to introduce his office of Inquisition into the City of Naples?

A. He did. After the Reformation begun by *Luther*, it pleased the Lord to enable me and one *Bernard Ochino* to testify publicly against the enormity of the reigning superstition, and the Papal yoke. A number of all ranks and orders now began to express their aversion to the Prisoner's treasonable conduct; and he, to put a stop to the progress of the Reformation, let loose upon these pretended *heretics* his bloody *Inquisitors*, who spread the mark of their usual barbarity through the greatest part of *Italy*. But the terrors of the Inquisition could never penetrate into the kingdom of *Naples*. Nor could either the authority or entreaties of the Roman Pontiff engage the *Neapolitans* to admit within their territories either a Court of *Inquisition*, or even visiting *Inquisitors*.

*Augustine Casal, Preacher to Charles V. sworn.*

Q. Did not you, and several others that were once connected with the Prisoner at the bar, as Priests, attend the Emperor *Charles V.*?

A. I did. I was brought by *Charles V.* into *Germany*, to combat the pretended heresy of *Luther*, but I propagated on my return the very doctrines I set out to oppose. Several others also, who accompanied the Emperor, did the same, *Constantine Pontius*, his confessor, the learned *Egedius*, whom he had nominated to the Bishoprick of *Tortosa*, *Bartholomew De Caranza*, a Dominican, who had been confessor to King *Philip*, and cruel Queen *Mary*, with above twenty more. After this *Charles V.* abdicated the throne, and retreated to spend the remainder of his days in retirement, in the year 1557. He evidently saw the folly of vindicating the Prisoner's authority, and after he had withdrawn from the busy scenes of public life about two years, he died; and was supposed to die a Protestant. No sooner was the breath of this Monarch gone, but I and the persons before noticed were put into the Inquisition, and all committed to the flames, or delivered over to death in other forms equally terrible to nature.

*Dennis Renix, Martyr in France, sworn.*

This witness said that he had lived at *Melde* in *France* for several years.—That he knew the Prisoner well.—That he saw a number of Protestants burnt and tortured. That one *Jo de Roma*, a Monk, who was commissioned to examine *Lutherans*, among other horrible means to torment them, he used to take the most pleasure in filling boots with boiling grease, and putting them on their legs, and tying them on the back on forms with their legs hanging over a small fire while he examined them. That among the multitudes that were burnt, was a bookseller for selling a Bible. That upon a complaint made to the council, that the Judges suffered *heretics* to have their tongues, a decree was made that all who were burnt should have their tongues cut off unless they recanted at the fire; which was afterwards strictly observed. That being himself a great enemy to the Prisoner and his government, and having publicly testified against his Mass, he was taken by his orders in the year 1558, and chained to a stake to be burned by a slow fire. And that the Prisoner, then known by the name of *Paul IV.* did suppose that he was burnt to death.

And deponent further said, that one *John Clark*, having written on paper that the Prisoner was Antichrist, and his pardons treasonable, and having broken some images to pieces, was first whipt three days and burnt in the forehead. That afterwards at *Mentz* he was taken to the place of execution, where he was tortured in the most cruel manner. That his right hand was first cut off, then his nose was torn from his face with sharp pincers, and further dismembered while he stood at the stake to be burnt by order of the Prisoner.

Admiral *Gasper de Coligny*, who suffered in the Massacre of *Paris*, sworn.

Q. Was you at *Paris* on the eve of the 24th day of August, or *St. Bartholomew's* day, 1752?

A. I was.



Q. Was there not a dreadful massacre at *Paris* that night, of many thousand Protestants, by order of the Prisoner?

A. There was. It is an event well known in history, and perhaps the blackest upon record.

Q. Will you relate to the court what took place on that night?

A. The Almighty having been pleased to cause the proclamation of his Gospel to be made in *France*, many were led to discover the usurped authority of the Prisoner and acknowledge our Sovereign Lord the King. When the Prisoner, according to the tyrannical laws of his kingdom, caused a general slaughter to take place; and almost in every town and village were fires kindled, gibbets erected, and tortures prepared for such as presumed to call in question his being the Vicar of Christ and Prince of the Apostles. Previous to the reign of *Charles IX.* the Prisoner had employed as his common executioners three Kings of *France*; *Francis I.* *Henry II.* and *Francis II.* who were very active at this awful work. *Charles* was early trained to this shocking employment, and for cruelty, hypocrisy, bigotry, and every savage property, could scarcely be equalled by any of the inhabitants of the infernal mansions. He was one of the Prisoner's pets.

In his reign, in addition to all the dreadful decrees against his peaceable Protestant subjects, an edict was published in July 1562, declaring it to be lawful to kill *all* the *Hugonots* wherever any could be found. This decree was read publicly in every parish on every Lord's day, and innumerable multitudes were slain.

Three civil wars succeeded each other. At last the court pretended to grant the Protestants a very advantageous peace in the year 1570, and a match was concluded between Henry, \* the young King of *Navarre*, a Protestant, and the French King's sister. The heads of the Protestants were invited to celebrate the nuptials at *Paris* with the infernal view of butchering them all if possible in one night. The Queen of *Navarre*, who visited *Paris* in order to be present at her son's marriage, was taken ill and died, as it was afterwards suspected by being poisoned, she being supposed a *heretic*. A few days after I was wounded by a musquet ball whilst walking the streets; but such were the professions then made of union and affection, that none suspected the design. *Charles* immediately visited me, and wept when he saw how I was wounded; he expressed the greatest sorrow on my account; and vowed the greatest vengeance on the assassin. He offered me a part of his own guards, who, under the pretext of protecting me, were to admit at midnight the remainder into my chamber to murder me.

Exactly at midnight on the eve of *St. Bartholomew*, (so called) 1572, the alarm bell was rung in the *Palais Royale*, as the signal of death. About five hundred Protestant Barons, Knights, and Gentlemen, who had come from all parts to honor the wedding, were among the rest barbarously butchered in their beds. The Gentlemen, Officers of the chamber, Governors, Tutors, and Household servants of the King of *Navarre*, and Prince of *Conde*, were driven out of their chambers where they slept in the *Louvre*, and being in the court were massacred in the King's presence. The slaughter was now general throughout the city, and as *Thuanus*

\* Afterwards the celebrated *Henry IV.*

writes, "that the very channels ran down with blood into the river."\* This was however magnified as a glorious action, and the King who was one of the most active murderers, boasted that he had put 70,000 *heretics* to death.

It is scarcely possible that it can even be supposed, that I can describe the horrors of that Sunday night. I might quote the words of a French author who wrote the History of *France*, from the reign of *Henry II.* to *Henry IV.* and say, "How strange and horrible a thing it was, in a great town to see at least 60,000 men with pistols, pikes, cutlasses, poniards, knives and other bloody instruments, run, swearing and blaspheming the sacred Majesty of God, through the streets and into houses, where most cruelly they massacred all whomsoever they met without regard of estate, condition, sex, or age."

"The streets paved with bodies cut and hewed to pieces; the gates and entries of houses, palaces, and public places dyed with blood. Shouting and halloosings of the murderers, mixed with continual noise of pistols and calivers discharged; the pitiful cries and shrieks of those that were murdering. Slain bodies cast out of the windows upon the stones and drawn through the dirt. Strange noise of whistlings, breaking of doors and windows with bills and stones. The spoiling and sacking of houses. Carts, some carrying away the spoils, and others the dead bodies, which were thrown into the river *Seine*, all now red with blood, which ran out of the town and from the King's Palace." While the horrid scene was transacting, many Priests ran about the city with crucifixes in one hand and daggers in the other, to encourage the slaughter.

A band of ruffians soon rushed into my chamber, while I was upon my knees supplicating my King. Immediately they (did what they called) dispatched me, while the young Duke of *Guise* waited at the door in expectation of receiving my head to present it to the inhuman King, and his brutal mother. To those who are unacquainted with the power of our King, my testimony may appear incredible, when I affirm that my head was really severed from my body, and after being presented to the King and his mother, she sent it embalmed to *Rome*, as a present to the Prisoner and the Cardinal of *Lorraine*. Not satisfied with what they had done to me, they proceeded to deprive me of some of the members of my body, after which I was dragged through the streets of the city for three days, and then hung up by my feet to a gibbet at *Montfaucon*. The general opinion now in *France* was that I was dead, and I am certain the Prisoner had no idea of seeing me alive again.

He now gave *Charles IX.* public thanks for his infernal work. He ordered the most solemn rejoicings at *Rome*. He sung *Te Deum*, and presumed to give the Almighty public thanks for this victory. He also issued forth a Bull for a *Jubilee* to be observed throughout the kingdom of *France* on the 7th day of December, 1572, as a particular day of great and unusual joy for what he called the happy success of the French King against his heretic or protestant subjects. He also exhorted *Charles* to pursue *this salu-*

\*Vide *Thuan.* Hist. lib. 52. 1572. Tom. 2. fol. 281. Geneva, 1620

*tary and blessed enterprise*, and fall upon them who called in question his usurped supremacy. This cruel slaughter brought on a fourth civil war. A fresh peace was concluded in the year 1573, with the Protestants; yet a fifth war broke out the next year, when *Charles IX.* stained with the blood of thousands of his subjects, which called for vengeance, was seized by order of our Sovereign, by one of his officers, named *Mr. Death*, and from that time has been detained a prisoner in the fiery cell under the charge of the keeper of the black gulf. He left no issue on earth.

Cross-examined by Counsellor *Quibble*.

Q. You are the first man I ever heard speak after he lost his head!

Although I may be the first man that you have heard speak after his head has been severed from his body; I am not the first that has appeared as a witness after being slain. *John* the beloved servant of our King declares, and this court knows it to be a fact, that those who "were slain for the word of God, and the testimony which they held," not only spake after, but spake with a loud voice, and applied to our Lord for judgment against their murderers, and were graciously heard.\* And he also testifies, that *he saw* on thrones such as were, like me, really beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, *Antichrist*, or his image;† and that they lived and reigned afterwards with our Sovereign King. For my own part I declare, that I have enjoyed more real life from the day I was beheaded than ever I did before.

(To be continued.)

---

UNIVERSALISM.

LETTER XIV.

*Conclusion. Liscentiousness of Universalism.*

WE had reason sir to know pretty early in this correspondence, that it was your purpose and hope, to drive us off the ground by the grossness of your conduct, and then claim the result as the effect of the strength of your cause. We heard it, we saw it,—we pitied and passed it by. But your plan went still deeper. For being bent on an explosion,—when you found we were insensible to your attempts, you resolved to blow up, yourself. We congratulate you, on the happy eclaireissement of the plot; and really the thing was not ill-timed. For a man who is as reckless in his statements as yourself, cannot do better when his *infidelity* is shown to be full of *contradictions*, and based on entire *perversity* and *ignorance*; than give up *reasoning*, and go to *pouting*. It was far easier at first to abuse us than disprove the truth; and now you are equally sagacious, in perceiving that, at last, it is also easier, to ac-

\*Rev. vi: 9—11.

†Rev. xx: 4

cuse us of abusing you, than to vindicate your wicked heresy. It is so exceedingly small a thing, with us, to be judged of such judgments; that such contrivances are thrown away, when used for our benefit. So that whether it suits you best, to abuse us separately, or unitedly, directly to ourselves, or sideways to your readers—be pleased sir, to use your own discretion; and accept beforehand our pity and forgiveness. So far as your conduct is personal to us, it is supremely indifferent to us. It is only for the truth's sake, which you hate; for our master's sake, whose blood you trample under foot; for our brethren's sake, whose souls you would kill;—that our hearts are stirred within us,—and that we have put on ourselves the strong constraint, to examine, to bear with, and to expose, you and your licentious code. The race is too far run, to be hindered in it now.

If we have rightly read our Bible, we find it there recorded, that our short and uncertain life in this world, is but the prelude to our eternal state of being; this world being to the next, like the humble vestibule to the gorgeous and mighty temple beyond it. We are taught, that we are to decide the destiny that awaits us beyond the grave, by the deeds done on this side of its dark and silent abode: and that a book of remembrance is kept on high, of all our thoughts, words, and deeds,—as the unerring proof in the trial that awaits the soul. That trial, is the eternal judgment, at the bar of God. Jesus is the judge. His word, which is in our hands this day, is the rule of judgment. The universe, will constitute the audience. Preparatory to that great assize, it is appointed unto man once to die. After it is past, the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment,—the righteous into life eternal.

Death, Judgment, and Eternity,—are the great themes of the Bible; the great objects that concern the soul; the great ends which make religion so imperious a want of man. To prepare for death, is the great end of life. To be ready for the judgment, is the very substance of all blessedness and all wisdom. And in the calm and solemn contemplation of both these great events,—to be able to look steadily forward into eternity, with a well-grounded confidence that it will be well with us there, is itself the earnest of that heaven, for which we strive.

In view of these sublime realities, how abhorrent and disgusting does that licentiousness appear, which denies that the Bible even reveals the fact that man will die at all;—which asserts that there will be no future judgment whatever; and which swallowing up the universe in one illimitable hell—calls the universal pollution after which it pants, the heavens of the Lord God!

This is Universalism and Christianity contrasted, in the grand results of each. And we are not aware of a better mode of concluding this protracted correspondence, than by a slight glance, at the features of these opposite systems, in regard to the solemn subjects of death, judgment, and eternity!

1. There is, if we may say it with profound reverence, a mighty paradox sustained throughout the scriptures,—and solved at last on Calvary. One branch of it is, the eternal, unalterable love of God to sinners; the other branch of it is, the equally enduring, quenchless hatred of God to sin. The cross of Jesus Christ solves

the paradox. But sir, throughout your tremendous system there reigns an opposite and horrid paradox: which represents God to be lenient only to sin, and rigorous only to those he has pardoned. And now you push this to such a degree, that you not only fill your ideal heaven with all the sin in the universe; but elaborately set forth (see your 12th letter) such a mode of salvation, as proscribes holiness, if it does not preclude the possibility of virtue!

2. Equally horrible is your doctrine, on the solemn subject of death. Omitting all other references take the following from your 9th letter:

"You ask me to tell you 'why it is that men do in fact die—and as it is my desire to communicate information, as far as I can, to the ignorant, I will 'condescend' to tell you. Now attend to my instructions. O ye simple, and learn wisdom from one who 'condescends' to instruct you. Men die because they are mortal—they are the victims of temporal death, for the same reason that they are the subjects of want, hunger, thirst, &c.—they die for the same reason that all other animals die; they die because they are subject to the invariable laws of organized matter—they die because God originally ordained that they should pass from this state, or mode of being, to 'an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away.'" And this is a truth sufficiently plain, to need revelation to make it intelligible. The death spoken of, as the consequence of sin, is to be done away by the grace of God; and as none are exempt from natural death, it is unquestionable that the death, is of a moral or spiritual kind. Should it still be asked why it was not revealed in the Bible that all men would be subjected to natural death—our reply is, because there was no need of a revelation to make mankind acquainted with that fact, any more than there was need of a revelation to teach us that when people are hungry they will want something to eat."

Was there ever as much of error, ignorance, and impiety condensed into the same number of words, as is contained in this self-sufficient farrago? Alas! how opposite to the clear repeated, and awful teachings of God; which admonish us times without number, that sin has brought every woe in its train, and amongst the chief, disease, decay and death. Which tell us that its sway would be universal and endless over us, but for the victory which Jesus has gained over it; and by which he is able to take its sting which is sin, away from his children. Which exhort us to prepare for it, by diligent obedience to God, lively exercise of faith in Christ, and sincere repentance for past sins. Which so severely warn us of its certain, early—irresistible, and yet always unexpected approach, leaving to us no alternative but to meet it as the king of terrors,—or to be joyfully and sweetly conducted, through the valley of its dark shadow, by the rod and the staff, of the shepherd and bishop of our souls. Which in short, so incessantly and so impressively point to it, as the very crisis of our destiny; before which all, is as to us, contingent and remediable; but after which, all is fixed, in glory to rise only to more thrilling intensity forever; or in woe to expand only in more exquisite anguish through eternity!—Look on this picture: then on that!

3. It were needless to make special citations from your letters

to prove that you deny the existence of a future general judgment. Those who have patience and opportunity, may find in your second, third, and ninth letters, amongst others,—attempts, as systematic, as your mode of thinking and state of knowledge allow you to make,—to prove that there will be no general judgment in eternity. It is not our purpose now, to make any new attempts, to show how very plainly and fully this doctrine is revealed in the Bible,—nor how necessary a part it makes, of the Christian religion. But it is worthy of profound regard on the part of your followers—or if they be past correction,—on the part of the community in which you are striving to propagate your demoralizing scepticism,—that the very dogma which makes the worst forms of Atheism intolerable, is the key stone of your blasphemous code. It *might* be admitted in argument, even that there was no God, and therefore no moral obligations, and of course no future, judgment, accountability or *punishment*, properly so called; and yet, it might still be *true*, and *firmly believed*, that virtue and happiness were united, and that sin and pain were also united;—and that the same fate or chance which makes us exist in this world, may make us exist in one, or one million of future states; in every one of which the same principles will hold, and therefore in every one of which, it will make us miserable to do what we call wrong, and happy to do what we call right. But to deny that there will be any future judgment,—or pain, whatever—is to make God indifferent to the morality of human conduct;—to teach which is more fatal to virtue, by far than to teach such atheism as that stated above. For the latter might admit it to be best hereafter to do well here; while the former says it is perfectly immaterial to God, with reference to eternity,—whether we keep or violate, every law, human and divine! In our poor judgment, your system is worse even than that form of atheism which asserts the annihilation of the human soul, as well as the non-existence of God; for it were better there were no God than one that promotes all evil;—better there were no futurity, than that there should be no judgment to adjust its tremendous issues, and by forcing the wicked to cease from troubling, give the weary rest.

There are multitudes of texts of scriptures, which present the general judgment, in a light so extraordinarily magnificent and awful, that we would gladly show, by stating and comparing a few of them, "*the proportion of faith*" on this imposing subject. There are a few such texts, whose comparison results in a conclusion so startling and glorious, that we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of exhibiting it, in contrast with your corrupt and miserable infidelity. You deny that there will be any eternal judgment at all. We wish to present a scriptural idea merely of what may be the *duration* of, that, which you say will never exist at all! In very many passages, the period of the judgment, is spoken of as *a day* (1 John 4: 17, 2 Peter 2: 9, and 3: 7, &c.) In many others by way of eminence, as *that day*;—as in 2 Tim. 1: 12, 18, and 4: 8, Mat. 7: 22—and especially in Mark 13: 32, in which it is declared by our blessed Lord that, *that day* on which the issues of all things will be decided (and which according to your interpretation, transpired when Jerusalem was destroyed)—was, *as to the period of its*

*occurrence*, an unsearchable mystery, known neither to men, angels, nor the Son himself, as simply mediator; but hid in the bosom of Jehovah! It may perhaps help your exegesis, to remember that the Temple of Jerusalem was destroyed by TITUS, and the city totally ruined, and the Jewish state entirely subverted in the year A. D. 70: and yet *twenty-six years* after this complete fulfilment of all things uttered in the Bible about *that great day of God Almighty*, the Apostle John, (weak old man!) continued to prate, about its advent—and to direct his eye, full of the light of heaven, into far distant eternity, to catch a glimpse of its awful movements! (See Rev. 6: 17,—xix. 1—3, xx. 4—14.) Now observe that the Apostle Peter in the third chapter of his second Epistle, discoursing expressly of the coming of “the day of the Lord”—and the “*error of the wicked*”—which led them to hold your mad notions about it; asserts in the eighth verse of the chapter, “that *one day* is with the Lord *as a thousand years*, and *a thousand years*, *as one day*.” Again, it is a well known mode of speaking throughout the prophetic books of the Bible, to use *a day* for *a year*, when future events are spoken of. Daniel’s seventy weeks are perfectly understood to represent 490 years, (Danl. ix:) and John’s forty and two months are universally known to mean 1260 years, (Rev. xi. 2, and xiii. 5.) Indeed in one remarkable instance (Ezekiel iv. 6.)—intended no doubt as a clue to the meaning of all like it, God told his servant that he had appointed “*each day for a year*.” The Jewish year, contained but 360 days. Now see the issue. The judgment, is *a day*; that in God’s sight, is as, *a thousand years*; each one of those thousand years *may be* a year of prophetic days, every one of which is a Jewish civil year. Thus the DURATION of the eternal judgment, which you say will *not occupy an instant*, may occupy *no less than three hundred and sixty thousand years!* And this *may be*, the real mind, of the divine spirit in these passages!—If it be really so, how august, how transcendent, how sustained—how infinite the glory of our Saviour! What an issue to the things of time: what a prelude to eternity!—Oh! between *no judgment*, and *such a judgment*,—do not the whole depth of hell, and the whole breadth of heaven, eternally divide!

4. That our comparison of atheism in its worst forms, with your pretended religion, does you no injustice, is abundantly confirmed by your doctrine about *eternity*. Men who believe that there is no future existence of the human soul; are justly and universally supposed to be destitute of all sufficient inducement to virtue and safeguard against crime. There is no adequate reward for doing what is right, in opposition to what may seem useful or agreeable; nor any adequate prevention against doing what is wrong, when it seems both painful and injurious not to do it.—Such men are presumed to act upon their own belief; and are therefore most properly held to be infamous. Now if one should vary this matter so as to hold, that the souls of men, would exist hereafter—but eternally, and without one exception, in a state of excruciating torture, and that without the least reference, to any moral quality in their past actions; the effects would be obviously the same or worse, as those of rank atheism. If all men believed such a doctrine—the ideas of self denial and restraint would be instant-

ly banished from the universe, and with them, all peace, all goodness, all hope. Suppose another modification of the terrific code, of which all these monsters are a common and kindred brood: Suppose a man to believe, that the soul will exist hereafter, eternally happy, in defiance of every enormity practised on earth; and that he pushes his rank lust after pollution, to so appalling an extent as to assent, that all belief, and all action even in time are perfectly immaterial as regards eternity! Now to our minds it is clear that this last, is of the three, the vilest form of licentiousness.—Naked atheism ruins man by merely leaving him to himself; this is the first form. The second, would overwhelm the world with despair, and kill the souls of men, by making present enjoyment however wretched, the only real good. The last and most horrid of the three,—can have no other effect than to degrade God, by levelling him to the condition of the most brutal sinners; or to deify corruption, by raising it to the level of God. In either case, its necessary effect must be, to throw all the authority of God, and all the sanctions of eternity, openly in favour of unlicensed sin!

And this sir is neither more nor less than your doctrine of eternity:—a doctrine the most horrible, that was ever engendered. Throughout this correspondence it is every where proven and admitted as your belief, that all men will be saved, and that no man will be punished in eternity. In several passages when pressed by the argument, you insinuate, and at length in your 9th letter openly and insultingly declare, that all belief is totally and supremely indifferent, as it regards eternity! “Now,”—say you *“that I may be understood even by a personification of theological dulness itself, I will state once for all, that neither a belief of Endless Misery, or (nor) Universalism, can afford to the believer, whether saint or sinner, THE LEAST ADVANTAGE IN ETERNITY.”*

Sir this is utter madness. Christ Jesus our Lord has told us with his own lips, *“if ye BELIEVE NOT that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.”* And he had the instant before said of those who die in their sins; *“whither I go ye cannot come,”* (John 8: 21—24.) To teach that all belief as it regards eternity, is alike; is therefore as directly contradictory of the word of God, as it is totally subversive of all moral principle. It is the most licentious form of atheism:—and seems to present no adequate motive even to those who hold it, to endeavour to spread it over the world, except the desire to make others, as much the children of the devil as they are themselves.

And now sir we are done. Before this letter is issued from the press, the writer of it, will perhaps have already left his native land. If he is spared to return,—he will hold this subject, and your Berean society, and the promised debate in mind. If otherwise, he rejoices in this last opportunity to say, that the principles he has advanced in these letters, have consoled his heart amid many and sharp trials, both from within and from without; and that he trusts to them, and to the dear Saviour who makes them known to his soul in power,—to support him, in the hour of death, and the day of judgment, with the same unshaken and joyful confidence, that he exults in the certainty that the same Saviour sits upon the throne of the universe, God blessed forever; amen!