

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. II.

FEBRUARY, 1836.

No. 2.

SERMON.

By the late Rev. Sylvester Larned.

MATTHEW XXII, 42.—What think ye of Christ?

IN the history to which this passage is annexed, we learn that our Saviour had been preaching in the Jewish capitol. After concluding his discourse, the Pharisees crowded around him, libelling as usual, the purity of his motives, and arraigning his claims to the Messiahship. To all this our Lord replied without the least asperity or irritation, by retorting the simple question of the text. What think ye of Christ?—or as it is in the Greek, of *the* Christ? In other words, if you impeach my pretensions to the Messiahship, let me ask what do you expect of a Messiah? What must he do, more than I have done to attest the divinity of his mission? What character must he sustain different from my own to suit the predictions of the word of God? This was a kind of attack which the Pharisees seem not to have expected. Had our Saviour begun to reason with them, they would have held their ground; for what chance is there of convincing those who are determined never to be convinced? But when instead of martialling the field of argument he merely calls on them to maintain their own position, they are at once thrown into consternation. "Tell me" says he "your own views of the Christ. If I have said or done any thing which your bible does not teach you to expect from him, I am willing to plead guilty. Only come forward and show that the charge is just." It is not at all strange that after stumbling and stammering through a sort of answer, the Pharisees were finally silenced, and from that day forth durst not ask him any more questions.

Now my hearers we have our subject before us.

The character of Jesus Christ regarded as an evidence of his religion.

Before we proceed, there is one reflection which ought to be candidly weighed. Biography, no matter of what kind, should never be read without knowing the spirit of the times to which it refers. The standard by which actions are usually measured is public sentiment; and this, we all know is constantly changing. Hence it happens that by the lapse of years and the progress of refinement,

what appears superlatively great at one period is viewed with very different feelings at another. For example, suppose Bacon or Newton or Boyle or Franklin had lived in the court of Augustus Caesar. Had they given the world *then* what they gave it afterwards, I know not but they would have been consecrated. No applause too loud—no laurels too costly or lavish could have been heaped upon them. Two thousand years ago some of our modern discoveries and inventions would have been looked upon as almost miraculous—and individuals now who fill but a moderate space on the pages of eulogy, old Rome would have enshrined and immortalized in columns of marble. Now let us apply this principle to the subject under discussion. The moral world *now*, and the moral world when our Saviour appeared are very different things. It has undergone a vast change. Eighteen centuries have altered some of its most important features—have matured and mellowed them, a Christian would say—have wrinkled them, a skeptic would say, into the appearance of dotage. Be this as it may, in order to judge fairly of Christianity, we ought to go back to the time when it first arose. We who have been taught it from the cradle may see in it nothing remarkable—nothing original in its principles—nothing striking in the lineaments of the system. But the question is what should we have thought had we lived 1800 years ago? We must ascertain the spirit of those times. We must represent an obscure young man, single handed and without education, establishing a new religion. We must remember that he opposed idolatry when the most refined nations practised it—that he inculcated the forgiveness of injuries when they ridiculed the idea, that he taught some of those great moral and religious truths which the world had never heard before. We must reflect that he disclosed his views on every subject that occurred—that he was called on frequently for opinions which most men would have wanted time to make up, that what he said was not only never retracted, but was said at the time in the most prompt and positive manner. And that the whole body of his moral doctrines, new, original, and surprising as they were, have been approved without exception by the united wisdom and experience of every subsequent age. And this too, when not another individual can be found in all antiquity but his sentiments are now seen to have been more or less exceptionable—not another but on some points is now proved to have been defective, on some to have been erroneous—and on all to have been materially bettered by those who have lived since. It is with these reflections that we ought to examine the character of Jesus Christ. *His* principles alone have stood the test of time—they have never been mended. Every body, good and bad agree that his system of morals is unrivalled. It has been charged with no fault and no defect. Statesmen, jurists and governments have taken advantage of its excellence. And yet that same Jesus Christ had no opportunities. During his life, not a single man of learning took his side. He lived without books and without instruction—poor, unpopular, persecuted, and finally submitted to martyrdom rather than disclaim the least of his sentiments—and when he died, there was hardly a man of sense in the world but thought his re-

ligion had inevitably gone with him to the grave. Permit me my hearers, to call your attention to this wonderful personage, viewed merely as a man—as the founder of the Christian religion.

In the first place let me mention his exemption from every thing like ambitious or aspiring views. Look at him where we wil, he evinces the most consistent humility which no applause could enflate and no trials dissatisfy. He was emphatically meek and lowly in heart; and there is something in the whole history which shows that this disposition was not affected. No attempt is seen to display it. Through the entire New Testament not a word is said to bring it before us as a mark of his piety. We are left to draw the conclusion from his life and not from his lips nor the lips of his followers. In his meakness too, we find nothing unnatural or constrained. He exposes the faults of his friends. He reproves the malice of his enemies. He speaks under all circumstances like a man of authority—and yet he is humble—he retires from public admiration. He works his miracles before the world, but never remains to listen to his own praise. He appears in the whole course of his ministry to have had no motive of personal aggrandizement. So far from this he frequently told his disciples that he expected nothing from the world but a cruel death, and that if they followed him at all, it must be on these conditions. Whosoever says he, is not willing to abandon houses, and lands, and parents, yea and his own life also, cannot be my disciple. And as if this were not enough, he is particular to enumerate the trials, hardships, and sufferings which they must endure. He tells them fairly to count the cost before submitting to the perils of Christianity. In a word, every thing which could mortify or afflict, he first encountered himself without a murmur, and then informed *them* that through just the same process they most pass in entering the kingdom of heaven.

Another characteristic of Jesus Christ, was that quality which is commonly called good sense. His conduct throughout was what we might expect from a great man, embarked in a great undertaking. Firm without obstinacy—strict without superstition, and cautious without concealment or disguise—he adapted himself to every class of men not by the accommodation of his principles, but by his amiable manners. In private life he appears the mild and endearing friend—in his public labours, the firm and undaunted advocate of truth without softening its pungency—without diverting its application. He did not covet opposition on the one hand, nor did he fear it when inflamed on the other. He moved steadily forward in the unwavering light of his own mind—and whether in the debates of the Sanhedrim, or at the table of an acquaintance, he conveyed irresistible impression of his greatness and glory. Every word is so full of meaning, and every action so full of example, and each one is so exactly in character with all the rest, that even if we could question his heart, we are compelled to admit the strength and comprehensiveness of his mind. There is a little incident recorded of him which illustrates the soundness of his judgment very forcibly. His enemies once took occasion when he was surrounded by a great crowd, to ask him if it were proper to pay tribute to Caesar.

Had he said yes, the mob would have torn him in pieces, for they hated Caesar and all his measures. Had he said no, the government would have arrested him for exciting rebellion against the king. What my hearers should you or I have answered? Feeling that it was a question which it belonged not to him to settle, he merely replied, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and to God the things which are God's." The same prudent, discreet, and judicious behaviour we discern through his whole life, and I wish particularly to remark, that he is the only individual on the pages of history who has never been charged with a single criminal or censurable action. Socrates deified a dumb animal. Plato justified drunkenness. Cicero allowed idolatry. Aristotle enjoined the stifling of weakly children. Diogenes inculcated and practised licentiousness—and Zeno and Cato committed suicide.—But our Saviour has never been reproached for a single immoral precept or a single improper example. Even his enemies, the most violent opposers of his religion from Pilate down to Paine, have admitted unanimously that they can find no fault in the man.

A third constituent in the character of Christ was the *practicalness*, if I may call it so, of his life and doctrines. Why is it my hearers, that such names as Howard, McIntosh, Reynolds, and Glanville Sharpe, hold so high a place in public affection? Because, you will say the public have a value received for it. Those men *earned* their laurels. They consecrated themselves to the cause of philanthropy. They explored the dungeons—the hospitals—and almost the tombs of their fellow beings, and made them ring with the news of mercy. True—And must that Saviour who has not only spent, but sacrificed life in the same work—must he remain forgotten while those are embalmed who have neither surpassed nor equalled, but only imitated him? What is the misery which he did not relieve—or the ignorance which he did not enlighten—or the vice which he did not reclaim—or the wretchedness which he did not console and sanctify? Rather let me ask where were the Howards or Sharpes of Greece and Rome? Who ever heard of such men till after Christianity appeared to impel and encourage them on their errands of mercy? Name a single *one*, who lived before the Star of Bethlehem broke through the heavens to show us not merely the hopes of a better world, but the relations and duties of this? But not in benevolence alone was our Saviour practical. It was seen in his whole deportment. Wherever we look at him there is nothing which wears the aspect of enthusiasm or excitement. His devotions are most strikingly appropriate. Solemn and impressive they may be, but they are not heated. In the inimitable prayer prescribed for his followers, and in the discourses which he delivered, there is a majesty of thought—an elevation of pity, and a tenderness of heart which no man ever did or ever will attentively examine without admiration. In his conduct too, we see no affected singularity—he dressed, he ate, he conversed like other people; he accepted their invitations, he was a guest at their entertainments, he was a partaker in their joys and their sorrows. He was engaging in his manners, affectionate in his attachments, and

unpopular only because he spoke the truth. And so of his precepts. They were all suited to the condition of human life. He did not require mankind like Mr. Rousseau to return to a state of nature—nor did he like the disciples of Monkery, invite them to caves and cloisters; nor did he like Zeno instruct them to throw their wealth into the sea; nor like the eastern Fakirs did he enjoin them to scourge their bodies for the purification of their souls. He taught a plain and sober religion which thousands and tens of thousands have found to comfort them here, to sustain them in death, and to save them forever.

There is only one more consideration in regard to our Saviour, to which I shall now advert, and that is the manner of his death. You will recollect my hearers, that he might have been pardoned, had he renounced his opinions. But he uniformly rejected the offer. Now if you or I were condemned to the scaffold for our religion, it would not be so strange that we should persist in it to the last extremity. For in such a case *we* should be convinced of its truth, we should believe whether correctly or not that our future happiness depended upon our perseverance. Hence it is that martyrdoms have occurred in every religion; for to every religion, there have been men so sincerely attached, that they would rather lay down life than disclaim it. But with Jesus Christ, it was not so. If he had been an impostor he knew of course that his future happiness could not depend upon dying with a lie on his lips. So far from this, every conceivable motive, his duty, his interest, his welfare, called upon him to abandon his errors before he went into the presence of the eternal God. If he had been an enthusiast, I admit he might have held out to the last and been a martyr without regret. But I ask you my hearers, is there any thing that looks like enthusiasm in his history? Does it appear in the profound and well adjusted system of ethics for which the wisest men in the world acknowledge themselves indebted to him? Can any one in his senses suppose that the gigantic intellect which must have devised the religion of the New Testament was so strongly excited as to imagine itself inspired in the very project which it had required so much coolness and prudence to plan? If not, Jesus Christ could not have died as an enthusiast. And if he died as an impostor, he is the only man that ever was, or ever will be, who without any earthly motive submits to a voluntary death, for opinions which he knows at the time to be false. But look my hearers at the manner in which our Saviour behaved in his last moments. He had no legal trial at all, but at such as he had, the officers of government were convinced of his innocence, and accordingly acquitted him. This however did not appease the mob. They were determined on taking his life, and frightened the court into submission. Had he not a right to complain? Where is the man who would not have complained? *He* did not. His friends appeared in arms to rescue him, but instead of permitting it he went forward in person and dissuaded them from the attempt. In the face of all the laws in the Roman empire, he was led out to execution the very day he had been publickly acquitted. His deportment on the occasion was entirely tranquil. He neither murmured nor fretted. Had he been

an imposter, he would at least have remonstrated against the cruelty of his sentence—or had he been an enthusiast, he would have betrayed that high-wrought excitement which sets danger and death at defiance. But he did neither. I know not that in his whole life he evinced more composure than during the hour which finally closed it. After arriving on the ground, he seems to have been extremely exhausted, and to have said but little. That little however, was not in his own defence; it was chiefly in bidding farewell to his family and friends, and in pardoning one of the criminals who were nailed by his side. Just before he expired, he cast a look of tenderness on the crowd, and instead of reproving them for their cruelty, he lifted up his eyes to heaven and said, Father forgive them, for they know not what they do. O my hearers; what a sentiment on the quivering lips of an innocent and murdered man! How do the fashionable ideas of honor, and the popular tribunal of pistols and balls, and the bleeding and frenzied bosom of premature widowhood and orphanage—how do they appear at the foot of Mount Calvary! What must we think of him—so cool in enthusiasm, or so godlike in imposture as to be the first to inculcate the forgiveness of injuries; and the first to exemplify his own lesson while bathed in the blood of the cross? With such a scene before me I can no longer wonder that infidelity itself in one of its lucid intervals should have burst into that impressive exclamation, "If Socrates died like a philosopher, Jesus Christ died like a God."

And now my hearers let me repeat the enquiry, "What think ye of Christ?" Was he what he claims to be, or was he a victim to the rottenness and corruption of his own heart? There is no middle ground. To use his own words in another sense, those who are not *for* him, must be against him. No room is left for doubt, none for compromise. Either Jesus Christ must be the king of heaven, or he must be, I tremble to say what. Look at his life—his character—his death, and see if your minds can be goaded up to pronounce him the abominable pandor of imposture and falsehood. If they can, I have one favor to ask, which those surely who are too wise to believe the New Testament, can have no apology for refusing. I wish to be informed who wrote the biography of our Saviour. We have often wondered that the authors of the letters of Junius, and of the poems of Ossian could have resisted the temptation of declaring their names. But to have composed out of raw materials such a production as the Life of Christ, to have contrived so faultless and original a system of morals; to have delineated a perfect character so completely, that enmity itself can discover no defect. And all this too, eighteen hundred years ago, when the greatest philosophers of the age had been unsuccessful in similar attempts. That any mere man should have done this, and especially that he should have concealed his name, and not only so but should have palmed the whole upon another; is one of those logical probabilities which I confess myself unable to comprehend. But my hearers I will not insult your understandings by pushing the argument further. Let me rather ask another question conveyed by the text. What do we think of Christ as our Saviour and Judge? How far are we conformed to the holy example which he has bequeath-

ed for imitation? Take for instance his *humility*; have we lived like him, above the world, unmoved by its praise and unambitious of its splendour? Have we resisted the approach of pride and filled our proper place in the dust, and sought our closets, and on our knees that spirit of meekness which our great exemplar evinced? Look also at the judicious and sober consistency of his life. Have we any corresponding indication in our own? Is our piety like his, the pure and steady flame which enlightens, animates, and warms our hearts? Or is it the tremulous blaze of feeling kindled by sympathy and kept alive by enthusiasm and animal excitement? Inquire once more, and see what *practical* effects our religion produces. Do we imitate our Saviour in his unwearied solicitude to instruct the ignorance, relieve the necessities, and console the trials of our fellow men. Do we share our blessings with the destitute? Do our purses confirm what our profession supposes? Will the records of poverty find our names in the day of judgment enrolled as the trustees of its wants? Ah! my hearers that hollow-hearted Christianity which makes long prayers, and wears long faces, but puts off practical things with a convenient "Be ye warmed and be ye clothed," is literally less than nothing and vanity. Never until hypocrisy is numbered among the cardinal virtues, will such a wretched pretext pass for the genuine currency of the Bible. In the disclosures of the final day, the inquiry of our text will be put to us again; and if we should then be found to have contradicted in our lives, what we professed with our lips, the affrontery of our pretensions will only aggravate our guilt and lend a fresh sting to the despair of eternity.

THE CASE OF REV. ALBERT BARNES, OF THE PHILADELPHIA SYNOD.

THE minutes of the Synod of Philadelphia, at its yearly meeting, for 1835, have been printed, with an appendix making together a pamphlet of about seventy pages.

We would commend to all the Christian sects, the practice of the Presbyterians, in giving full publicity, in perfectly authentic form, to all their formal proceedings and acts. The world has a right to know, what all associated bodies of men are doing. Christianity is entitled to speak openly, in every possible form to men. And truth and justice require that in the present heated state of religious contest, and the alarming disregard to fairness and accuracy which so many journals pretending to be religious, habitually manifest the most authentic and undeniable, evidences of all important occurrences should be placed in reach of all who read at all.

They who read the partizan newspapers, published by Semi-Pelagians who call themselves Presbyterians, will be surprised to find, on reading the published minutes of the late sessions of the Synod of Philadelphia, how great an amount of misrepresentation has already been spread before the public, in regard to the recent doings of that noble body of men. Indeed the Synod had hardly adjourned before a settled and apparently a concerted attempt was simultaneously made, in all the newspapers of the country, devoted to the Semi-Pelagian heresy, to write down that ancient and power-

ful body. In this crusade, the *neutral papers*, relying upon the past credulity of the churches in regard to their hollow professions, threw in their aid, in its appropriate place. While the radically unsound were doing their work in ruining the Synod, those who are neutral only so far as the interests of error require, performed theirs, in a settled attempt to glorify Mr. Barnes. And it is painful to observe, that members of other Protestant sects, instead of sympathising with the truth, or preserving a delicate silence, have, to some extent, been boisterous in favour of men and principles, whose propagation amongst themselves, is already causing all good men to weep.

Our readers are referred to an article entitled "Pelagianism and the New Haven Quarterly" in our magazine for June 1835, for a brief statement of the errors of the new sect, which has arisen in America, and of which, the Synod of Philadelphia, has recently convicted and suspended Mr. Barnes for holding some of the worst dogmas.

Mr. Barnes, it is generally known, was pastor of the 1st Presbyterian church in Philadelphia; which is one of the oldest and most respectable, in the Presbyterian sect. He received his theological education at Princeton, New Jersey; which as he stated on the floor of the last general assembly of the Presbyterian church, he entered, a few days after his conversion! A statement, which must have filled all who heard it with dismay: and which went far to account for all his subsequent career. A man who is prepared, within a few hours after uniting with the church of Christ, to rush upon a course of life which usually requires long and careful and prayerful investigation on the part of others; must have either miraculous help from above, or miraculous want of suitable preparation to decide such a question at all.

Dr. Junkin, the individual who arraigned Mr. Barnes is at this time a member of the Newtown Presbytery, under the care of the Synod of New Jersey: and is president of the Lafayette College at Easton, Pa.

The 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia to which Mr. Barnes belonged, and before which he was accused, tried and acquitted, is under the care of the Synod of Philadelphia. It was constituted some years ago by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, contrary to the wishes of the Synod in whose bounds it is, and who at first received and immediately dissolved it. Again, a succeeding assembly, that of 1834 re-established it, and pronounced the act of the Synod dissolving it, void. And this time, the Assembly carried its zeal for this Presbytery to such an extent as to create a new Synod, contrary as the event showed to the wishes of both the Synods (of Virginia, and Philadelphia) which were divided to make it, apparently for no other object, but to receive and protect it. The Presbytery of Baltimore, positively refused to enter the new Synod of the Chesapeake of which it was a necessary constituent part. This reduced the next assembly (that of 1834) to the necessity of dissolving that Synod and erecting the new one of Delaware. And to put the Assembly in a condition to do so the Presbytery of New Castle and the Synod of Philadelphia had, in the mean time been tre-

panned into the erection of a new presbytery, called Wilmington, which with Lewis, and the 2d of Philadelphia, made the three Presbyteries which are indispensable to the formation of a Synod.--It may serve to show the nature and end of all this procedure, to state, that the assembly of 1835 dissolved the Synod of Delaware; and the Synod of Philadelphia, of the same year, dissolved both the new Presbyteries; (2d of Philadelphia, and Wilmington,) which helped to compose it. It may show the temper and spirit of the men who have done all these acts, each one of which convulsed their whole sect, and all unitedly have kept it in turmoil for five years—to state, that they have jointly or severally, connected with the various procedures in the church courts within that period, taken about *fifty appeals, complaints, &c.*; no less than seven of which relate to the proceedings of the last Synod; and that they finally came to such a pass, as to draw down on a part of them, for the first time, amongst us, a sentence from a very large body of their brethren, that their conduct was "*obstinate, vexatious, unjust, uncandid, contumacious, and grossly disorderly.*" (See page 14, printed Minutes of synod, Philadelphia, for 1835.) It may serve to exhibit, the theological opinions of these persons, in their proper light, to say, that the 2d presbytery of Philadelphia acquitted Mr. Barnes by a triumphant majority; may if their long prosing, mistified and contradictory judgment in his cause, is capable of being understood, they even appear to defend the *supposed errors*, on which he was arraigned.

Such were the parties, and such the first court, in the case to be decided by the recent Synod of Philadelphia. That Synod, embracing all Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, and about half of Pennsylvania; and having perhaps nearly five hundred churches and ministers, unitedly, under its care, met at York, in Pennsylvania, in the latter part of October last,—and constituted with about 250 members. It was much the largest body of the sort, that had ever met in this country: and had duties to perform, which were hardly inferior in apportance or difficulty, to any ever laid on any other.

As it regards the case of Mr. Barnes, however important it might be supposed to be, in its personal aspects, there were others in which it was vastly more so. He would naturally feel the deepest interest in the determination of the Synod. For if he possessed only that usual self-distrust and humility which constitute a vital part of the Christian character, he could not fail to see, that if such a body should decide against him, the chances would be greatly in favour of his views being false, on some of the most vital points, regarding evangelical truth:—while supposing him to be free, from even this reasonable diffidence in the absolute truth of his own opinions, he must have known, that as evidence before the churches, a judgment against him, from such a source, would be at least as weighty, as the joint commendation of the New York Evangelist and Observer, responded to by his own church and Mr. Patterson's—endorsed by political hacks through party newspapers, and sealed by the supporting smiles of Dr. Beman on one hand and Mr. Finney on the other, on all the platforms in New York. On the other hand, the

Synod could not fail to observe, that as all the past admonitions of the Presbytery, Synod and Assembly itself, before all of which Mr. Barnes and his doctrines had made no mean figure for some years past, had only stimulated him to greater activity in spreading his opinions, and his friends to greater extravagance of commendation, both of his piety and learning therein: so now, it only needed, that they should put the finishing hand to the work, by any act short of actual discipline that would be felt,—and every boy in the church whose crude opinions happened to contradict themselves or the standards, would have the highest possible temptation in the notoriety and riches, gained with impunity by Mr. Barnes,—to ruin himself and disturb others, by letting a stream of exploded heresies run through his head into some stereotype foundry, and thence over the whole land!

The personal aspect of the case therefore was not unimportant. But its general bearing, was as we have said far more so. They who pay any attention to this subject know that almost from the days of Edward's speculations in regard to the true principles of morality, and the true philosophy of religion, have been carried forward under the guidance of a false system of mental science; until the whole concern has fairly exploded. Dr. Taylor and Mr. Finney, and their followers have perfected a conjoint code of religion, morals, and metaphysics; all the particular parts of which may indeed be picked up, strewed amongst the rubbish of former ages, but which stands itself a monument of that species of eclectic genius, so strongly illustrated by the operations of the magnet, which in the midst of the most precious jewels, will cover itself only with the filings and dust of steel!—It would not be candid to insinuate that this system is held in all its parts, by all those who are tinctured with the new theology: perhaps Mr. Barnes himself may not fully embrace it, though he is understood to have been for a considerable time one of the stated contributors to the *Christian Spectator*, which is the great focus (next to Chatham Street chapel) of the new opinions. But on the other hand the germs of the system are entertained by many amongst that numerous band, who ranking themselves with the orthodox, prefer the appellation of '*moderate!*'—whether to temper their theology—their zeal—their opposition to error, or their love of truth, is not yet perfectly manifest. So that on the whole, a sympathy for the person and opinions of Mr. Barnes was not only widely spread in the Presbyterian church, but in the four assemblies, immediately preceeding that of 1835,—constant evidence was furnished which led many to fear that the whole church was rapidly tending to Pelagianism. In this conjuncture, the famous Act and Testimony, was issued in the spring of 1834, by about seventy persons. By the following spring it had been signed by considerably more than two thousand presbyters—and adopted by many church courts. In the spring of 1835, a large convention of these signers, met at Pittsburg, and agreed on and presented to the Assembly which met there about the same time, a memorial containing every thing contended for, by the Act and Testimony, and which was substantially adopted by the assembly itself. In this manner, all the doings for years, to give security and permanency

to the new opinions were reversed—the new theology pronounced to be “*pestiferous heresy*”—the Synod of Delaware dissolved,—and the old foundations of truth and order restored.

Before the meeting of the assembly of 1835, two very conspicuous upholders of the new theology had been accused before their respective presbyteries. In the west Dr. Wilson of Cincinnati had arraigned Dr. Beecher, president of Lane seminary; and in the east the case under consideration had occurred. In both these cases, the presbyteries which tried them, deferred the hearing and decision of them from month to month, for no other apparent reason, than to prevent them from being issued before the last Assembly met, and so taken up by appeal to it. In the case of Mr. Barnes, this was so manifest, that the decency of a good pretext, was hardly considered necessary. It is needful to remember, that the accusation of these gentlemen was not a spontaneous matter, in the sense in which Mr. Barnes has thought proper to represent it: nor the result of minute prying into small errors. The whole new school party in their defence of the errors charged, were clamorous for the specification of persons; and the entire “moderate” party, in its vehement opposition to the Act and Testimony, demanded the presentation of a personal case. It has been done—and what now is the voice—and where are the votes, of the new school, and the moderates? Alas! for poor, erring, inconsistent man!

It appears from the minutes now before us, that Mr. Barnes, Dr. Junkin, and the Presbytery, all went to York, expecting the Synod to try the case. It is clear that when the Synod met, it was *unanimously of opinion* that the case was regularly, fairly and constitutionally before it; for it voted unanimously that the appeal was “*in order*” and “*that the Synod take it up and issue it according to the provisions of the Book of Discipline. Chap. VII, Sec. 3, articles 8 and 9.*” (see page 10 printed Minutes.) Some gentlemen, afterwards turned a sharp corner. We hope they saw new light, before they did it. But those who did not see the light, should not be so lavishly abused, for not turning the corner.

Mr. Barnes repeatedly stated, that he was prepared for trial. And yet Mr. Barnes at last refused to be tried! And why this change of purpose? Why reader, solely and exclusively, as he himself states, because by the refusal of his Presbytery to produce the record in the case it became unconstitutional for the Synod to proceed! (See page 15.) Well: this is clever; and it proves, that to write a commentary on the epistle to the Romans, logic and candour are not indispensable, any more than Greek.

But let us see. What was the withheld record? Why the charges; the proof, and the sentence. The sentence and the charges were in possession of the synod, of both the parties, and of every body who had chosen to keep a copy of any one of a dozen or fifteen newspapers, that published them! The proof,—every word of it,—mark that—every word of it, was contained in Mr. Barnes’s notes on the Romans—of which he had published several editions, of which many copies were in the hands of members of Synod—and which the appellant produced and proved by the oath of a worthy gentleman,

was the *identical paper and proof*, offered by the prosecutor, in the presbytery.

But who withheld it? Why Mr. Barnes's presbytery with his full approbation, as he admitted on the floor of the Synod!—And that too, although repeated attempts were made to obtain it! Against which attempts, the Presbytery, *embracing Mr. B. himself*, actually appealed to the assembly! (See page 16.) That is, the entire case was fully before the Synod, and so unanimously voted; the entire proof and proceedings in the presbytery (except Mr. B's speech, which was in his pocket) were all, in the hands of the Synod, and Mr. B. knew it;—he was fully prepared for trial, and so stated *after* his presbytery refused the record, (see page 11); nay it was not till it was perfectly clear that the way which his presbytery with his approbation had hedged up, was again fully opened, (see Mr. Steel's evidence on page 15) that Mr. B's nerves gave way, and new light from the constitution broke in on his mind—and he found he could not be legally tried. Then he appealed with his presbytery, *as a member of it*, because the Synod went too far in trying to get the record (page 16)—and then afterwards appealed again *on his own account*, because the Synod tried the case without that very record! (see page 31, and also Mr. Barnes's printed reasons for appeal.)

But still the constitution is in the way; and that, all who ever read Mr. Barnes's sermon on the Way of Salvation—not to speak of his Explanations, which the Assembly of 1831 considered so very satisfactory,—know to be too sacred and venerable in his own eyes to be spoken against where it is wrong, much less disobeyed where it is right. This paroxism is therefore, the more respectable, as it is of such ancient origin. Let us then candidly look at this question.

Suppose this case to have been like most others, and that the record below contained proof usually taken, &c. &c. It is manifest that the clerk and the presbytery, who have the custody of the records, and not the parties, should be responsible for their production. So our standards provide (Discip. Chap. vii. Sec. 3, sub. sec. 7.) that the appellant shall lodge *his appeal* and the reasons for it, &c., because they are his. But every church count is bound (see sub. sec. 15 of the above reference) under severe penalties, whenever a judgment is appealed from “to send authentic copies of all their records, and of the whole testimony relating to the matter of the appeal.”—Was it then lawful for the presbytery to hold back this record? Or was it becoming in Mr. Barnes to take advantage of their fraud? But again, in Chap. xx. of the form of government, it is made the duty of all clerks to grant extracts from all their records, whenever properly applied for. Will poor Mr. Eustice say they were not applied for? Then let him look on pages 50 and 51 of the printed minutes of the Synod, and see Dr. Junkin's letter demanding, and his answer refusing to give the necessary certificate! Will he say they were not *properly* demanded? Then let him read chapter iv. sec. 16 of the Discipline, where it is written “*parties shall be allowed copies of the whole proceedings, at their own*

expense, if they demand them." Now where lies the inseparable barrier of the constitution? Who violated plain duty?

But Mr. Barnes fortifies his assertion with references. Let us examine them. The first is to Discipline chap. vii. sec. 3, sub. sec. 8, in which nothing exists that can by possibility help his case, except the order, "thirdly, to read the whole record of the proceedings of the inferior judiciary, in the case" &c. But if Mr. Barnes will read sec. 1, sub. sec. 4, of the very chapter to which he refers above, he will see, that when precisely such a case as his arises, where "heretical opinions" have been "allowed to gain ground," and "offenders" have been "suffered to escape"—in which defective, imperfect, or fraudulent records exist, and how much more, if no record at all?—the superior judicatory being well advised, *is bound* "to examine, deliberate, and judge in the whole matter, as completely, as if it had been recorded, and thus brought up by the review of the records." If the law had been made for the case, the fit, could not be more perfect.

His next reference is to Discipline, chap. iv. sec. 23 in which it is thus written; "and nothing but what is contained in the record, may be taken into consideration in reviewing the proceedings in a superior court." And when did the Synod attempt any thing else? The whole object was to get the very record, with the clerk's seal attesting it. When this failed, the next object was to prove what was in the record, by witnesses. It was a mere question of attestation. Technically, Mr. Eustace's signature, was better than any thing else. But morally Mr. Steel's oath was the best; and technically it was the next best, when Mr. Barnes's presbytery with his approbation prevented Mr. Eustice from doing what as a faithful clerk, and a Christian man, it was his bounden duty to do. But here Mr. B. will pardon us for saying, that, although he manifests great aptness for that part of the business of a lawyer, which is usually least captivating to sober minds, he falls into the common error of enthusiasts in a favourite pursuit, by pushing his special quibbles, a little over the mark. He and his Presbyters exact too much when they require, first liberty to withhold the attestation of their clerk, and then, secondly, the right to make that withheld attestation, not only the best, but the only possible proof of a fact susceptible of being many ways established,—and never capable of being questioned, except as the result of their deceit, and injustice.

Let us then pass to his only remaining reference, which is to chap. xx. of the form of government. In this short chapter the duties of clerks are laid down. And if the citation of it by Mr. Barnes, be not intended as a biting jest on Mr. Eustice, it is perhaps, to prove that records are properly attested by the signature of the clerk: Surely. This is most certain and most reasonable. But what of that? Suppose the clerk refuses to attest? Suppose he attests an untruth? Suppose he makes a mistake? It is law, ever any where, that what a clerk attests is immutable truth,—and nothing else, is true at all? Here is the same shallow ignorance, which in the name of acute speculation, cuts such a figure in the discussions of our day. Mr. Barnes ought to know that the law is a noble science; the science which applies right reason and equal

justice to the ever varying conditions of human right; and that it is not a bundle of miserable fetches and quirks. He ought to comprehend that the great principles of interpretation, which are based in common sense, and a true knowledge of things, are equally indispensable in the exposition of the social systems on which all our earthly comforts depend, as in that of the heavenly word on which our future hopes repose. He should consider that such egregious absurdities, touching the one, will at least shake our confidence in that perfect fitness, for the other, which has impelled him, at so great a cost of the feelings of his weaker brethren, and so little effort on his own part, to pour forth successive commentaries on the most difficult and important passages of holy writ, with the facility and fruitfulness of a writer of romance.

It is sad that such things need be said. Yet the interests of truth do not permit us to be silent. Mr. Barnes became a Presbyterian of his own free will. That church has standards, plain, venerable, and dearly loved. Nothing was demanded of Mr. Barnes except that he would either conform to them, or make no pretence of so doing. He would do neither. He would write against both the doctrines and the standards which contained them; and would persist in professing to believe and teach them all! Not only so, he set himself forward, in the front of the attack; and has written and published more, and given more trouble, than any one else. Now it occurs to us that after all this, it is rather an incongruous finale, for a gentleman to sneak out of a trial through such miserable pretexts, and give such superlatively silly reasons, for conduct which required the most weighty to justify it.

But we forbear. The Synod tried the cause, upon the very same evidence which had been submitted to the presbytery. It sustained the appeal, reversed the judgment of the presbytery, and suspended Mr. Barnes from the ministry. We give below the charges on which he was tried, and the sentence of the Synod on the whole case.

THE CHARGES.

The Rev. Albert Barnes is hereby charged with maintaining the following doctrines, contrary to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, viz:

1. *That all sin consists in voluntary action.* Witness his notes on the epistle to the Romans, pp. 249, 123, 192, 124, 116.

2. That Adam (before and after his fall) was ignorant of his moral relations to such a degree, that he did not know the consequences of his sin would or should reach any farther than to natural death. *Idem.* p. 115.

3. That unregenerate men are able to keep the commandments and convert themselves to God. pp. 164, 165, 108.

4. That Faith is an act of the mind, and not a principle; and is itself imputed for righteousness. pp. 94, 95.

Mr. Barnes is also charged with denying the following doctrines, which are taught in the Standards of the Church: viz.

5. That God entered into covenant with Adam, constituting him

a federal or covenant head, and representative to all his natural descendants. pp. 114, 128, 118, 115, 120, 121, 128.

6. That the first sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity. pp. 10, 117, 119, 121, 127, 128.

7. That mankind are guilty, i. e. liable to punishment, on account of the sin of Adam. pp. 123, 128.

8. That Christ suffered the proper penalty of the law, as the vicarious substitute of his people, and thus took away legally their sins, and purchased pardon. Same as on the 6th and 7th charges, also pp. 89, 90.

9. That the righteousness, i. e. the active obedience of Christ to the law, is imputed to his people for their justification, so that they are righteous in the eye of the law, and *therefore* justified. pp. 28, 84, 85, 94, 95, 127, 212.

10. Mr. Barnes also teaches in opposition to the standards, that justification is simply pardon. pp. 28, 29, 110, 124, 127, 128, 182, 217.

I further charge Mr. Barnes with teaching, as referred to the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, and 10th of the above doctrines in *opposition to the Holy Scriptures*; and with denying the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th, of the above specifications, *contrary* to the Word of God.

THE FINAL SENTENCE.

Resolved, 2. That in view of the proof presented to the Synod, and of the whole case, the decision of the (Assembly's) 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia, in the case of the charges of the said Geo. Junkin against the said Albert Barnes, be and the same hereby is *reversed*, as contrary to truth and righteousness, and the Appeal declared to be sustained.

2. That some of the errors alledged in the charges to be held by the said Albert Barnes are fundamental; and all of them contrary to the standards of the Presbyterian church, in the United States; and that they do contravene the system of truth therein taught, and set forth in the word of God.

3. That the said Albert Barnes be, and he hereby is suspended from the exercise of all the functions proper to the gospel ministry, until he shall retract the errors hereby condemned, and give satisfactory evidence of repentance.

On the naked question to sustain the appeal and reverse the judgment of the presbytery acquitting Mr. Barnes of the above charges, the vote stood; Ayes 142:—Nays 16:—Non liquet 17: Excused 1. (See page 21.) On the vote to adopt the two first resolutions of the final sentence little or no opposition appears to have been made. (See page 28.) On the question to strike out the third resolution (suspending Mr. B.) with a view to take some other course, and for which motion all would naturally vote who preferred any other possible result, to that actually proposed in the resolution; the vote was; Ayes 41: Nays 113:—Non liquet 1. Thereupon the third resolution was adopted, (page 29.) Then the vote on the whole Minute, embracing the preamble and three resolutions, as the final vote of the Synod in the case was taken, and stood Ayes 116:—Nays 31:—Excused from voting 6: Non li-

quet 2. That is, a majority of three-fourths of the whole Synod, were convinced not only that Mr. B. was guilty as charged, but that his guilt involved unfitness for the sacred duties of the gospel ministry. While out of 176 presbyters that voted on the first question of sustaining the appeal, only 16,—that is one in eleven, thought the decision of the presbytery in acquitting Mr. B. consistent with truth and righteousness! This is an overwhelming result! And one which a very scanty share of modesty, humility and discrimination, should have taught Mr. B. and his friends, to regard with solemnity, and treat with becoming reverence. The New York Evangelist, traduces the Synod in unmeasured terms. But the Synod may still exist under its rebuke, so long as the Boston Recorder lives to make it evident, that the Evangelist draws on its imagination for its facts, and deduces its moral code from the impulses of the passions. Dr. Ely, who has had so large a share in all these troubles, has asserted over his signature, that he would as soon trust his slave Ambrose (who by the way, has pleased him so well, that he has resolved to have more)—as the Synod of Philadelphia. To most ears, this sounds bitterly and contemptuously. And yet until the Doctor is acquitted of the dreadful crime which we are pained to perceive, by the paper of his friend Mr. Lovejoy at St. Louis, the Grand Jury of Marion, have on their oaths, presented him for committing,—the Synod of Philadelphia, may be content to risk *its good name*, against *his veracity*.

That which is of chief interest to the churches, is the result of this cabale subject in the General Assembly; whither various branches of it and the matters connected with it have gone, on seven appeals! And here let us look steadily at the future; and discern if we may, what it portends.

The whole subject of Mr. Barnes will be before the Assembly of 1836. Let us suppose, first, that they sustain his appeal (which the constitution of the church expressly forbade him to take, at all, after refusing to submit to trial;) that they reverse, the decision of Synod entirely; that they acquit Mr. Barnes of teaching error; and solemnly affirm as true, the errors charged and proved on him. Such a decision, is impossible, and never will, nor can be had, until the majority of the church has become Pelagian. And whenever it is rendered, it amounts to a solemn vote by the Assembly, that the Bible and the Standards are both false; and must be tantamount to a simple *felo de se*, of the Assembly itself. Every orthodox presbytery would of course take immediate steps to depose every delegate from them, that should have a hand, in so rank and wicked an act.—It can never happen.

Let us suppose, that they dodge the question; that they decline saying whether Mr. Barnes teaches error or not; or that they take his subsequent explanations, or that they refuse to decide whether the charges against him contain error or not.—The result will be in any case which does not amount to a full, complete, and ample meeting and settling the whole difficulty,—that the contest about the doctrines and doings of the new school, will be renewed and indefinitely protracted. For these errors and disorders may no

longer be borne with. And the General Assembly must meet questions as they arise, and decide what is truth, and order, and what makes for righteousness and peace.

But let us suppose, that the Assembly sustains the decisions and judgment of the Synod; dismisses the vexations and disorderly appeals of the two Presbyteries dissolved; declares openly what is truth and order, and ranges itself firmly on their behalf:—how blessed, how happy will that day be, for the cause of our divine Lord! Will Dr. Taylor's followers secede? Blessed day!—Will Mr. Finney, with his big tent, and little college, curse the church and leave it? Alas! we will bear the former, for the sake of the latter act! Give us the antidote—and we will try the bane!

There is indeed an intermediate course. They may sustain Mr. Barnes's appeal, and reverse the decision of the Synod, so far as the mere suspension goes; then rebuke him,—or let him explain and beg off, (*as Dr. Beecher has done;*) but at the same time strongly condemn the errors with which he is charged,—as it were *in thesi*. In any of these cases, it occurs to us,—that the great body of the church ought to exercise a noble forbearance, in every *personal* aspect of the case. If the truth is safe; let us be satisfied. If the Assembly clearly and firmly, denounces error, let us not care too much for immediate personal results. If Mr. Barnes is content to *escape*; there is no very great importance in preventing it. It may be on the whole, the best thing that could happen—that error should become ridiculous, instead of being seriously punished.

The truth is undeniably evident, that the strength of this terrible current of error, which threatened to inundate us, is set back. The hand of a kind and wise Providence has been signally over us for good: and all the events which have transpired since a portion of the church, arose to reform it, have constantly and strongly tended in favour of them and their holy cause. The force which was needful to put these events in motion, is so far from being necessary to continue their progressive action,—that if continued it might make the machine run off, and tear itself to pieces. We need a firm hand at the helm now, more than a strong arm at the oar.—Beside all this, the church itself has been an accessory before the fact to all these evils, which had so nearly ruined her. Then let her not be harsh in visiting her misconduct on the heads even of real offenders. Let it be settled that truth and order, must be restored; but let those who have been tolerated, if not seduced into error, see that personal considerations mix lightly—and no farther than faithfulness requires, with the strongest opposition to the miserable theology, and the unsound morality, which have so fatally marked the times out of which we are emerging.

Upon the whole; while we are perfectly satisfied that the decision of the Synod of Philadelphia in the case of Mr. B. was wise, just, and constitutional,—and that the best thing (and the most probable also,) that could be done by the next Assembly, is its simple and complete affirmation: yet on the other hand, it needs only to enlighten the public mind in regard to it, and no decision to which that Assembly can possibly come—will be such, in all probability, as to give just dissatisfaction to those who love Jesus Christ. Nor

can there be the least doubt, that the Presbyterian Church is rapidly returning to and setting down on its ancient standards, and that the Acts of the last Synod of Philadelphia, must have a mighty influence in hastening the completion of so happy a termination of all her troubles.

AN ATTEMPT TO PROVE THAT THERE IS A FUTURE AND ETERNAL STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, IN A FEW LETTERS TO THE EDITORS OF THE SOUTHERN PIONEER AND LIBERALIST, BY THE CONDUCTORS OF THE BALTIMORE LITERARY AND RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

LETTER I.

Sir:—If you will take the trouble to examine a file of your paper you may observe, that occasionally, for the last two years, one of us, has been the subject of attack in it. You will perceive that before the existence of the Magazine which we now conduct, your predecessor did us the honour to revile us, along with many better men; and that our Journal was not perfectly established, before it became the object of his attack.—You, too, Sir, appear to us to have sought and rejoiced in the hope of a personal controversy with us. And although you are nearly an entire stranger in this community, and preach and publish doctrines, which nine out of ten of our citizens not only disbelieve but detest,—you have thrown yourself upon us all, in a way that would take no denial, and as to ourselves, exulted over us beforehand, as if in the certainty, that your opinions could not possibly be contested by us, without advantage to yourself. And this may be true. For there are opinions so deplorable, that society has generally considered that the best way to deal with them was to take it for granted that no reputable man, held them: just as there are nuisances which it is more offensive to remove than to tolerate.

It is therefore not perfectly clear to our own minds, that we have done wisely in taking such a notice of your attacks upon us as cannot fail of being in some respects liable to the misfortune of doing good to your newspaper. But we have considered in the first place, that the truths which we suppose to be at stake, are such as affect the very foundations of all morality, as well as all religion, so that if you succeed, men not only become unfit for heaven, but unfit for human society; and in the second place, that the efforts which are making by a combination of Universalists, Agrarians, Liberalists, Deists, Workies, Fanny Wright men, and Atheists, through various newspapers, Schools, (both day and night)—debating clubs, &c. have at length arrived at a pass, which requires at once, in our judgment, the intervention of the police—and the correction of right reason and sound morals. You will therefore do us the favor to remember, that a controversy for its own sake, with you personally, and about your own opinions, forms no part of our design. Nor yet do we set out to disprove the doctrines of Universalists in general; for the plain reason, that there are as many kinds of them nearly as there are societies amongst you. There may be some,

nearly orthodox and evangelical in the entire faith of the gospel,—except the cardinal doctrine of the eternal state of future punishment; while others are Socinians; others deists; others atheistical fatalists.

Our object is different. It is specific, and simple. We desire with the aid of the Lord, to prove, *first, that there is a future state of rewards and punishments; and secondly that it is eternal.* In doing this, we shall use all the seriousness which the awful import of the subject demands; and all the freedom which the interests of truth require.

Before proceeding with the main argument, we will suggest a few hints which seem to us, to place the orthodox, and true doctrine in regard to a future and eternal state of retribution, on a footing of infinite preference to every possible form of Universalism. And like the use of olives at the feasts of the ancients, they may, if they serve no better use, sharpen your appetite and quicken your digestion for the coming entertainment.

1. Suppose we admit it to be true, that all men are at once admitted into Heaven, immediately after death. In that case the righteous man is as well off as any; for surely if all are saved, and none punished, for a single moment, then the good will also be saved, even in defiance of their mistaken belief that the wicked would be lost. In this case, it is not easy to see, the advantage of such a form of Universalism.

2. But suppose it to be the true doctrine, that all men will be saved, not immediately at death, but after a period of suffering more or less protracted, according to the particular case of each. Now it seems to us, that in this case he who believed eternal punishment and so lived as to avoid all punishment, if he could, would be quite as apt to escape as the rest. But if there be *two ways* to Heaven,—the one *direct*—the other *through Hell*, it strikes us that the former, is by great odds the preferable way.

3. But if you please, let us suppose the Universalism of your friends, the Deists, to be the true doctrine, and reject not only all eternal punishment, but all idea of a *spiritual* heaven. In the physical paradise which would then exist, we would surely be as likely as any to find a place. For the two grand ideas of these worthy persons are, *that all who are sincere in what they believe, and who do no particular harm to others*,—must be saved at once; and all others after a while. But surely if there is no Hell, we do no harm in warning men against it. And just as surely, our *sincere* belief, that the blood of Jesus can save us *from Hell*, is not a sufficient reason why *we alone* should go thither!

4. Not to be unjust even to that form of atheistical Universalism, which at Tammany Hall, in the city of New York, makes weekly exhibitions of blasphemy against the God of Hosts, at the rate of a shilling or two a head, for all spectators; let us suppose that Mr. Kneeland and Mr. Offen, and the rest have hit the true secret; that sensation is blessedness, that men have no souls, but that at death we are resolved into the great sentient universe; as a happy part of the blissful whole.—What then? Suppose there is no separate future existence of the human soul; suppose there is no spirit in us

now, independent of organization. Why our system is as good as any for *the future*, if there is no future; better than any, for *the present*, inasmuch as, seeing we have no souls, we thank God that *our bodies are made happy by it!*

5. Let the hypothesis be changed for a moment. We have supposed your system true, and ours false, in all the preceding cases. And yet so fatally absurd is the doctrine of Universal Salvation, that even on the admission of its truth, nothing can be deduced from it which does not demonstrate, that even what is admitted by the hypothesis to be false, is both truer and better than it! That is indeed a sad falsehood, which is more false, than an admitted absurdity. That is indeed a poor ground of trust, which is worse altogether than no ground at all.

6. But as we have said, change the hypothesis. Suppose for argument sake, that we are right and you are wrong. Suppose it to be really true, that there is a state of future rewards and punishments;—that “the wicked shall be cast into *hell*,” that their worm shall never die—nor the fire of their torment be ever quenched. How will Universalism meet that exigency? Why plainly thus: If the two great motives,—the desire of happiness and the dread of misery, be both necessary to incline men to virtue—no man can be virtuous, where either is removed. Therefore on the supposition, of a state of future retribution, it follows with the certainty of demonstration, that all Universalists must perish. But on the supposition of no future retribution, it follows with equal certainty, that all others, have equal or greater assurances of salvation than Universalists.

It is a singular goodness of Providence, that a scheme which is so big with mischief, should be so empty of sense. So that the defect in the moral sense which might permit us, to be misled by what seems to have little to recommend it but freedom from all salutary restraint, should be immediately exposed by the fatal and overwhelming absurdities which the first and simplest processes of the understanding, in its investigation, fasten upon it.

This is not said to give offence, but because it is both pertinent and weighty. For amongst these six preceding suppositions the truth is obliged to lie, because they cover the whole ground. But if a single one of them is true, your system is ruined: whereas all being true representations of undeniable results, where alas! is it driven? But even if all the suppositions were false, still the method of proof is perfectly fair, and as it seems to us conclusive also. For in the most exact sciences, the argument which proves a matter false, by proving it to be absurd, is not only of perpetual application; but as you cannot fail to know, many of the greatest discoveries of modern times in physical science have been made, and its highest principles demonstrated, by the use of methods, which may be hypothetically incorrect. The science of fluxions has no better foundation, and one of the common rules in elementary arithmetic, is based on the very same ground which our *positions* would occupy if they were all admitted to be false. The result, in any case, is most manifestly true and certain.

Indeed we are incapable of conceiving any supposed case, upon which it will be better in the future state of being, if there is one, or in the coming state of annihilation, if that be our destiny,—for a man to have believed in, and trusted to the doctrine of Universal Salvation, while he lived on earth. Perhaps sir, your superior acquaintance with your own theories, may help us out of this dilemma.

LETTER II.

Direct Scripture proof of a state of Rewards and Punishments after death.

WHATEVER is known to us concerning the state of man after death has been taught us by revelation from God. We may indeed in the exercise of all our knowledge and all our powers, search into such subjects with some advantage, after the great facts are settled from above. But independently of the word of God, we know almost nothing of ourselves, or of our destiny. The first question is one of fact; what does God say in the scriptures? The second question is one of interpretation; what does God mean, by what he says? There can be no other pertinent question concerning the teachings of the Holy Ghost.

We shall for the present take it for granted that the Old and New Testaments contain the real and entire revelation of God's will to us. If this be denied, we will undertake to prove it: until it is, we shall in this argument assume it, as true. That the soul of man is immortal, we shall not attempt formally to prove; first, because we suppose it will not be questioned: and secondly because it is inevitably proven, and follows as a necessary truth, if we can show, that there is an eternal state of rewards and punishments. Neither will we mock our readers with proof, that temporal death, is the portion of all mankind. We therefore begin the scriptural argument, at the point which first requires elucidation; namely,

1. *That temporal death is the fruit of sin.*

Rom. 5: 12. Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.—(See also Gen. 2: 17. Ezek. 18: 4. Rom. 6: 23.)

2. *That there is a very great difference in the death of those who do, and those who do not love God.*

First of the former. Ps. 30: 37. 'Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace.'—Ps. 116: 11. 'Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his Saints.—Numb. 23: 10. 'Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.'—(See also 2 Cor. 5: 8. Phil. 1: 21. Rev. 14: 13.) Secondly of the latter; viz. the enemies of God. Prov. 11: 7. 'When a wicked man dieth his expectation shall perish.' Prov. 14: 32. 'The wicked is driven away in his wickedness; but the righteous hath hope in his death.' John 8: 24. 'For if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.'—(See also Prov. 10: 7. Eccl. 8: 10. Isa. 14: 9.—Ezk. 18: 18. John 8: 21.)

3. *That there will be a resurrection of the dead; or a change equivalent thereto upon the living; in which there will be a vast difference, between the just and the unjust.*

Acts 24: 15. 'There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.' Dan. 12: 2. 'Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' Ps. 17: 15. 'As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness.' 1 Thess. 4. 14—17. 'If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, them that sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent (*that is, precede*) them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then, we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we be ever with the Lord.' John 5: 28, 29. 'For the hour is coming in the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good into the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.' (See also Mat. 22: 31, 32. 1 Cor. 15. which is a treatise expressly on the resurrection of the dead.)

4. *That after the resurrection, there is to be a General Judgment; in which we shall be judged by Jesus Christ; according to our works; and out of the scriptures.*

Heb. 9: 27. 'It is appointed unto men, once to die, but after this the judgment.' Acts 17: 30, 31. 'And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men, every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.' Rom. 2: 12, 16. 'For as many as have sinned without law; shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law; shall be judged by the law;***. In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men. by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.' Rev. 20: 11—15. 'And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away, and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged, every man, according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.' (See also Eccl. 3: 17.—Mat. 12: 36.—Rom, 14: 12.—Mark 13: 24—26. Luke 21: 34—36. Dan. 7: 9, 10. Mat. 25: 31—46.)

5. *That the righteous result of this judgment will be, the entrance of those who love God into a state of perfect happiness, and the en-*

trance of those who do not love God, into a state of dreadful torment.

And first of the state of the righteous, after the General Judgment, Mat. 25: 31—34. 'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, come ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world, &c.'—1 Cor. 2: 9. 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.' 1 Peter 1: 3—9. 'Blessed be the God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy had begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance, incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time. Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season if need be, ye are in heaviness, through manifold temptations; that the trial of your faith being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ: whom having not seen ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory, receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.' (See also, the whole of the 8th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans; the 25th chapter of Mat. from the 31 verse to the end of the chapter;—the 21st chapter of Revelations, the 1st chapter of John; and innumerable separate texts of the holy scriptures.)

Secondly; of the state of the wicked after the general Judgment. Mat. 25: 31. 41—46. 'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, &c. Then shall he say also, unto them on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels;***. 'And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.' Ps. 9: 17. 'The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God.' Mat. 23: 31—33. 'Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?' Rev. 21: 8. 'But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death.' 2 Thess. 1: 6—9. 'Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you. And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.' (See also Jude 7.

Rev. 20: 14, 15. Mark, 9. 43—50. Rev. 14: 8—11. Isa. 57: 20—22.—Mat. 13: 41, 42. The whole of Mat. 23. Luke 16: 19—31 the parable of Lazarus.)

Here we rest for the present, the direct argument from scripture, that there is a future state of rewards and punishments. We shall next attempt to prove that it is eternal, on the same high authority. In the mean time we ask the favour of our readers to examine carefully, all our references.

LETTER III.

Direct Scripture proof that the future punishment of the wicked will be eternal.

NONE but those who hold the doctrine of annihilation, doubt that the state of the righteous will be eternal, in its future blessedness. It is written over and over, for substance, not only that God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and that there shall be no more death, nor sorrow, nor pain, nor curse; (Rev. 21: 4, 5,) but also that they who overcome shall go no more out, forever. (Rev. 3: 12.) We therefore omit any special proof on this point, first as not being in controversy, secondly as necessarily established in a collateral way, in the course of the entire argument, and thirdly as not being specifically what we undertook to establish. Our propositions were, 1, that there is, after death, a future state of rewards and punishments. 2. *That the estate of those, who die in their sins, is eternally miserable, in that future state.* This latter point, is the one to which we shall address ourselves at present.

In every system of truth some principles are more clear, and more fundamental than others.—That this is so with the religion of Christ, we have his own word. For he told his hearers, (John 16: 12.) that he had many things to tell them, which they could not then bear. And we learn, (Mark 4: 33;) that he taught them eternal truth, as they were able to bear it.

These most simple and elementary truths, are obviously, those which it is the most indispensable to understand and believe. That he who *teaches* any system should, at the least, have possessed himself, of this much knowledge regarding it, is plainly thought needful by our Saviour in regard to religion, as well as by all men touching every other thing. For when he taught Nicodemus the first elements of all evangelical religion, in the nature and the necessity of the new birth, (John 3: 1—21;) he thus rebuked his ignorance and slowness of heart to believe: Art thou a master (*a teacher, didaskalos*) of Israel and knowest not these things? verse 10.

That men and churches are however, in danger of resting in ignorance, even of these most simple truths, is manifest from what is said by the Holy Ghost to at least two great apostolic churches. (See I Cor. 3: 1—4; and Heb. 5: 12—14.) In the latter of those two passages, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews after rebuking those to whom he wrote, for needing, when they ought to be qualified to teach, that some one should teach them what are the first principles of the oracles of God, (Heb. 5: 12.) proceeds to lay down (Heb. 6: 1, 2.) these principles themselves. We

crave the attention of our readers to the striking fact, that in this extraordinary connexion, we are expressly told that *eternal Judgment*, (verse 2, of chap. 6.) is one of the *foundations of the doctrine of Christ; as well as one of the first principles of the oracles of God.* (verse 12 of chap. 5.) As such, it is connected with repentance, faith, baptism and the resurrection of the dead. He who does not believe it, is pronounced by Paul, ignorant of the most simple knowledge of the gospel; and our blessed Lord more than insinuates, that such an one, is unfit to be a teacher of his people. (John 3, 10.)

In the same context, the apostle (Heb. 6, 4—8.) warns us, in the most solemn manner, that those who have once known these first and simple principles of divine truth (namely, *repentance, faith, baptism, the resurrection and ETERNAL JUDGMENT;*) and who building upon that knowledge, go on to some considerable degree of enlightenment, enjoyment, and participation of heavenly things (verse 4, 5;) and then 'fall away,'—into the rejection of the 'first principles, —which had been stated by him before, (in verse 1, 2;) then indeed are they lost. 'For it is impossible,'—'to renew them again to repentance.' And the reason of their hopeless ruin is clearly stated in the sixth verse to be, the open contempt and indignity which they thus heap upon the Son of God. If we were Universalists, we would tremble, in view of these searching truths. If we were teachers of that sect, we should look narrowly at the foundation of a system, whose only distinctive principle, is thus distinctly denounced by God himself.

It may be pretended that the word '*eternal*' connected with the judgment, is meant to express the duration of the process of judgment itself.—This is in itself absurd, for it is contrary to the very nature and end of trial and judgment that they should be *eternal*, in the mere formal process. It is also contrary to all the scriptures, which represent one object of the judgment, to be the authoritative and final decision of the destinies of men. But even if it should be admitted that the judgment itself is to be eternal in its own duration, the Universalist is not at all helped. For in that case, what is to be the lot of those who are condemned, at the beginning of the judgment? If the mere process is itself eternal, the first condemned will have to suffer eternally—if they suffer till all are judged! But on the other hand, what is to be the state of those unrighteous persons, who are not judged till the last of this unending process?—While they await trial, with hearts condemning them, and a fearful looking for of judgment, to come to their lot, only after eternity, how will their intermediate estate be characterized, but as one of eternal pain?

But the word *eternal*, applied here to *judgment*, it is abundantly evident, characterizes the end and effect of the judgment, and not its own duration. So that the judgment of the great day of God Almighty, will be eternal; 1. in opposition, to all temporal judgments; 2. in that it will dispose of men unalterably, as to their eternal estate, whether of blessedness or of misery. Now as we are plainly told that those will be present at the last judgment, who shall fare worse than either Sodom or Gomorrah, Tyre or Sidon,

(Mat. 10: 15, and 11: 24. Jude 7. Mark 6: 11.) that God will 'reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished,' (2 Peter 2: 9.) that in short, 'the great day of his wrath,'—in which the wicked cannot stand, will be then fully come, (Rev. 6: 17.) and here we see that the issues and effects of the judgment of that day, are eternal, we are at a loss to conceive, upon what pretext of reason, it can be denied that the punishments of the condemned must be eternal. Or rather it is perfectly plain, that they who do deny this, flatly contradict the word of God,—and according to that blessed teacher are ignorant of the simplest elements of the christian system.

On a subject so momentous, we would expect the most ample illumination. And so we find, not only these fundamental truths all so plainly taught that involuntary error would seem to be impossible; and the consequence of rejecting them so plainly laid open, that the heart sinks at the contemplation of it;—but our most merciful Father has condescended with equal clearness, to point out the causes of this fatal "*error of the wicked.*" In the last chapter of the second Epistle of Peter, that Apostle tells us, that in both his Epistles it was his object to stir up the minds of the brethren, to the remembrance of what the prophets and apostles had taught; because he knew that, in the last days, there would arise *scoffers* (verse 3.) whose peculiar characteristic would be '*walking in their own lusts;*' and their distinctive mark *wilful ignorance.* (verse 5.) Blinded by the lusts in which they walk; they are wilfully ignorant, that the same word of God which sustained, and afterwards overwhelmed in universal ruin, 'the world that then was,'—(verse 5—6.) did it only as a type of more stupendous events yet to come, when the present universe shall be burnt up, in the "day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" (verse 7, and 1 Peter 3: 20—21.) This is that at which they scoff. Yet the "new heavens and new earth" (verse 13.)—and "the day of the Lord"—which must precede them, (verse 10)—are steadily advancing,—and are not yet fully consummated, because of that "long suffering of our Lord"—which we account salvation (verse 15.) This is the woful error (*planee—delusion*) of the wicked (verse 18,) in which they, all "*unlearned and unstable*" as they are, "*wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction*" (verse 16.) Oh! that they were wise, that they understood this that they would consider their latter end!

The doctrine of a coming judgment, fearful and endless in its results, has existed in every age of the church that knew and rejoiced in a coming, a present, or a risen Saviour, able to deliver us through faith in his name, from the curse and the penalty of the Law,—from the pollution and the punishment of sin!—Indeed the last, is necessarily after the first: for where sin, judgment, and punishment, are not found—why need a Saviour come? And so, the threat, the fall, the curse, the conscious guilt, the true knowledge of the end of sin went first (Gen. 2: 17. 3, 1—18.) then comes the glorious promise of the deliverer. And so in every period after. For Enoch the seventh person from Adam, proclaimed anew, the future coming of the Lord to execute judgment, (Jude 15.) upon the ungodly. And after the same truth had been reiterated by all

God's people for forty centuries, the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ, left it on final and everlasting record, (Jude, 17: 18.)—that none but 'mockers' deny it, and they in order that they might 'walk after their own ungodly lusts.'—In every age of the Church, her appeal to a guilty world has still been the same—'the Lord cometh' (*Maran—Atha*) and while to the righteous this sacred warning is always full of hope, to all the wicked it is the knell of destiny. For, 'if any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be *Anathema, Maran—atha*' (1 Cor. 16: 22.) that is, *accursed when the Lord cometh*; devoted by him to total ruin!—So precisely in accordance with this view of divine truth, it is to be observed not only that the very words which are used to express the final and eternal Judgment (*Krima and Krisis*) mean most naturally and usually, the latter one *separation*, and the former, a *sentence*, and most commonly an *adverse one*; thus bearing on their very face the assurance of the final *separation* of the wicked, from all others by a judicial *sentence* against them: but the whole subject of a judgment to come, whenever mentioned in scripture, is almost uniformly in connexion with the public exposure, condemnation, or punishment of the wicked. The resurrection of the body is the great theme of consolation to the righteous, as the time when their joy and glory will be full;—while the wicked are only briefly and sternly reminded, of their everlasting shame and contempt therein. For the day of judgment is the great day of the wrath of God, and of the perdition of ungodly men; and its mention is most usually, in that respect.

Too surely then may all men know that 'the wages of sin is death.' (Rom. 6: 23.) Death temporal, namely the separation of the soul and body. (Gen. 25: 11.) Death *spiritual*, namely, the separation of the whole man soul and body, in this life, from God's favour. (Luke 1: 79.) And death *eternal*, namely the perpetual separation of both soul and body, from God's favour, and their endless punishment in hell, which is the *second death*. Rev. 2: 11. How they who are thus encumbered shall escape from "the lake of fire"—into which, after the 'eternal judgment,' not only 'death and hell' but all whose names shall not be found written in the book of life, shall be cast, passes our capacity to discover. There is indeed one solution of the difficulty, more venerable for its age, than reputable for its source. 'And the *serpent* said unto the woman, *ye shall not surely die.*'—(Gen. 3: 4.)

There reader is the proof. God and that word more firm than the enduring earth and glorious sky are with us. Against us, Satan—himself, the father of lies,—and who else? We speak as unto wise men; judge ye!

ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF IDOLATRY.

To the editors of the Baltimore Religious and Literary Magazine.

GENTLEMEN.—In compliance with request I cheerfully contribute to your useful magazine, a translation of a chapter of Vossius, upon the *Origin and Progress of Idolatry*. The translation is not strictly literal, but free; presenting the substance of the author's

able discussion—in an English dress. The chapter I have selected is the 3rd of the 1st part of book 1, which clearly illustrates the nature of idolatry.

In the first chapter he leads our minds back to the origin of the human family, as revealed in the scriptures, and having extolled the beneficence of God, as manifested in the creation of man,—in giving the promise of eternal life, and in instructing him in the true manner of that worship to be rendered to himself; he introduces satan, as tortured by envy at the idea that a *son of earth* should be advanced to such a height of glory, and dignity—whilst himself a being of nobler origin was debased from his eminent station in the celestial palace. Actuated by malice and ambition, satan is described as resolving the overthrow of man, and his degradation, from fellowship with Deity; and as engaging in the stupendous work of seduction with indefatigable diligence. By use of falsehood, as the father of lies, he is successful, and our deluded parents, have their eyes opened indeed! but to behold themselves destitute, not only of those vestments which adorned their persons, but of virtue itself: and too late deplored, not only their own, but the misery of all their posterity, in their exclusion from Paradise, and their loss of a happy immortality. "For in Adam's sinning, we all sinned. He being by his own act constituted under sin, we are all born sinners, and as we have become heirs of sin, so also of death. Speedily, however, undeserved mercy shined forth to man, bound under a deserved sentence of condemnation—God in his infinite compassion promised that *the seed* of the woman, *his own son* assuming the form of a servant—should, by *that nature*, in the conquest of which satan had exulted—conquer satan himself, and accomplish a salvation, humbling indeed to human pride, but by which the humbled should be exalted. This promise having been made to man, *the malignant spirit* resolved not to be idle; otherwise he would have the mortification of beholding man, over whom he had exulted as renounced of heaven, adopted into the heavenly family; the ejected received again, the dead, eventually resuscitated, and what he considered most ignominious of all, gloriously advanced to the heavens whence he himself had irrecoverably fallen—and placed far beyond the reach of his power, eternally triumphant. He therefore stimulated by a more malignant hatred, resolved that himself, with his fallen legions would not cease to entice depraved man to all manner of wickedness, and chiefly, as the most efficient means of dishonouring Deity, and degrading man, to induce him to *worship the creature* in the place of God. This effectual poison he delights to infuse into the minds of all. But on the other hand, God has not left man without an antidote to this virus of infernal invention. Passing over the antediluvian ages, the author traces the doctrines of the primeval religion among the descendants of Noah, who preserved some knowledge of its leading doctrines: viz. that there is a God; that He governs the world—that He is to be worshipped; and the doctrines of rewards and punishments—obscured however by manifold superstitions, and abominations of idolatry.

In the second chapter he treats chiefly of the doctrine of a supreme Deity—some traces of which he finds among the Grecians

and Romans and other Gentiles. We pass this by, and proceed immediately to the third chapter in which he illustrates the nature of idolatry. "We have sketched" says he, "those things which can be attained by the light of nature, both as to the knowledge of God, and his worship; in which true religion consists: religion being understood as the right worship of the true God. If any one desires a fuller definition he has it in the language of the apostle in the beginning of his epistle to Titus. "The acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness, in hope of eternal life." In this place the apostle calls religion, knowledge, or faith: not merely theoretical, which pertains only to the understanding, but practical which furthermore affects the will, inasmuch as piety has for its immediate end, the love of God and our neighbour, and as its ultimate end—the hope of eternal life.

True religion as thus defined may be departed from in two ways: either by *defect*, which is a contempt of the Divine majesty, or by *excess* which is a corruption of the worship of God, by superfluous ceremonies. The former is denominated (*atheotes*,) impiety or irreligion. The latter is denominated (*deisidaimonia*,) the fear of dæmons; by the Latins superstition. Not as though the true God can be too much worshipped, but because by adding to the *material matter* of worship it is corrupted. Clement of Alexandria explains both modes in his admonition to the gentiles. "The extremes of ignorance are two, impiety and superstition, both of which it should be our study to avoid." Before him, Plutarch in his learned works concerning Isis and Osiris gives a similar explanation. "Some wandering from the right path, evidently end in superstition—others fleeing from superstition, end in impiety, as the man in avoiding the fen, imprudently plunges himself over a precipice."

But *impiety* or irreligion has a broader meaning than the words of Plutarch present, as also the word *superstition*: and that because *every departure* from the *true religion* is generally comprehended in these terms, as language does not supply better. When God therefore is *not acknowledged* it is called by us impiety or a *denial of the Deity*. Or when his providence towards individuals, both in this, and the future life is not acknowledged, it is equally with the former denounced as impiety. There is therefore a *four-fold impiety* differing in degrees of wickedness. The first is committed when a man as if seized with a species of madness, because he cannot see God! says in his heart, *there is no God*. Next—If God is not worshipped on account of the excellence of his nature—and not only because a man expects assistance or favour from him. Such are called (*asebeis*) Those who deny the Deity the worship which is his due, of which class were the Epicureans.

Parcus Deorum cultor et infrequens.

as Horace describes them. "Sparing and unfrequent worshippers of the gods." Again—If it is imagined that as great men attend only to those affairs, which are of importance, but leave those which are inferior and insignificant, to their servants; so God directs only those beings and things which are exalted and important, but neglects those which are ignoble and humble—this is impiety; and I think such would not be improperly denominated Semi-Epicure-

ans. Finally—If God is worshipped only as a benefactor or rewarder in the present life, as are the opinions of the Sadducees—this sentiment is to be denounced as impiety.

In like manner (*deisidaimonian*) superstition, is more widely taken as when God is acknowledged, and his providence towards all, both in the present and future life—but either the worship that is due unto the true God is rendered to a *false God*—or the *true God* is worshipped by a *false manner*. The former is usually denominated *superstitio falsi cultus* because a false deity is worshipped. The latter *superstitio cultus indebiti*, because God is not worshipped by that worship which is his due. The former mode is called also (*idololatria*,) idolatry. It is no objection to this that an image or picture is not in all instances worshipped instead of God. Whatever is treated with divine honour, is called an idol. This is properly idolatry in its more extended signification, for that is deemed an idol, which occupies in the human mind the place which God should occupy. This kind of idolatry is spoken of in the 96th Psalm, 5th verse, “all the gods of the nations are idols.” The Septuagint has (*eidola*) and the Latin interpreters retain the idea, and translate it *idola*. The Hebrew word is (*Elihim*) the radical import of which is *vanities*, or as I would say nullities. Whence also the apostle says, I Cor. VIII ch. 4 v. “An idol is *nothing* in the world.” As if he had said an idol is neither a deity, nor possessed of divine power, but is a vain thing, an empty human invention, endowed with no *efficiency* either for the sanctification or even pollution of men. Hence afterwards he affirms the eating of those things which are sacrificed to idols not to be a crime in itself, but becomes criminal when a man abuses this liberty of eating, to the neglect of charity, as when he eats and thereby gives an occasion of stumbling or offence to a weak brother. These things evince, that the word *idol* is not limited to images and pictures, to which divine honours are rendered, but has a more extended application. Ancient theologians were of this sentiment: Tertullian in his book concerning idolatry, chapter II. says “idolatry commits a fraud upon God, denies him the honours which are his due, so that contumely is added to fraud. Cyprian affirms “idolatry is committed when divine honours are rendered to another than to God.” Gregory Nazianzen calls it “the translation of worship and adoration from the Creator to the creature.” Ambrose and Hillary says “idolatry usurps the honour of God, and exalts the creature.” Augustine concurs in opinion with these fathers.

Neither do I suppose that it is required to constitute superstition or idolatry, that a man should recede so far from the true manner of worship as to render homage to another than the true God; but also if he should embrace a system of worship contrary to the *command* of God, he is chargeable with idolatry: and especially if he performs religious worship to a creature, as a symbolic representation of the Divine majesty. Of this we have a striking illustration in the odious example of the Israelites worshipping God in the symbol of the Aaronic calf. Their sin in this transaction was two fold; first, in framing the idol, second, in reverencing it. By framing, because thereby they changed their *glory*, the glory of the in-

corruptible God, into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass, as the scriptures declare, Psalm cvi. 20. Romans i. 23. By honouring it, because they adored the calf and offered sacrifice unto it. Exod. xxxii. 8. "They have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it and have sacrificed thereunto." also Acts vii. 41. They made a calf in those days, and offered sacrifice unto the idol, and rejoiced in the works of their own hands. Some may think that the Israelites did not sin so grievously in this affair, because they say in Exod. xxxii. 1. "Make us gods, which shall go before us," desiring in this, nothing more than that they might have a *symbol* of the true God, after the example of the Gentiles who rejoiced in representations of their false deities: and they so desired it, that by this present, and guiding symbol, they might have a sign of the presence and guidance of the Divine being. I confess I do believe that all the Israelites, unless those who were blinded by extreme folly, did propose that the *true God*, should be worshipped in the symbol of the calf. Joannus Ferns, among others, in his dissertation upon Acts vii. 41, acknowledges this and proves it from the words of the Israelites Exodus xxxii. 4. "These be thy gods O Israel which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." He reasons from these words, that they did not sin in worshipping another God—but because they desired, contrary to the *command* of God, to worship him in an idol or image. Neither does the Hebrew phrase *Elohim tui* form any objection. Because in Nehemiah ix. 18, where there is a reference to the same event. The record is in the singular number (*Deus tuus*,) thy God—And it is abundantly evident that *Elohim* was a title of the *one God* of Israel, and does not signify a plurality of gods. Nothing can be more evident however, than that the worshippers of the calf are said to have forgotten God—Deut. xxxii. 18th v. "of the Rock that begot thee—thou art *unmindful* and hast *forgotten* God that formed thee." Psalm. cvi. 21. "They forgot God their Saviour." Bonaventure and others, have correctly observed that in this transaction there was a two-fold forgetfulness. The one total, in which there was an abolition of the true idea God. The other a want of recollection, as the mind was intently occupied by another object viz. the symbol, as an illustration of the latter—a woman forgets her husband—or the marriage covenant, when she prostitutes her person to the embrace of a stranger. In like manner a man is forgetful of Jehovah, and the divine covenant, when indulging in vain and foolish thoughts, he presumes to worship another than the true God, or venerates him in an interdicted symbol. This is not properly forgetfulness, but comparatively, because in such a mode of worship, a man acts as though he had forgotten God, which however, in scripture is declared to be forgetfulness of God. It is evident that the Israelites did not by a voluntary oblivion, endeavour to efface from their memory the wonderful displays of God's kindness to them, otherwise they would not have called the calf "the God that had brought them out of Egypt"—therefore by the calf here is to be understood nothing else than the image of the true God. This is further evident from the next verse, when Aaron erected an altar, before the calf "he made proclamation and

said, to-morrow is a feast to the Lord"—or *Jehovah*, a title which Moses no where bestows upon the gods of all the gentiles. Some one will say, however, the Israelites would not have deserved so tremendous a punishment, if they had not altogether revolted from the true God: as if it were not sufficient, to have revolted from the *true worship*. To worship God by gentile rights, is not only most repugnant to the Divine will; but is dangerous, inasmuch as it is calculated to bring the grossest darkness over the human mind—as all experience demonstrates the facility with which men glide insensibly from the worship of the deity symbolically, to the worship of the symbols themselves, employed to represent him. It becomes us therefore to consider this subject, not only as to what may be the *intention* of the worshipper, but also in its *own nature*, and according to the expressed will of God. Wherefore, if any persons suppose that the homage of the Israelites did not terminate in the calf, but in God; let them moreover consider God's entire hatred and scorn of this mode of worship, and how utterly difficult it is to carry the worship through the calf to the invisible God, without its necessarily terminating upon the calf itself. Hence the protomartyr Stephen, does not hesitate in Acts vii. 41, to call this calf an (*eidolon*.) idol. Therefore although the Israelites intended to render religious worship in the calf to the true God, notwithstanding it is deservedly pronounced idolatry.

My judgment is the same respecting the image of Micah, mentioned in the 17th of Judges. His mother is said to have dedicated the silver unto the Lord, that a graven image might be made of it. And Micah evidently intended to worship the God of Israel through it, as his language intimates. Now know I that the Lord will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest. For the same reason ancient critics interpret the Hebrew *Teraphim* by *idolum*, an idol.

But this is yet more evident from the calves which Jereboam set up at Dan and Bethel, as we have the record in 1st Kings, xii. chap. it is plain from the 25th verse, he intended these calves as idols of the God of Israel; and still more so from the xv. chap. a part of the reproof of God, for his exceeding impiety. "Thou hast made thee other gods and molten images to provoke me to anger and hast cast me behind thy back." Josephus, in his antiquities, confirms this view of the subject, when he represents Jeroboam as comparing himself with Solomon, and shewing the agreement of his own worship with that of the latter, "I have made you," says he "two calves, which obtain the same title, as that which belongs to God." b. 8, chap. 3. The Scriptures proclaim this entire system, as one of gross idolatry. 1 Kings xvi. 30, 33.—"And Ahab the son of Omri did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him. And it came to pass as if it had been a light thing for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat; that he took to wife Jezebel the daughter of Ethbaal king of the Zidonians, and went and served Baal and worshipped him, and he reared up an altar for Baal in the house of Baal, which he had built in Samaria. And Ahab made a grove; and Ahab did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger, than all the kings of Israel that were before him."

How plainly does this passage teach that the nature of the worship of the true God through the calves of Dan and Bethel, was different from that of the sun and others of the work of God, through the images that were made of them. This difference also appears in the language of the prophet Elijah, 1st Kings xviii. chap. 21 v. "How long halt ye between two opinions. If the Lord be God, follow him, but if Baal then follow him." A further illustration you have in the case of Jehu, king of Israel, in 2d Kings, x. ch. where Jehu slew the servants of Baal, and brake down his images, he said "*see my zeal for the Lord.*" But those who worshipped the true God through the calves he did not destroy, but called them the *servants of the Lord*, v. 33. Their idolatry was comparatively different from the worshippers of Baal. The latter worshipped the creature as God. The former by what is called *human intention*, worshipped the true God in the calves; which does not remove the charge of idolatry, but renders the worship somewhat less criminal in the divine estimation.

Besides these two kinds of idolatry there is a third which is denominated *metaphorical*, receding farther from the nature of proper or direct idolatry. For God in Eph. 5, and Col. 3, calls that idolatry, when a man places his confidence not so much in God as he does in his riches. The reason is, such persons place their *chief good*, not in God, having all other things subordinated to his glory, but in corporeal pleasure, hence in scripture their *belly* is said to be their God. In like manner, *honour*, is said to be the God of the ambitious man. B. Hieronimus, speaks correctly in his comment upon Amos 4th. "Each one adoring his own vices and sins, soon makes them his God—being overcome by them." According to the saying of the apostle, 2 Peter ii. 19. "For of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage." The avaricious man worships his gold. The glutton his *belly*. The libidinous, impure pleasures.

This kind of idolatry, however, where the sin is not so much in the *object* as in the *act*, is not properly, but metaphorically denominated idolatry. For men of this description do not propose to themselves honour, the belly, or riches, as objects of religious homage, nor through a veneration of these, do they worship a superior nature. But the above scriptures, contemplate the case as it is in itself, and in its own nature. For to have any thing as our supreme good, or to place confidence in it above all others, is transferring to the creature what peculiarly belongs to God. Therefore, he who so trusts in the creature, so as to exclude confidence in God, is guilty of worshipping it as God; and however the moral character of an action may depend upon the intention of the agent, nevertheless, in its own nature, and in the Divine judgment it is deemed idolatry.

R.

(To be continued.)

THE TRIAL OF ANTICHRIST.

THE Proceedings at a Special Commission, held at the Sessions House of TRUTH; in order to the Trial of ANTICHRIST, for High Treason against His Most Sacred Majesty, KING of HEAVEN and EARTH.

THE Court being sat, the Commission of Oyer and Terminer, under the great Seal of Heaven was read, when a Bill being found by the Grand Jury, the Prisoner, after manifesting considerable reluctance, was brought to the Bar.

CLERK OF THE CROWN.

'ANTICHRIST, alias MAN OF SIN, alias ROMAN PONTIFF, hold up your right hand. You stand indicted, for that you, not having the fear of God before your eyes, but being moved and seduced by the devil, did associate with other false traitors against our Sovereign Lord, the present and everlasting King, your supreme and undoubted Lord, not considering the duty of your allegiance, but wholly withdrawing it, the peace and common tranquillity of his kingdom to disturb; and our Sovereign Lord the King from his royal state, title, power, and to depose and deprive; and our Sovereign Lord the King to death put.

'You the said ANTICHRIST, and so forth, with other false traitors, did usurp authority contrary to every act and statute of our Sovereign Lord, the King: and in the year of our Sovereign Lord 666, in the city of *Rome in Italy*, did erect your Throne in opposition to the Throne in Heaven. And in furtherance of your most evil intentions, and treasonable imaginations, as such false traitor, feloniously and maliciously did conspire, and combine together with other false traitors, particularly with that monster of wickedness, PHOCAS who murdered his master the Emperor MAURITIUS and his family, consisting of six sons and two daughters: In return for the favour and countenance he received from you, he conferred upon you the title of UNIVERSAL BISHOP, and you, were then known by the name of POPE BONIFACE III.

'And afterwards at the said City of *Rome*, in further pursuance of said Treason and Rebellion, You the said ANTICHRIST being lifted up with pride by the Prince of Darkness, did in order to gratify your ambition, and promote rebellion, add various other high and dignified titles, in open defiance of the Crown, Dignity, and Honour of our Sovereign Lord, the King: such as Christ's Vicegerent, His Holiness, Prince over all Nations and Kingdoms, King of Kings, and Lord of lords, The Lord God the Pope, and so forth, so that sitting in the Temple of God you did proclaim to the world that you held your throne on earth, not simply as a man, but as true God!

'And in furtherance of your most treasonable and rebellious designs, You the said ANTICHRIST did from time to time, wickedly, falsely, and maliciously associate with other false traitors, and with force of arms, make and levy war, with intent our Sovereign Lord the King of, and from his royal state to depose, and deprive, and to kill, and put to death; and as such false traitors feloniously and maliciously did conspire and combine with other false traitor to raise and levy cruel insurrections, rebellions, and wars within his kingdom; did collect together, arms, ammunition, gunpowder, and shot

for the purposes of said rebellions, and to levy war within his kingdom. And for many years, in many countries, in many nations, with force and arms, falsely and traitorously did use, and procure to be used, many hundred thousand pikes, and sundry other arms, and did procure an immense quantity of gunpowder, with racks, gibbets, fire, swords, red hot pincers, thumb-screws, whips, cords, and various other instruments of torture, (which for cruelty and diabolical ingenuity, could scarcely be equalled in all the dark regions of infernal spirits) for the purpose of carrying on said insurrections and rebellions within his kingdom, and therewith cruel slaughters made among the faithful subjects of our Lord the King within his kingdom.

'And in furtherance of said treasonable designs, You, the said ANTICHRIST, did associate with, and caused yourself to be proclaimed the head, and did become the ringleader of a certain society, called the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church; and for the purpose of supporting your tyrannical and usurped authority in direct opposition to every divine law of our Sovereign Lord the King, You did confer on other false traitors, in said society, divers and numerous honors, and titles, such as *Cardinals, Pope's Nuncios, Apostolic Vicars, Pope's Legates, Archbishops, Holy Fathers of Inquisition, Inquisitor Generals, Prelates, Monks, Hermits, Jesuits, Augustine Monks, Benedictine Monks, Dominican Friars, Franciscan Friars, Mendicant Friars, Jansenists, Molinists, Abbots, Abbesses, Priests, Canons, Carmelites, Nuns, &c. &c.* All of those said traitors have been engaged, and most of them deeply concerned in the many Treasons, Rebellions and Murders committed by you at various times.

'And in further pursuance of said treasonable designs, You the said ANTICHRIST in order to draw others into rebellion and treason, did forge and counterfeit; and did cause to be forged and counterfeited, the name, hand-writing, and seal of our Sovereign Lord the King, with intent wickedly, feloniously and maliciously to deceive the world, and force obedience to yourself. For which purpose you caused it to be proclaimed that you were appointed by divine authority to be the *Head of the Church*, and *CHRIST's Vicar on earth*, and that, by the positive Mandate and Decree of our Sovereign Lord the King, given under his hand and seal, at *Jerusalem in Judea, in Asia.*

'And in furtherance of said treason and rebellion, You, the said ANTICHRIST, wilfully, wickedly, and maliciously, did forge and counterfeit, and cause to be forged and counterfeited, the hand writing of one of his Most Sacred Majesty's loyal and confidential servants, namely the apostle PETER, from whom you have presumed to declare, you received your authority to commit treason, rebellion and murder, with every other crime, in the name of the holy and righteous God of Heaven and Earth, our Sovereign Lord and King; and your Supreme and undoubted Lord. And you propagated and caused to be propagated, designedly, maliciously, and falsely, that in order to delegate you with princely power and unheard of tyranny, the said apostle PETER, came to the city of Rome, as Prince of the apostles, and invested you with all your

titles and power to govern the Church of CHRIST in the Universal World.

'And afterwards at sundry times, and at the said City of *Rome*, in further pursuance of said treason and rebellion, You the said ANTICHRIST did feloniously write, and cause to be written, several rebellious manifestos or proclamations, termed *Pope's Bulls*; to support your unlawful Supremacy, to give indulgences to sin, and commission to violate every law of God, to pardon treason, to give liberty to souls in misery, giving encouragement to subjects to rebel against their lawful Sovereign, to hurl kings and princes from their thrones, and to encourage murder, treason, rebellion, rapine and blood, with every detestable crime, that can be named by human tongue. And for this purpose, did make open publication of the same as being the Manifestos or Proclamations, termed BULLS of His Holiness the Pope of Rome, Vicar of CHRIST; Prince over all nations and kingdoms, &c. &c. And did circulate the same among different nations and people, for the purpose of inciting and encouraging them to enter into rebellion against our Sovereign Lord the King, within his kingdom.

'And in furtherance of your most evil intentions, and treasonable imaginations, as such false traitor, You, the said ANTICHRIST, feloniously and maliciously did conspire and combine, together with other false traitors, to excite all the nations on earth to repair to your pretended consecrated standard, in open rebellion against our Sovereign Lord the King.

'And for the purpose of further promoting your treason and rebellion you did from time to time change your title; commanding yourself to be called by various names, insomuch that from the day you first usurped that of Universal Bishop, by the name of BONIFACE III. to that on which you arrived at the highest pitch of Papal grandeur, under that of GREGORY VII. you assumed no less than one hundred and fourteen appellations. And from that date, to the present, you have continued to change your name, for the vile purpose of alluring others into your awful rebellion and treason against the King of kings and Lord of lords, and his Imperial Crown and Dignity.

'And in further pursuance of said treason and rebellion, You, the said ANTICHRIST, did openly and publicly in the year of our Lord 751; presume to depose Kings, and establish yourself as a *temporal Prince*. You therefore did by the name of *Pope ZACHARY I.* dethrone CHILDERIC III. King of *France*, and invest with royalty the usurper PEPIN in his place. From this period you carried two swords, to signify both your temporal and spiritual power, and assumed more and more authority; you as CHRIST'S Vicegerent claimed the same power, as would belong to CHRIST alone had he been personally on earth, reigning on his throne. You even used to be called God on *Earth*, and most of the Princes of Europe submitted to your rebellious arms and usurped supremacy. You also brought Emperors and Kings to kiss your feet, to receive their crowns from your hands; and Princes dreaded your displeasure more than they would a thunderbolt from heaven. If you were pleased to excommunicate a King, all his subjects were by you declared to be free from their allegiance, and obliged to

renounce it on pain of your displeasure; and not only so, but any man might kill him. Further, you arrogated the power of damning the souls of men, and persuaded the people (whom you had deluded into your rebellion) to believe, that you possessed that ability, so that whoever died under your excommunication was considered by them as eternally lost.

'And in furtherance of your most wicked and traitorous designs, You, the said ANTICHRIST, not having the fear of God before your eyes, but being moved and seduced by the instigation of the great promoter of, and your co-operator in rebellion, the Devil; did with force of arms, by craft, subtlety and superstition, falsely, wickedly, and traitorously, compass, imagine and intend our said Lord the King, then and there your supreme, true and lawful Lord, of and from the royal state, crown, title, power and government of his Imperial Realm, to depose and wholly deprive, and to death and destruction bring. Did levy and make war for several centuries to support your usurped authority, and to overthrow and destroy the government and constitution of the kingdom of our Lord, to establish your tyrannical and despotic decrees, laws, and canons, to the certain destruction of all who are drawn by you into your treasons and die in a state of rebellion against our Sovereign Lord the King.

'And in further prosecution of said wicked designs as aforesaid, You, the said ANTICHRIST, did (after you dethroned CHILDERIC, King of *France*,) depose and deprive, and excommunicate a number of Princes, contrary to every law and statute of our Sovereign Lord the King, made in that case and provided.—During the time you went by the name of *Pope INNOCENT III.* at the commencement of the thirteenth Century, when the Empire of Germany was disputed between PHILIP, Duke of *Suabia*, and OTHO IV. you first espoused the cause of OTHO, and thundered out your excommunications against PHILIP, and upon the death of the latter, in the year 1209, you placed the Imperial Diadem upon the head of his adversary, who not being disposed to bow sufficiently to your ambitious desires, in his turn felt your malice and resentment. You therefore declared him unworthy of the Empire, and anathematized and deposed him in the year 1212, and raised his pupil FREDERIC II. to the throne and dignity in his place.

'You also excommunicated and deposed *John King of England*, and absolved all his subjects from their oaths of allegiance, when you proclaimed the kingdom under an *interdict*, shut up all the places of public worship for three years, declared the throne of *England* vacant, and requested the King of *France* to execute your sentence, and undertake the conquest of *Britain*; till *John* was compelled to pay large sums of money for both *England* and *Ireland*, to do homage before your *legate* at *Dover*, and receive his crown from his hands, as a special favour from you, (as his Holiness the Pope and Prince of the apostles) after it was detained five days.

'When you were called by the name of *Pope Constantine* in the year 712, you also deprived *Phillipicus Bardanes*, Emperor of the Greeks.

'By the name of *Gregory I.* and *II.* you excommunicated *Leo*, the *Isaurian* Emperor.

- 'In the year 1076, by the name of *Gregory VII.* you deposed *Henry IV.* Emperor.
- 'By the name of *Celestine III.* you excommunicated *Henry VI.* Emperor. By the same name, you excommunicated *Leopold,* Duke of *Austria.*
- 'By the same name you excommunicated *Alphonso X.* King of *Galicia* and *Leon.*
- 'By the name of *Innocent III.* you deprived *Philip Augustus,* King of *France.*
- 'In the year 1245, by the names of *Gregory IX.* and *Innocent IV.* you deposed *Frederic II.* Emperor.
- 'In the year 1303, by the name of *Boniface VIII.* you deprived *Philip the Fair,* King of *France.*
- 'In the year 1512, by the Name of *Julius II.* you deprived *Lewis XII.* King of *France.*
- 'In the year 1538, by the name of *Paul III.* you deprived *Henry VIII.* King of *England.*
- 'In the year 1570, by the name of *Pius V.* you deprived *Elizabeth,* Queen of *England.*
- 'By the name of *Paul IV.* you issued out your edict in the year 1563, to order *Joan,* Queen of *Navarre,* to appear before you at *Rome,* to answer for the crime of rejecting your authority.
- 'In the year 1589, by the name of *Sixtus V.* you delivered a famous (or rather an infamous) oration* applauding the murder of *Henry III.* King of *France,* by a *Jacobine Friar,* as both admirable and meritorious.
- 'By the name of *Urban II.* you prohibited *Bishops* and *Priests* from promising allegiance to *Kings* and *Princes.*
- 'By the name of *Martin V.* you forced the emperor *Sigismund* to violate his covenant and promise, and made that diabolical decree, *that Faith must not be kept with Heretics.*
- 'By the name of *Clement IX.* you presumed to deprive *James I.* King of *England,* of his right to the crown, even before he ascended the *Throne,* and afterwards attempted to destroy both him and his parliament by gunpowder.
- 'By the name of *Clement XI.* you declared the treaty of *Charles VI.* Emperor, to be null and void, (so far as it did not appear to the interest of your government) although repeatedly confirmed by oath: and,
- 'By the name of *Gregory VII.* you not only dethroned *Basilius* King of *Poland,* but you did by an express and imperious edict, prohibit the *Nobles* of *Poland* from electing a new King without your consent, contrary to every divine law of our Sovereign Lord the King.
- 'And in furtherance of your most evil and traitorous designs, You, the said ANTICHRIST, did, for the purpose of promoting rebellion and insurrection, wilfully and knowingly adhere to, and confederate with some of the most notorious and violent enemies of our Sovereign Lord the King. And as such false traitor, did feloniously and maliciously hold such communication with the aforesaid rebels, with intent to alter and overthrow the constitution of the kingdom of our Lord. And our Sovereign Lord the King from

* See the oration, page 114 of the 1st vol. of this magazine.

his royal state, titles, and power, to depose and deprive, and our Sovereign Lord the King to death put. You, the said ANTICHRIST, with other false traitors, did in several countries erect and establish most awful, dreadful, and diabolical courts for the trial and punishment of all those who refused to own your unlawful authority. To these courts or tribunals you gave the name of *Holy Office of Inquisition*, where every cruelty that devils could invent was employed by your commission. You also appointed to superintend these works and mansions of darkness, such false traitors as were zealously attached to your treasonable designs, and did confer on them the title of *Holy Fathers of Inquisition, Holy Inquisitors, &c.*

'And in furtherance of said treason and rebellion, You, the said ANTICHRIST, with other false traitors, did presume to declare that you had by divine right, power to introduce into the highest seat of dignity in heaven, some of the most notorious rebels against our Sovereign Lord and King. You did therefore (what you call) canonize a considerable number of such false traitors as *Saints* in heaven, both men and women, for the purpose of promoting your awful rebellion, by withdrawing the allegiance and affections of thousands from our lawful Sovereign, by venerating and adoring those creatures of your own forming, and thus promoting rebellion and treason in all the world to the utmost of your power.

'And in further prosecution of said wicked designs as aforesaid, You, the said ANTICHRIST, did wilfully and maliciously, by open proclamation, give encouragement to the most detestable Murderers, Traitors, Robbers, and Villains, that could be collected together on earth. And did for such Murderers and Rebels appoint several places, called Holy Places of Refuge, where every infamous character lived in safety by your orders, in defiance of every divine and human law, for the purpose of promoting rebellion and treason against our Sovereign Lord the King.

'And further to promote treason and rebellion, as such false traitor, You, the said ANTICHRIST, did wickedly and feloniously, with other false traitors, proclaim the assumed power, to grant to those who were rich enough to purchase them, *Indulgences*, which administered remission of all sins, however enormous in their nature they might be. You did therefore, especially in *Germany*, in the year of our Lord, 1517, (when you were known by the name of *Pope LEO X.*) employ several persons connected with you to circulate and sell the said *Indulgences* for money; particularly a *Dominican Friar*, and false traitor, known by the name of *JOHN TETZEL*, who in describing the efficacy of these rebellious *Indulgences*, among other enormities, said that *even had any one deflowered the mother of God, he had from you wherewithal to efface his guilt.* And he also boasted that *he had saved more souls from hell by these indulgences, than St. Peter had converted to Christianity by his preaching.*

'You likewise commissioned other false traitors to plead in the defence of said rebellious acts, when they were opposed by one who rejected your authority; and one *CAJETAN*, a rebel in your employ, did declare in support of your usurped power, that *one drop of Christ's blood, being sufficient to redeem the whole human race, the remaining quantity that was shed in the garden and upon the cross, was left as a legacy to the church to be a treasure, from whence Indul-*

gences were to be drawn and administered by the Roman Pontiff, or you, the said ANTICHRIST. And of these and other awful expressions you were the author when you were called *Pope CLEMENT VII.*

'And in furtherance of said treason and rebellion, You, the said ANTICHRIST, with other false traitors, did wickedly, wilfully, and maliciously, murder and cause to be murdered many hundred thousand subjects of our Sovereign Lord the King, who refused to own your assumed supremacy. To enumerate all the said murders would be a task impossible for men, if not for angels to perform: But you did, by various instruments put to death upwards of a million of the people called WALDENSES and ALBIGENSES, whom you persecuted with fire and sword for several centuries. And, you also burnt very many faithful preachers of the kingdom of our Lord.

And you did on the 24th day of *August, 1572,** and few following days, cause to be murdered, at *Paris in France,* 70,000 persons, who were massacred by one of your agents, called CHARLES IX. and who in a few years murdered 300,000!! Within thirty years were killed in *France,* 39 Princes, 1148 Counts, 234 Barons, 14,7518 Gentlemen, and 760,000 persons of inferior rank in life, but whose blood equally called for justice:

'And you did in *England,* during the short reign of the ever to be execrated *Queen MARY,* burn 1 Archbishop, 4 Bishops, 21 Preachers, 8 Gentlemen, 84 Artificers, 100 Husbandmen and Labourers, 26 Wives, 20 Widows, 9 unmarried Women, 2 Boys, and 2 Infants. And in *Ireland* also you did in the year 1641, cause to be murdered, 40,000 persons.† And in *Scotland,* in *Holland,* in *Germany,* in *Spain,* in *Italy,* in *Portugal,* in *Poland,* in *Hungary,* in *Bohemia,* and other countries in *Europe,* and in *South America,* innumerable multitudes have been slaughtered by your rebellious arms, for the vile purpose of promoting said insurrections and treasons within the kingdom of our Sovereign Lord, the Everlasting King. And for the purposes of your treasonable imaginations as aforesaid, our said Lord, the king from the royal state, title, honour, power, imperial crown and government of his realm, to depose and deprive, contrary to the duty of your allegiance, against the peace of our Sovereign Lord the King, his crown and dignity, and against the form of the statute in that case made and provided.

*See page 342, 1 vol.

†See page 316, 1 vol.

(To be continued.)