

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1836.

No. 4.

SERMON

By the Rev. Wm. L. Breckinridge, A. M. Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Louisville, Ky.

ISAIAH XL. 1.—Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith your God.

IN the revelation which God has made to us, in the sacred scriptures, of his own character, He has presented very prominently that display of it which we call his grace. His great glory is his grace. We are certainly not at liberty even to admire one of the attributes of the Almighty to the discrediting of another; but we read that when He rises up to judgment, it is to “do his work, his strange work, to bring to pass his act, his strange act.” And “though he cause grief, yet he doth not willingly afflict the children of men.” His people are taught to feel, even in the bitterness of their sorrow, for having wandered from him, that he will “have mercy upon them according to his loving kindness, according unto the multitude of his tender mercies will he blot out their transgressions.” So rich and ample are the displays of his gracious goodness, that it is said “God is love.”—And it is presumed that we “know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we, through his poverty might be rich.” This grace is displayed in every part of the plan of salvation; in every successive step by which a poor sinner is led along, till he becomes a glorified saint. The topstone of the spiritual building will be laid with shouts of grace, grace unto it. The acclamations of the redeemed will forever arise to the praise of God’s glorious grace!

By this and the succeeding verse there are suggested several considerations which illustrate and enhance this gracious goodness.—1. The guilty, miserable, hopeless state of those to whom it is directed.—“Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem.” In like manner spake our blessed Lord in his last interview with his disciples, teaching them that repentance and remission of sins should be preached, in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. It was an illustrious display of the Saviour’s love, that salvation was offered to the inhabitants of that rebellious and bloody city; that they, who in cruel mockery had crowned his sacred head with thorns, should be offered crowns of everlasting glory. “God

commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

2. The close and tender relation, into which such wretched creatures are not only invited to enter, but are actually introduced. "Comfort ye my people."—God's people are not only recognized as his servants, his subjects and his friends, but they are also often called his children. There runs through the Bible the precious sentiment, that there really does subsist such a close and tender connexion between God and ransomed sinners.—"Be ye followers of God as dear children."—"Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him."—"The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in those that hope in his mercy."

3. This relation is an enduring and indissoluble one—else there could be no lasting or solid comfort arising from it—Nay, that poor joy which could arise from a transient connexion, would only embitter the deep horrors of the eternal separation. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him, *should not perish*, but have everlasting life."—"Verily, saith the Saviour, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life."—God's covenant with his people is an everlasting covenant, nor shall any ever pluck them out of his hand, or make their joy premature or unavailing.

4. Vile and guilty as those who have received God's grace originally were, yet by its power they shall be made holy. The apostle Paul having spoken of those who shall not inherit the kingdom of God, continues "and such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are *sanctified*, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the spirit of our God." Those who shall dwell on high are a holy people. Not *for*, nor *by* simply, but yet in connection with this holiness on their part is their salvation perfected. "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Jesus Christ gave himself for us that he might "redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." How is the glory of this grace exalted, in making such rebels first holy, and then possessors of salvation.

But our chief object is, in view of this passage, to consider *some of the sorrows and some of the consolations of God's people.*

I. Then, some of the sorrows of Christians—for the command to comfort them, presumes that they have sorrows.

1. Christians suffer from all the natural causes of sorrow which afflict other men—as sickness, losses, disappointments, the thwarting of their most fondly cherished expectations, the frustrating of their best laid plans, that deferring of their hopes which makes the heart sick, that utter blasting of their most precious earthly hopes which seems oftentimes enough to make the heart burst.—Nay, it appears sometimes as if Christians had more troubles than other men. We are frequently constrained to remark the great prosperity of the wicked, their exemption from many of the calamities of life, and the singular success of all the schemes they lay. It is, perhaps, because they are receiving now their good things, and the Christian, like Lazarus, is receiving his evil things. So it

is, this is a world of woe, and Christians have their full share of its distresses.

2. There is another set of sorrows which many wicked men probably never feel; some doubtless do, but all Christians must; that deep and bitter anguish of the soul which we call conviction for sin. No doubt the children of this world, so wise in their generation, although in their gay passage through it, they often feel that the way of the transgressor is hard, do often pass from the cradle to the grave without once feeling, as they should, the bitterness of sin; that misgiving of the soul, that beginning of repentance, with which they are sometimes troubled, they forget amid the laughing throng, or in the midnight revel, or somehow dash from them amid the care and love of the world. No doubt too, many a poor wretch has felt deep conviction, has suffered unutterable agony under the lashings of conscience; the incipient gnawing of that worm which shall never die; and after all has gone back to perish in his sin, and had all his pangs for nothing. But these deep and bitter sorrows, under a sense of sin, every Christian at some time or in some degree has felt; and this anguish of the unrenewed soul is a bitter sorrow.

3. But Christians have many a bitter pang from sin after they have received a sense of pardon. Still their worst enemy is sin; numerous, powerful, and alas! too successful temptations assail them. It is of the state of perfect rest, that the poet has taught us to sing—

“Sin their worst enemy before,
Shall vex their eyes and ears no more—
And every power find sweet employ,
In that eternal world of joy.”

In this world, said our blessed Lord, ye shall have tribulation; and here is the chief fountain of sorrow. Nor do they merely grieve in general terms, because they still fall into sin. There is, and they feel it, peculiar odiousness, nay, peculiar atrocity in their sins. They are committed against that kind and gracious Father who has so touchingly asked, “He that spared not his only son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?” Against that compassionate Redeemer who loved us and gave himself for us. Against that Divine Spirit who maketh intercessions for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered.

How often have they to utter against themselves, with no mistaken application, Absalom’s bitter taunt to Hushai—“Is this thy kindness to thy friend.”—It is remarkable that David after a series of the most atrocious acts of cruelty and injustice, of which a monarch was ever guilty, towards a gallant and faithful subject:—when at last he came to feel his sin against God, seems utterly to forget the injuries of Uriah.—“Against thee,” he exclaims, in the anguish of his soul, “Thee only have I sinned and done this evil in thy sight.”

4. Christians have sorrow sometimes in the apprehension that their afflictions are sent for their sins, in deep and bitter chastise-

ment. Not indeed in irreconcilable judgment, but in holy and strong displeasure. In the Prophet's interview with David, in the case which has just been mentioned, he assured him, that in consequence of his sin he should not only suffer a speedy and very affecting trial, but that the sword should never depart from his house; and when years thereafter, David, fleeing before Absalom, "went up the ascent of Olivet and wept as he went up and had his head covered, and he went barefoot," no doubt he mingled with his tears and his apprehensions of his enemies, acute remembrance of the sin which entailed this bloody curse upon his house. No doubt he whispered in his prayer, Lord they are the sword, the hand is thine. And when we hear him mourning over the just, but sad catastrophe, in all the brokenness of a parent's heart, "Oh my son Absalom, my son, my son, would God I had died for thee, oh Absalom, my son, my son;" how much of the agony of that moment which assured him that he had lost his child forever, is traceable to the recollection of his own great sin!

5. Christians have great sorrow in view of the sins of others. Every one who loves the Saviour in sincerity, and knows something of the evil of sin, has mourned over the iniquity that abounds in this vile world. We find in the journals and letters of our brethren, who preach the gospel to the heathen, very striking expressions of the sorrow with which they behold the abominations around them. Brainerd relates that one of the Indians who had been hopefully converted under his ministry, was seen weeping with every mark of great distress; and being asked the cause of such sorrow, after the joys of peace with God, answered, "I weep because my people will not come to Jesus."

It seems precisely the sentiment of the great Apostle, when he spoke so solemnly of his great heaviness and continual sorrow of heart for his brethren, his kindred according to the flesh. Just so too did the Psalmist mourn—"Horror hath taken hold on me, because of the wicked who forsake thy law." "Rivers of waters run down mine eyes because they keep not thy law."

6. And this grieving over the sins of others is often greatly aggravated by the thought that our sins have led to theirs. Unquestionably the wicked are often encouraged in their wickedness, by the inconsistencies of Christians; some of the most remarkable sins of pious men recorded in the Bible, have not only been for centuries a standing reproach to Christianity, but are constantly used by the wicked to quiet their own consciences. How would Noah have felt, could he have lived to hear some bloated sot taking comfort from his sins. How must the Christian now mourn when he has reason to fear that his unfaithful conduct has led others to sin!

7. Many a time the sins of Christians bring sufferings upon others. To refer once more to David, you remember when he had wickedly numbered the people, how the wrath of God fell upon his subjects for his sake, and you remember the sorrow of his heart in view of their suffering. "And David's heart smote him, after that he had numbered the people." "And David said unto God, I am in a great strait." "And David and the elders of Israel, who were clothed in sackcloth, fell upon their faces, and David said unto

God, is it not I that commanded the people to be numbered, but as for these sheep what have they done?"

8. But apart from their agency in producing them; Christians suffer many sorrows in those of others. Doubtless religion softens and refines the sensibilities of our nature, and renders more tender and acute the sympathies of the heart. As the people of God mourn over the sins, so they weep over the sorrows of others. Jeremiah could say, "Oh that my head were waters and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people. Let mine eyes run down with tears night and day, and let them not cease, for the virgin daughter of my people is broken with a great breach, with a very grievous blow." The spirit of our holy religion is a tender and sympathising spirit. The great High Priest of our profession, was a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief, for he bore our griefs and carried our sorrows. Jesus wept, not only at the grave of Lazarus. "His spirit was tender and he admitted the impressions of sorrow." We never read that he laughed, but often that he wept; grief was his intimate acquaintance, for he acquainted himself with the grievances of others and sympathised with them; and he never set his own at a distance, for in his transfiguration he spoke of his own decease, and in his triumph he wept over Jerusalem. Such was the Saviour's spirit, and such in some degree is that of his disciples; for if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

9. Christians have many seasons of distress in view of that hardness of heart, which keeps them from feeling more for others as well as for themselves. They mourn that they do not desire more earnestly the glory of God and labour more assiduously for its promotion, that they do so little for the Saviour's cause, pass so many of their days almost uselessly, and have so little love to Christ and zeal for his interests. It was a petition in almost every prayer of a very eminent Christian in the latter part of his life. "Let us not outlive our usefulness." They mourn over their small attainments in piety, the selfishness that mingles with their best exercises, the frequent hidings of God's face which they know are referable to their own sins; for his ear is not heavy that it cannot hear, but their iniquities do separate between them and their God, and cause him to hide his face from them, that he will not hear. They have many a dark hour of unbelief and despondency and fear. It is said of the man after God's own heart, notwithstanding his sins, a man of exalted piety and very singular faith; after all the deliverances effected in his behalf and all the sacred promises of God, that he should sit upon the throne of Israel, it is said of him; and "David said in his heart, I shall now one day, fall by the hand of Saul."

10. And even in the happiest moments that God's people enjoy, when the spirit leads them by living fountains of waters and brings them nearest to the throne of grace, when they view most clearly their kind redeemer as he bled upon the cross for them, and are assured that his blood cleanseth from all sin, even then, shame and grief mingle with the tears of their delight.

"They see their sins, his blood had spilt,
And helped to nail him there."

They feel the enormity of those sins that crucified the Lord. They weep over the melancholy repetition of those sins by which they crucify him still and open all his wounds.

It was a look of tenderness and forgiveness and love, a look of meek upbraiding, but of unutterable kindness, which the Lord turned upon Peter. But Peter could not bear the compassionate glance of that eye. He went out and wept bitterly, and even now do Christians in the sacred interviews with which the Saviour blesses them, catch many a tender look which makes them weep. When Jesus would go into Judea, Thomas could say to his fellow disciples, "let us also go that we may die with him," and yet, when he was risen from the dead, this same Thomas said, "except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my fingers into the print of the nails, and thrust my hands into his side, I shall not believe." With what a strange mixture of delight at the recognition of his Lord, and shame for his unbelief, did Thomas hear the blended accents of rebuke and mercy, as they dropped from those sacred lips; "Thomas, reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side and be not faithless but believing." There seems to be shame and extacy mingled with the very tones of his answer, "my Lord and my God."

II. Some of the consolations of Christians. And these, unlike the joys of the men of this world, are real and solid and satisfying, because they come from God. The means by which they are communicated are various, but the author and agent is one, the Holy Spirit of God. The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace. "If ye love me, says the Saviour, keep my commandments, and I will pray the father, and he will give you another comforter that he may abide with you forever, even the spirit of truth." Whence it appears that the comfort derivable from this blessed source of consolation is intimately connected with keeping the commandments, and therefore the consolations of which we speak are not mentioned, as those which every Christian does at all times enjoy, but which all may enjoy.

1. Then, the people of God find great comfort in the reflection that they *are His people*. The consolations of religion belong to them as religious people. The benefits and the pleasures of Christianity are theirs as being Christians. It may appear to some a violation of good taste, others may think it wild enthusiasm, but 'tis the joyous gushing of a warm and tender heart, which leads a minister of my acquaintance in preaching the Lord Jesus, the desire of all nations, sometimes to clasp his hands and exclaim; Oh, I am so glad I'm a Christian! The assurance of reconciliation with God is enough to bring joy to the soul. When it has been tossed upon the billows that conscience has rolled mountain high. To find a calm resting place in the Saviour's bosom, must be joy indeed! 'Tis heaven begun below! The wonder is that we are not always rejoicing in the Lord, "for light is sown for the righteous and gladness for the upright in heart.

2. The very mode by which this reconciliation is communicated is extremely joyful, the Holy Spirit, the *Comforter* leading us to him who loved us and gave himself for us. He was delivered for our

offences and raised again for our justification; *therefore* being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. The love of God displayed in this amazing transaction, when duly appreciated, imparts joy to the soul. Every view which we can take of this great sacrifice and plan must rejoice the heart that feels its efficacy. There is a power which religion excites over the heart to make it glad. The preaching of the cross is to them that are saved the power of God. And one of the instances in which this power of the cross is displayed, is to fill the soul with precious consolation, and thus it is, the "tongue breaks out in unknown strains and sings surprising grace."

3. All the sacred principles which the spirit implants and cultivates in the hearts of Christians are new sources of delight. It is said, "they shall be abundantly satisfied with the fatness of thy house, and thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures, for with thee is the fountain of life, in thy light shall we see light." It is but a whisper of God's power that we can hear, it is but a glimpse of his glory that we can behold, while we dwell here below. But the very training of his children for his presence is a joyous work, and all the influences of his grace are pleasant and consolatory. Faith, hope, charity, every Christian grace, while they are all his gifts, do richly comfort the possessor. He who has been taught of God confidently to believe all that he has said, and firmly to trust him for all that he has promised, he that indulges a strong and well founded hope of seeing the King in his beauty, he who has glowing in his bosom genuine love to God and man, he begins already to drink of the river of God's pleasures. He can already have some faint conception of the Psalmist's triumph, when he says, "I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness." A rich collection of these joyous fruits of the spirit, the apostle Peter throws together when he says, referring to our Divine Redeemer, "Whom having not seen, we love; in whom though now we see him not, yet believing, we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

4. There is great happiness found in active obedience; in running out into practice the above-mentioned principles, in acting out our love to God and man, our zeal for the Divine honor and man's true happiness. In keeping his statutes there is a great reward. It is more blessed to give than receive. The way not only to cultivate and apply, but to enjoy religion, is to labour in our master's vineyard. How much happier was Howard in the loathsome dungeons that he penetrated, and Clarkson in his toilsome and thankless labours for the poor slave, and Henry Martyn, in his fearful toils for the Heathen; how much more consolation in their own bosoms, did these men enjoy in the trials that were inseparable from their respective errands of mercy, than all the devotees who ever buried themselves in the solitude of their cloisters. And oh, if their labours of love afford such pleasure in the performance, how rich will be the final recompense!

5. Even in the common enjoyments of life, the true Christian has greater zest than other men; for he feels that all comes from God's covenant love in Christ, and is to be appropriated to his ser-

vice. That which is presented as the token or consequence of kindness entertained for us, is doubly precious on that account. That which is afforded to us, that in the use, and by the means thereof, we may promote the pleasure of him whom we love, is received with double satisfaction. Thus Christians ought to receive, and prize, and appropriate the common blessings of life. Doubtless the child of grace, who eats his crumbs in singleness of heart, feeling that God's love bestows them, that they are far more than he deserves, and that the strength derived from them must be given to God, is happier, far happier in the use of what the world would despise, than all this world's possessions can make its votaries. Perhaps this is what the Saviour means, when he declares that those who have given up all for him, shall receive an hundred fold more in this present time.

6. And as the common enjoyments of God's people, so their very afflictions have blessings connected with them. Their very trials have precious consolations. In their darkest hours often arise their brightest joys—"Man's extremity is God's opportunity." He often exalts the riches of his own grace, and comforts the hearts of his children, by making streams break forth in the desert. In the midst of their trials they are often comforted. "Before they call I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear." And *after, from, and out* of their afflictions come their richest pleasures. "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." The mountains are most elevated and afford more brilliant prospects, but the valleys are more fertile. No growth is so luxuriant for the Christian as that which has been watered by his tears. "He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him." The rule of this blessed service is, first the cross and then the crown: and although the crosses which we bear, win not the crown, yet the bearing of the one, is a prelude to the wearing of the other. "In the world ye shall have tribulation," saith our Master, "but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world," and we are solemnly assured that our "light afflictions, which are but for a moment, shall work out for us a far more exceeding and an eternal weight of glory." Many a time it is necessary in drawing us towards our rest, that God should take the "cords of our affection from earth and fasten them in heaven."

7. Doubtless all the sanctified afflictions of God's people tend to their comfort and to their great advancement in piety, by teaching them to say and to feel "*Thy will be done.*" I suppose, to feel this perfectly, is the highest attainment of the Christian in this imperfect state, and will secure to him the purest peace, the richest and most unmingled consolation which he is capable of enjoying in this world of sin, and change, and commotion.

8. There is another pure and exalted source of consolation for God's people. The advancement of his kingdom. "Blessed are your eyes, for they see—and your ears, for they hear—for many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them—and to hear those things which

ye hear and have not heard them." This, their joy, is sustained, by that which is untouched by all the opposition of the powers of darkness, and all the difficulty to be surmounted in the establishment of God's kingdom upon earth;—nay, by that which is far stronger and more encouraging than all the prospects or probabilities of success which appearances can present; the unfailing promise of the Almighty. A child was once asked, if there is any thing which God cannot do? Yes, was the reply—God cannot lie. That being who cannot lie has sworn by himself, that the world shall be filled with his glory. And this promise, firm as his own throne, affords precious consolation to all his people. Their hearts exult in view of that day, when the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the tops of the mountains.

9. Some of us have seen Christians die. In that trying hour, the power and willingness of God to comfort his people are often exhibited. "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for thou art with me, thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." "Oh death where is thy sting? Oh grave where is thy victory?" How rich are those consolations of religion, how precious those instructions of the Spirit, which can teach men how to die! And how far do the calmness and triumph of the Christian's death surpass in dignity, the madness of him who rushes upon this enemy of us all—as the horse dashes into the battle, and dieth as the fool dies!

X. And who shall tell the consolations, the eternal joys and the pure and boundless recompense of God's people, in the world of light and glory. We dare not attempt to lift the curtain, that shuts in the glories of that world. Our eyes could not bear the brilliancy of its scenery. Our ears could not sustain the richness of its melody. The mind cannot now at all comprehend, what it is for the soul to be with God. But then they shall see the King in his beauty." They shall live and reign with Christ. They shall have attained to the full possession of glory, honour and immortality. Eternal life shall be theirs. They shall have no more sorrow, all tears will be wiped away from their faces. Their eyes shall thenceforth beam with the glorious effulgence of the sun. No dross of sorrow to dim the radiance of those orbs. They shall sin no more. Then shall they love and serve their Master perfectly. They shall glorify God and enjoy him forever. There shall be no impediment to that blessed work. It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is!

THE TRIAL OF ANTICHRIST.

(Continued from page 95.)

Phocas the Emperor examined by the *Solicitor General*.

This witness being a prisoner was brought into the court attended by two of the keepers of the black gulf, and made a most awful and terrific appearance.

Q. Are you *Phocas* the Roman Emperor?

A. Yes. My name is *Phocas*, and I am called Emperor of *Rome*.

Q. Did you know the prisoner at the bar, at *Rome*?

A. Alas I did, to my sorrow.

Q. Will you relate to the court what you knew of the prisoner, during your residence at *Rome*.

A. I am compelled to do it by the constraining hand of justice. And I look forward with terror, to that great and tremendous day, when the Judge of the world will constrain me to make a more public declaration. When I came to the throne, which I obtained by means, the reflection of which adds to my misery, the Prisoner at the bar, then Bishop of *Rome*, so insinuated himself into my favour, that I readily granted his request, and by an *edict* established him in the title of *Universal Bishop*. I was led to this measure by my ignorance of the real motives of the Prisoner; and of true religion. And as I detested the bishop of *Constantinople*, and stood in need of the prisoner's influence, I sanctioned his claim.

Q. He was therefore principally by you, established in his supremacy?

A. Yes.

Cardinal Baronius examined by Mr. *Impartiality*.

Q. Do you know the Prisoner at the bar?

A. Yes. I am intimately acquainted with him, as thousands know by my writings.

Q. Of what religion are you?

A. I am a rigid Roman Catholic, and have long acted by the Prisoner's authority.

Q. Are you acquainted with the way and manner in which the Prisoner first obtained the title of *Universal Bishop*?

A. I wrote and published to the world, that *Phocas* the Emperor, after he murdered *Mauritius* and family, and usurped the government, established *Boniface III.* Pope of *Rome*, by the title of *Universal Bishop*. *Anastasius* and *Paul Deacon* wrote nearly the same, and many have confirmed the testimony I have given.*

The *Clerk of the Crown* then read the following extracts which had the Prisoner's signature to them.

"*Christ* made *Peter* the chief, that from him as from a certain head he might diffuse, as it were, his gifts into the whole body; for that having taken him in CONSORTIUM INDIVIDUAE TRINITATIS, into the partnership of the UNDIVIDED TRINITY; he would have him called that which the Lord himself was, saying, Thou art *Peter*, and upon *this Rock* I will build my Church."†

Signed, *Boniface VIII.*

Note on Matt. xiv. 29. *Rhemist's New Test.* published by the Pope's authority.

"*Peter*, saith *St. Bernard*, walking upon the waters as *Christ* did, declared himself the *only Vicar of Christ*; which should be Ruler not over one people, but over all. For many waters, are many

* See *Anastasius, De vitis Pontificum.* *Paul diacon, De rebus gestis Longobard.* lib. iv. cap. 34. In *Muratorii Scriptor. rerum Italicar.* tom. i. p. 46.

† *Sexti Decret. L. 1. Tit. 6. cap. 17.*

people. And from hence he deduceth the like authority and jurisdiction, to his successor, the bishop of Rome."

Mr. *Historical Truth* was then further examined by the *Attorney General*.

Q. Are you acquainted with the prisoner's hand writing?

A. Perfectly so.

Q. Do you believe that this is the hand writing of the Prisoner at the bar?

(The papers were then delivered to him.)

A. I do believe it is. He never disowned it. Many thousand copies have been published by his orders.

Q. Did you ever know the prisoner to make similar declarations in support of his supremacy?

A. Yes. If I should relate all that I have taken notes of, none in this court could survive half the time it would take to read them.

Q. Is the Prisoner owned as *Lord* and *Sovereign* by those who act under him, called *Bishops* or *Priests*?

A. Such take an oath at their consecration (so called) that they will, from that time forward, be faithful to *St. Peter*, and to the Holy Roman Church, and to their *Lord* the *Pope*, and his successors canonically entered: to help them to defend and to keep the *Papacy*, and the rules of the *Fathers*. And they not only swear to be *faithful*, but also to be *obedient*. And not only to endeavour to *preserve* and *defend* the *Rights, Honours, Privileges, and Authorities* of the *Pope*, but to increase and advance them, and to the utmost of their power, to cause the *Pope's* commands to be observed, by others as well as themselves. The first part of the oath I have alluded to was framed when the Prisoner called himself by the name of *Pope Gregory VII.** but several additions have since been made.†

Q. When the prisoner was known by that name, did he not give more evident proof of his rebellious authority, than ever had been known before?

A. He did: when he was known by the name of *Hildebrand*, or as he was often called *Hell-brand*, on account of his tyrannical disposition, he planned the most traitorous designs, which he afterwards brought into effect, though not to the extent of his ambitious views. By the name of *Gregory VII.* he became outrageous, and impiously attempted to subjugate to his jurisdiction, the *Emperors, Kings, and Princes* of the earth, and to render their dominions tributary to him at *Rome*. Such infamous behaviour has frequently been called by his deluded followers, his pious and apostolic exploits. His government was one continued scene of tumult and slaughter.

I need only refer to his own epistles, signed by his name, to prove more of his traitorous conduct than it would be proper for me now to trouble the court with. I shall briefly state, that he drew up an oath for the *King* or *Emperor* of the *Romans*, from whom he demanded a profession of subjection and allegiance‡ It is a well known fact, that *France*, deceived by the subtlety of the

*See *Decretal* L. 2. Tit. 24 C. 4.

†See oath of allegiance to the *Pope*, page 159, 1st Vol. *Balt. Lit. & Rel. Magazine*

‡See Book ix. of his *Epistles*, Epist. 3.

Prisoner, contributed more than all other nations to the establishment of his dignity and dominions. Yet he pretended that this kingdom was tributary to him, and commanded his legates to demand yearly, in the most solemn manner, the payment of that tribute. He wrote an insolent letter to *Philip I. King of France*, to whom he recommended an humble and obliging carriage, from the consideration that both his kingdom and his soul were under his dominion, who had the power to bind and loose him in heaven and earth! Nothing escaped his all grasping ambition; he pretended that *Saxony* was a feudel tenure, held in subjection to him, to whom it had been formerly yielded by *Charlemagne*, as a pious offering to *St. Peter*. He also extended his pretensions to the kingdoms of *Spain* and *England*, and other countries; and had his success been equal to the extent of his insolent views, all the kingdoms of Europe would have been tributary to the prisoner, on the pretext of his being the Vicar of Christ, and prince over all nations and kingdoms.

Q. Did he not, in the exercise of his rebellious authority, depose kings and princes when called by his name?

A. He deposed and treated in the most shameful manner the Emperor *Henry IV.* And he dethroned *Basilaus II. King of Poland*, with all the circumstances of infamy that he could invent. After pulling him from his throne, he dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken, and by an express and imperious edict, prohibited the Nobles to elect a new king, without his approbation. *Demetrius Suinimez, Duke of Croatia and Dalmatia*, was raised by the Prisoner to the rank and prerogatives of royalty, in the year 1076, and solemnly proclaimed King by his Legate at *Salona*, upon conditions that he should pay an annual tribute of two hundred pieces of Gold to him as to *St. Peter*, at every *Easter*.

Q. Did he not call himself by a variety of high and imperious titles?

A. Yes; he not only assumed the appellation of Universal Bishop, but also Sovereign Pontiff, Christ's Vicar, Prince of the Apostles, God on Earth, Lord God the Pope, His Holiness; King of Kings and Lord of Lords, Prince over all Nations and Kingdoms, The Most Holy and Most Blessed, Master of the Universal World, Father of Kings, Light of the World, Most High and Sovereign Bishop, &c. &c.* And he has frequently declared that his power extended to things Terrestrial, Celestial and Infernal. He also presumed to qualify and invest with the same ability, the different orders of priests who act under his rebellious government.

Q. Has not the Prisoner at the bar claimed adoration from the very creatures who elected him?

A. He has: when he was occasionally elected, he was clothed with (what is called) the Pontifical Robes, and crowned and placed upon the altar. The Cardinals then kiss his feet, and this impious ceremony is called *Adoration*. They first elect and then they worship him. When the Prisoner was known by the name of

*See *Council of Siena*, printed at Paris, 1612. *Pius V. bull* to Queen Elizabeth. *Newton on the Prophecies*. Vol. ii. p. 366. *Mosh. Eccl. Hist.* *Edwards's Hist. Redemption*, &c.

Pope Martin V. on the medals of him then coined, two are represented crowning the Pope, and two kneeling before him, with this inscription, "*Quem creant adorant, Whom they create they adore.*"* When he was elected by this name, the Emperor *Sigismund* kneeled down before the whole Council of Constance; kissed his feet and worshipped him. It is a fact universally known, that deluded by the artifice of the Prisoner, several Emperors and Kings have thought it an honour to kiss his toe, being misled by his assumed titles of Vicar of Christ, &c.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Equivocator*.

Q. You say, that the prisoner at the bar was elected by Cardinals who adored him?

A. I do say that he was so elected: and that they did adore him.

Q. Did you not say before, that he usurped the title, and engaged *Phocas* the Emperor to establish him in his Government?

A. I did; and I assert the same now. The Prisoner first obtained his supremacy, in the way before stated to the court. But afterwards procured himself to be elected and crowned by those who were deeply interested in the establishment of his authority. He was therefore often elected by different means. And as often as he changed his name, some ceremony took place.

Q. Then you say, that the ceremony or mode of his election, which you have stated has existed among a variety of others, but you cannot say *when* this form was in practice? You have heard some report about it, and you have no objection on your oath to assert it!

A. I can not only declare on my oath, that this mode of election has been adopted, but I have the Prisoner's own hand-writing to prove it. In the year of our Lord 1179, he assembled a Council at *Rome*, called *The third Council of the Lateran*. He then, by the name of *Pope Alexander III.* decreed, "That in order to put an end to the confusion and dissensions which so often accompanied the election of the Roman Pontiff, the right of election should not only be vested in the Cardinals alone, but also, that the person in whose favour two thirds of the College of Cardinals voted, should be considered as the lawful, and duly elected Pontiff." This decree alone is sufficient to prove, that before the year 1179, other forms of election did exist, and that they were frequently accompanied with confusion and disorder. And I believe that the Prisoner himself will not contradict what I say, when I assert that *this* law was made by him, and is yet in force.

The decree being shewn to the Prisoner, he acknowledged that it looked like one which he had framed at *Rome*.

Here the Clerk of the Court read the following paper, written and published by the Prisoner, by the name of *Pope Innocent III.*†

'We may according to the fulness of our power, dispose of the law; and dispense above the law. (From an Epistle.) Those whom the Bishop of *Rome* doth separate, it is not a man that separateth them, but God! For the POPE holdeth place on earth, not simply

**Bonanni Numismat. Pontific Romanor.* Daubuz, p. 381. *Mosh. Abr. Eccl. Hist.* 2 vol. p. 352. Dub. Edit.

†*Book of Gregory, 9 Decret. C. 3.*

of a man, but of TRUE GOD!—That he hath celestial Governments, and therefore may change the nature of things, applying the substance of the one to the other, of nothing can create something, and a decree that is void, *he* can make in force; for in matters that *he* will have come to pass, *his* will is *his* reason; and no man questioneth him, wherefore do you that? For *he* can dispense above the law, and of *Injustice*, can make *Justice*.”

Cardinal Bellarmine Sworn.

Q. Are you the *Bellarmino* that wrote what is called the Fifteen Marks of the True Church, to prove the Church of *Rome* the only true Church, &c.?

A. I am.

Q. Do you know the Prisoner at the bar?

A. Yes, I am intimately acquainted with him,

Q. Are you not a Roman Catholic by profession?

A. I am.

Q. Did you not write and publish several books, to vindicate his authority?

A. I Did.

Q. Did you publish in your 4th book *de Pontiff*, as follows: “In good sense and judgment, Christ hath given to *Peter*, (and consequently to the Pope) the power of making that to be sin, which is no sin, and that which is no sin to be sin?”

A. Let me see the copy.

It was shewn to him.

Q. Do you acknowledge it to be your own writing and publishing?

A. I do acknowledge it.

Q. Did you publish this book, with others, by the Prisoner's authority?

A. I did. I acted by his commission, and was supported by his government.

A number of Emperors, Kings and Princes were now called as witnesses, who were either excommunicated, or deposed, or dethroned, or assassinated by the Prisoner. Some appeared also who were otherwise treated. And perhaps a greater number of crowned heads never appeared in any Court before.

Philipicus Bardanes, Emperor of the Greeks, Sworn.

Q. Do you know the Prisoner at the bar?

A. I do. He lived at *Rome* when I knew him.

Q. Did he ever presume to usurp any authority, as the Vicar of Christ?

A. He did; within a little better than a century, after he first obtained the title of Universal Bishop, he excommunicated and condemned me.

Q. Will you relate to the Court, the pretext assigned by the Prisoner for his conduct to you?

A. I ordered a picture, which represented the VIth General Council to be pulled down from its place, in the Church called

St. Sophia in *Constantinople*. And as I perceived the people fast verging to the worship of Images, I sent to *Rome* a mandate, to remove all Images of that nature from places of worship. The Prisoner, who then went by the name of *Constantine* the *Universal Bishop*, immediately opposed my decree, ordered six pictures of Councils to be placed up in the porch of *St. Peter's*, assembled a Council at *Rome*, and condemned me as an Apostate. Tumults and insurrections followed as the consequence, which the year following deprived me of the Imperial Throne.

Q. Was the prisoner, at the time he condemned you, established as a Temporal Prince at *Rome*?

A. No, he was not. But from the time he obtained his supremacy, he always appeared to be aspiring after it. He was subject to me as his Emperor.

Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, Sworn.

Q. Did you not profess to be a great enemy to the worship of Images?

A. I did. What the Emperor *Bardanes* begun I resolutely carried on.

Q. Did the prisoner at the bar ever presume to counteract your edicts, and exercise authority over you as the Vicar of Christ?

A. He did. I issued out an edict in the year 726, to forbid the worshipping of Images, and also to remove them all, except that of Christ's Crucifixion, from all places of worship. The Prisoner then opposed me in the most outrageous manner. He passed a sentence of Excommunication against me, and declared me unworthy of the Christian name. No sooner was this formidable sentence made public, than the *Roman* and other Italian Princes, subject to me, violated their allegiance, and rising in arms, either massacred or banished all my deputies or officers.*

Q. Will you relate to the Court some of the effects that followed?

A. When I first proclaimed my decree, a number of my subjects, who were deluded by the Priests and Monks, who acted for him, raised a rebellion in the islands of the *Archipelago*, ravaged a part of *Asia*, and afterwards reached *Italy*. The Prisoner (who was the author and ringleader of these civil commotions and insurrections,) had ordered me to revoke my edict against Images, and upon my refusing, his anathemas followed. However, being exasperated by these violent proceedings of this haughty Pontiff, I resolved to make him and his *Italian* rebels feel my displeasure; but I failed in the attempt. More irritated than discouraged by this disappointment, I assembled a Council at *Constantinople*, ordered all Images to be burnt, and inflicted a variety of punishments upon such as were attached to that idolatrous worship. The deluded followers of the Prisoner, being supported by him, continued to rebel. And at last it ended, after much blood being spilt, in the Italian provinces being torn from the Greek Empire.

Q. What name did the Prisoner go by, when you knew him?

A. He was known by the name of *Constantine*, afterward he assumed that of *Gregory I.* and *Gregory II.*

* See quotation, page 209 1st vol. *Baltimore Literary & Religious Magazine.*

Emperor Constantine, Sworn.

Q. In what year did you succeed to the Imperial Throne?

A. In the year of our Lord 741. I am the son of *Leo*, who resigned his sceptre to me.

Q. Are you acquainted with the conduct manifested by the Prisoner at the bar to your Father, and did he presume to treat you in the same manner?

A. I recollect his base conduct to my Father. He was excommunicated, all his subjects in *Italy* were absolved from the obligations of the oath of allegiance which they had taken, and prohibited from paying tribute to him, or shewing him any marks of submission and obedience. I followed my Father's steps, and in a council assembled at *Constantinople*, in the year 754, condemned both the worship and use of Images. I met with the same treatment from the Prisoner, as my Father did, while I endeavoured to the utmost of my power, to extirpate idolatry from my dominions.

Q. Did the Prisoner excommunicate you by the same name he did your Father?

A. His ecclesiastical interdict was sent forth, first by the name of *Gregory II.* and afterwards *Gregory III.*

Emperor Leo IV. Sworn.

Q. Look at the Prisoner at the bar. Do you know him, and by what name do you know him?

A. I do know him. He lived at *Rome*; and was known by the name of *Pope Adrian*.

Q. In what year was you declared Emperor?

A. In the year 755.

Q. Did you continue long on the Imperial Throne?

A. No. Only about five years. Three Emperors who preceded me had zealously opposed Image worship, and I followed their example. But a cup of poison, administered by the impious counsel of my perfidious and profligate wife, *Irene*, rendered me incapable of performing the functions of royalty. The Prisoner and my wife perceiving me disqualified to govern the empire, as I was considered dead; they entered into an alliance, to abrogate all the imperial laws against idolatry. They summoned a council at *Nice* in *Bithynia*, restored the worship of Images, and denounced severe punishments against such as maintained that God was the only object of religious worship. The other enormities of the flagitious *Irene*, and her deserved fate, I need not state to the Court.

Childeric King of France, Sworn.

Q. Did not the Prisoner at the bar, under pretext that he was Christ's Vicar, depose you, and place another person on your throne?

A. He did. In the year 751, when he called himself *Pope Zachary I.* Vicar of Christ, &c.

Q. Will you relate to the Court some of the leading particulars of that transaction?

A. In the year I before noticed, one *Pepin* who was mayor, as-

pired to the throne, and in an assembly by him collected, proposed the design of dethroning his sovereign. It was then agreed, that the Roman Pontiff should be first consulted, and accordingly an ambassador was sent by *Pepin* to *Rome*, with the following question: "Whether the divine law did not permit a valiant and warlike people to dethrone a pusillanimous and indolent monarch; who was incapable of discharging any of the functions of royalty, and to substitute in his place, one more worthy to rule, and who had already rendered most important services to the state?"* The Prisoner then decreed *Pepin* to be King of *France*, and as soon as the decision of the *Pope* was published in *France*, I was stript of royalty, *Pepin* ascended the throne, and was anointed by his *Legate* at *Soissons*. Soon after this the Prisoner assumed the title of *Pope Stephen II.* when he came into *France* to solicit assistance to fight against the *Lombards*. He then dissolved the obligation of the oath of allegiance, that *Pepin* had sworn to me, and which he had violated by his usurpation. And to render his crown pretendedly sacred, he anointed him a second time, with his wife and two sons. *Pepin* in return, fought for the Prisoner with a numerous army against the *Lombards*, and in the year following established him as a temporal Prince.†

Q. Do you recollect in what year the Prisoner came into *France* and anointed *Pepin*?

A. In the year 754.

Q. Then he never was properly established as a temporal Prince till the year of our Lord 755. And he obtained both his spiritual and temporal authority, it appears, by usurpers like himself?

A. He never was owned as a temporal Prince till the year 755, and after that, he carried two swords to signify both his terrestrial and celestial power, which he had blended together.

Henry IV. Emperor, sworn.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the Prisoner at the bar?

A. I have. I have reason to know him, and so have many thousands. When I knew him he was called *Pope Gregory VII.*

Q. What authority did he arrogate over you, as Christ's Vicegerent on earth?

A. He claimed the power of appointing all persons to ecclesiastical dignities, while my subjects were to support them within my empire, at a very heavy expense. From a prevailing custom, Emperors and Kings had long considered themselves empowered to act independently in this case, and appoint whom they thought proper. I refused to give up my right as Emperor, and he persisted in the most insolent manner to demand my submission. Had the German Princes seconded my claim, it is more than probable, he would have been compelled to desist from his demands. But, as nearly all Germany were then his devoted slaves, and civil discord divided the Empire, the imperious Pontiff ordered me to

*See *Bossuet Defens. declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, Part I. p. 225, &c. *Mosh. Eccl. Hist.*

†*Car. Sigonius, de regno Italiae*. lib. iii. p. 202. tom. ii. op.

repair to *Rome* immediately, and clear myself of various crimes laid to my charge.

I absolutely refused to obey his summons, but assembled a Council of German Bishops at *Worms*. Before this Council the Prisoner was charged justly, with several flagitious practices, deposed from his Pontificate, of which he was declared unworthy. He no sooner received information of what was done at *Worms*, but with all the violence possible, he thundered out his Anathemas on my head, to exclude me from the Throne, and absolve all my subjects from their oath of allegiance to me, as their lawful Sovereign. This he did in the name of the Vicar of Christ and Prince over all Nations, and no terms are sufficient to express the complicated scenes of misery that arose through the war which then took place, between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers.

The *Suabian* chiefs, with Duke *Rodolph* at their head, then revolted from me; and the *Saxon* Princes followed their example. These united Powers were requested by the Prisoner to elect a new Emperor; and accordingly they met at *Tribur* in the year 1076, to take counsel together. The result of this meeting was, the case being referred to the Prisoner, he was to be invited to a Congress at *Augsburg*. To various rigorous conditions imposed on me, they added, that I must forfeit the kingdom, if, within the space of a year I was not restored to the bosom of the Church, and delivered from the Anathema that lay on my head.

When things came to this extremity, and grew worse and worse every day, I was advised to go into *Italy* and implore in person, the clemency of the Roman Pontiff. I yielded to the ignominious counsel, passed the *Alps* amidst the rigour of a severe winter, and arrived in the month of February, 1077. Immediately I repaired to the fortress of *Canusium*, where the prisoner, as the pretended sanctimonious Vicar of Christ, at that time resided, with a young woman named *Matilda*, Countess of *Tuscany*, and the most powerful patroness of his church. At the entrance of this fortress I stood three days in the open air, without the least regard paid by the Prisoner to my situation. My feet were bare, my head uncovered, and my only raiment was a wretched piece of coarse woollen cloth, which was thrown over my body to cover my nakedness.

On the fourth day I was admitted into the presence of the lordly Pontif, who with much difficulty granted me absolution, but he refused to restore me to the throne till the Congress met. After this, my eyes being enlightened to discover much of his wickedness, I opposed him with force of arms to the utmost of my power. I therefore was by him excommunicated a second time, and *Rodolph* was declared lawful Emperor. My arms however were yet victorious; I slew *Rodolph* in battle, and took the Pope prisoner. But being betrayed by my own son, I was compelled to resign my crown.

Basilaus II. King of *Poland*, sworn.

Q. Do you recollect the Prisoner at the bar?

A. I do very well.

Q. What name do you know him by?

A. By the name of *Pope Gregory VII.*

Q. Did he ever presume to usurp authority over you in *Poland*?

A. He did. I was legally elected to the throne by the Nobles of *Poland*, and was regularly crowned. But sometime after, through the death of one of his Bishops, the Prisoner not only excommunicated me with all the circumstances of infamy that he could invent, but also hurled me from the throne, dissolved the oath of allegiance which my subjects had taken, and by an express and imperious edict, prohibited the nobles and clergy of *Poland* from electing a new king without his consent.*

Leopold, Duke of Austria, sworn.

Q. Did not the Prisoner at the bar excommunicate and anathematize you, claiming that authority as Christ's Vicegerent on earth?

A. He did; he assumed the same power over me as over all Princes, arrogating to himself this authority as the Vicar of Christ.

Q. What name did he go by when you knew him?

A. By the name of Pope *Celestine III.*; he went by that name, almost to the close of the twelfth century.

To be continued.

AN ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

Hon. Mr. Gaston of N. C.—Catholic Perfidy.—Prostitution of the public press.

BEING on the eve of departing from the United States, in discharge of a public duty, committed to my hands, by that branch of the church of Jesus Christ, of which I am a member; I feel myself imperiously bound by a sense of what is due to myself, as well as to the cause of truth, and public morality, to lay before my countrymen, the following correspondence. For I am well aware, that the same religious principles which teach men to swear falsely, and keep no faith with those, who, as they say, have no faith; will prompt those who are so tardy and reluctant to speak even in necessary explanation when I am present and ready to reply, to be bold and prompt even in attack, when I am far away. Nor can I doubt, that the prostitution of the public press to the Catholic superstition, which has wrought me so much injury, though so great injustice, in despite of all my personal efforts to the contrary: will lend itself, to the same designs in circumstances more favourable to success.

I have then solemnly to call the attention of the American people, to the facts established, by the following papers; which go far to show—1. *That the Roman Catholic religion, not only admits, but approves of, false swearing, when Papists can gain any advantage thereby:—2. That the political newspapers of the day, to some extent, applaud this tremendous principle; and to a still greater extent, are grossly subservient, to the religious sect, which teaches and practises it!*

The attention of the reader, is directed first, to the letter of

* See Dlugossi Hist. Polon. tom i. p. 295.

JUDGE GASTON of North Carolina, and the introductory remarks which precede it; both of which are taken from the LEXINGTON (Va.) GAZETTE, of February 5th, 1836. They follow:—

HON. WM. GASTON.

THE reader will find below a letter from this gentleman to the editor of this paper, on the subject of the charge preferred against him by "Senex" of procuring, from the Bishop of Baltimore, an ecclesiastical permission to hold an office under the State of N. Carolina, which the Constitution of that State expressly disqualified him from holding—in other words, authorizing him to *commit perjury*, for the Judge could not enter upon the duties of the office without first swearing to support the State Constitution.

We wish our motives in publishing this letter to be distinctly understood. We do not publish it, for any bearing it may have upon the questions heretofore in controversy between Senex and ourselves: that is altogether incidental and undesigned. We publish it simply from a sense of justice to Judge Gaston—to the elevated station he occupies and to the State of North Carolina which has conferred that station upon him and whose fame is involved in that of her sons. Our paper has been made the vehicle of a calumny: it is proper therefore that it should be made the vehicle also of the refutation of that calumny.

We had hoped to have been spared the necessity of publishing this letter. "Senex" knows that we employed the only means in our power to absolve us from the necessity—but unfortunately without success.

We do not mean by any thing we have said to reflect in the slightest degree, upon the conduct of "Senex" in making this charge. His error we sincerely believe was one purely of the head, such as we are all liable to commit.

The letter must satisfy every candid mind that the charge is wholly unfounded. The Judge's positive denial would be sufficient to prove this particularly as the evidence by which it is attempted to be sustained is of the very weakest character.

All who know Judge Gaston, know that his character is without reproach and above suspicion. The high and most responsible station which he occupies by the election of his PROTESTANT fellow citizens with whom he has spent his life, shows that his character is without a stain.—If the charge is true, the Judge is not only a liar and a perjured scoundrel, but a "fool" too, for if the *facts* which he states are not true would it not be the height of folly in him to publish them to the world when their falsity can so easily be established? Would he not thus furnish unequivocal evidence of his guilt? and that too, to persons who would seize upon it with ferocious avidity? But with those who question the Judge's veracity we have no argument. The letter itself bears upon its face convincing proof of his *candour*. We commend it to our readers.

Raleigh December 29th, 1835.

SIR,—I had the pleasure of receiving yesterday, and not before, your letter of the 17th of October addressed to me at this place. The number of the Lexington Gazette, referred to in the letter as accompanying it, was forwarded to Newburn, the place of my residence, some time since. In consequence of the editorial article in the Gazette, I caused to be transmitted to you two newspapers containing a speech which I made in our late State Convention. I presume that you have received these and that they furnish most, if not at all, of the facts about which you enquire.

The publication to which the editorial article is an answer I have not met with. From the nature however of that answer I infer that it contains a vile charge of my having obtained some ecclesiastical dispensations or permission to hold an office under the State of North Carolina, and relieving me from the guilt of perjury in violating my oath to support the Constitution of the State. I know that a charge to his effect had been made in a periodical work published at Baltimore called (I think) "The Religious and Literary Magazine," for not long after the adjournment of the Convention and while I was yet here occupied with the duties of the Supreme Court, a copy of the Magazine containing such an accusation was sent on to me, and as I suppose by the conductors of the work. It is not easy to determine when it is proper to come forth with a denial of a calumnious charge, and when it is most becoming to treat it with silent contempt. The accusation in question seemed to me so preposterous—so ridiculous—that it was scarcely possible

for me to notice it gravely, without subjecting myself to ridicule or the manifestation of a morbid sensibility. But I was saved from all difficulty in deciding on the course then to be pursued. The style of the article was so uncourteous, and the temper which it breathed so malignant, that self respect utterly forbade me from paying any notice to it.

But your enquiries, Sir, are evidently prompted by a sincere desire to know the truth, and made in a manner that demands my respectful consideration. If therefore it will afford you any satisfaction to have my peremptory denial of the accusation, I have no hesitation in stating that it is wholly false. It is no doubt but a mere repetition of the Baltimore slander, and *that* professes to be mainly founded on the asserted fact—that I withheld my assent to be put in nomination for the office of Judge until after I had visited Baltimore. This allegation is itself utterly false. My lamented friend Chief Justice Henderson died in August 1833. In a few days afterwards I was informed of the occurrence, and urged by gentlemen of the highest standing in the State, upon *public grounds*, to permit myself to be considered as willing to accept the vacant office if it should please the Legislature to confer it. Strong reasons were also presented for pressing an early decision. There were difficulties in the way of an immediate determination, but these had no connection whatever with constitutional scruples. I had occasion but a short time before to examine for myself and to seek the best counsel to examine the disqualifications for office which some supposed the Constitution denounced against the professors of the Roman Catholic faith. I was satisfied that my religious principles did not incapacitate me from taking the office. But there were personal considerations which compelled delay. It is unnecessary to set these forth—but *that* which was *last* removed arose from pecuniary engagements which I had contracted, and which I feared the great sacrifice of emolument that would follow on quitting the bar might disable me punctually to comply with. Justice, honor required that a satisfactory arrangement of these matters should be concluded before I consented to be removed from the bar to the bench. This was done by an early day in September, and *then* I gave my written consent to be nominated for the vacant office, and my permission that this determination might be publicly known.

A very laborious fall circuit closed in the first week of November. From it I went on a long promised visit to see my daughter who was settled in New York. I travelled by Norfolk and Baltimore, and passed one day at the latter place, and as well as I recollect one only. It had been supposed by several who took a deep interest in my receiving the appointment, that it would be bestowed without opposition. They had afterwards ascertained that this was a mistaken opinion, and had informed me before I left Carolina that doubts had been expressed on the Constitutional question, and difficulties raised about it. Having an hour of leisure when at Baltimore I wrote to one of my zealous friends residing at Raleigh, stating the views which I had taken of the Constitutional question, and authorizing him to give publicity to them, that their correctness might be judged of. I have understood, and have no doubt of the fact, that this letter was read by my friend at his table in the presence of several distinguished gentlemen, among others the great and good John Marshall, and that copies of it were taken. This is the letter which has afforded the pretext for the falsehood (I hope a falsehood through mistake) that my assent to be put in nomination had been withheld until after I reached Baltimore.

It is needless surely for me to go further—but I will add, that I *never* had any intercourse, verbal or written, direct or indirect, with the Bishop of Baltimore on the subject—and that I did not directly or indirectly confer with any individual belonging or professing to belong to the Catholic Church, upon the subject (out of my own immediate household) until after I had announced my unconditional assent to be put in nomination for the office.

What use you may make of this communication I leave entirely to your sense of propriety. It is not a pleasant matter for any man of character or feeling to have a discussion entertained on the question

whether he has or has not acted as a scoundrel and a fool—and I regard the wantonness with which men's characters are dragged before the public; the facility with which slanders are credited, and the rashness with which unfounded imputations are attributed by political or sectarian rancor, as among the worst vices of the age. If any public motive should require that the miserable calumny to which I have referred should be contradicted or repelled, you have here my authority for so doing. But as it respects myself personally, I cannot but believe that a life of nearly threescore years has established for me a character such as it is, that does not require to be defended or propped. I could wish therefore that I might be permitted to pass the remainder of my days in the quiet discharge of my duties, and that no further notice should be taken of this contemptible falsehood. You will however act in relation to it as your judgment shall direct.

With very respectful sentiments, I am, Sir,

Your obliged and obedient Servant,

Mr. C. C. Baldwin.

WILL. GASTON.

To the foregoing letter, which came into my hands, in the manner described in the one which follows; I immediately addressed to the Gazette, which published it, the following reply, under cover to a friend in Lexington, Va.

Baltimore, February 19th, 1836.

To the Editor of the Lexington Gazette:

SIR,—Some unknown person has sent to me through the post office, the fragment of a newspaper dated the 5th of this month, in which I find a long letter of JUDGE GASTON of N. C. addressed to Mr. C. C. BALDWIN, and preceded by a column of editorial remarks. It is from a passage of JUDGE GASTON's letter only, that I am enabled to determine the name and location of the newspaper, a part of which has been sent me. It is from the same source, that I learn he had been called to account by a previous article in your paper, under the signature of 'Senex;' and that his present letter is published on the responsibility, of the gentleman to whom it is addressed; and rather against the wishes of its author.

In the course of JUDGE GASTON's letter, he refers to the Baltimore Religious and Literary Magazine, as having been the vehicle of a charge similar to the one now hinted at by him; and indulges himself in such expressions, to justify his contemptuous silence under the accusations of that periodical, as were perhaps, natural under the circumstances. My right to address to you this communication, and to ask its publication in your paper, is founded in part on the fact, that I am the senior editor of the work in question, and the author of the article complained of; and in still greater part on the intrinsic and induring importance of the matter in contest.

Then be pleased sir, to bear with me while I make a short and perfectly plain statement. In the "*Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine*," for July 1835, is an article of four or five pages, entitled, "*JUDGE GASTON of N. Carolina. Religious Liberty. Mental Reservation.*" I send you, along with this, a copy of the work, and ask the insertion of that article, in your paper. This I do the more readily, that all who choose, may see the real temper, manner, and end of that article; which Judge Gaston has so grossly misrepresented. It will then be seen, that the whole ground of defence set up by him, for the most extraordinary act ever justified by a christian gentleman, is entirely evasive and irrelevant; and that the real ground of dissatisfaction with his conduct and religious principles, remains not only uncontradicted, but absolutely confessed.

JUDGE GASTON is a Roman Catholic. To that I have nothing to say. He is at full liberty, to believe and practice whatever religious rites, seem good in his own eyes; or none at all, if he so pleases. And God for-

bid that any should abridge him of his liberty. But sir, JUDGE GASTON has no right, either natural, civil, or moral, to continue a Roman Catholic, and at the very same moment, SWEAR, that he believes "THE PROTESTANT RELIGION TO BE TRUE." Still less has he the right to do this, in a solemn, public, formal and official manner! Yet this is the very thing which he has done—which he neither has denied nor can deny—which I have alledged against him,—which I am ready to maintain to be true before any tribunal in the universe, and that with unanswerable proofs—and which he in the letter I am now noticing, indirectly justifies! This sir is the plain matter of fact, of the case. By the XXXII Article of the late Constitution of N. Carolina, it was provided, "That no person who shall deny the being of God, OR THE TRUTH OF THE PROTESTANT RELIGION, or the divine authority either of the Old or New Testaments, or who shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the state, SHALL BE CAPABLE OF HOLDING ANY OFFICE, OR PLACE OF TRUST OR PROFIT, IN THE CIVIL GOVERNMENT WITHIN THIS STATE."—Yet JUDGE GASTON, being and continuing a Papist, was appointed a judge under this constitution—and actually took the usual oaths to support that which he trampled under foot even while he called God to witness, that he believed, that to be true, which in his secret soul, he was satisfied was false!!

You will allow me sir to say, in my own defence; that I have been kicked into this Popish controversy, by the priests and others around me: that the case of Judge Gaston, was no private matter, but a public and official act;—that as such it has been used as a strong and frightful illustration, of the natural and necessary fruits of a false and bloody superstition; which is spreading in all directions in this country—and which foreign States and Princes are conspiring to establish as the public religion of America; and that, in the whole case, the talents, public services, and private virtues of Judge Gaston have been fully admitted, indeed stated. But this act of his, is undeniable and indefensible; and it ought to open the eyes of all men to the dreadful nature of a religion, which while it persecutes on principle all who reject it;—at the same time corrupts all who receive it.

If you will look at the article to which I have already alluded, you will discover, that four grounds of defence set up, by the friends of this gentleman, are slightly examined. 1. That the provision in the Constitution of N. Carolina, was a mere dead letter. 2. That he was not bound to know what was meant, by the terms "Protestant Religion," as they were not defined either in the laws or constitution of his state. 3. That the oath he took was actually true, and that though a Catholic, he might believe the Protestant Religion to be true. 4. That he got a *dispensation* to take this oath. These were actual defences which I had heard suggested in his own state, by his own friends, over, and over; during two journies entirely across the state in two different directions, which I had then recently taken. For the notice taken of them, I refer you to the printed article.

It must be apparent then, how absurd and how evasive is Judge Gaston's letter lately published in your paper; in which he admits that he had seen a copy of my article, and yet passing *over the only real charge, namely, that he took the oath*, confines his defence to the denial, of that which his own friends had suggested as a defence for him. The burden of his letter is to show, that he did not get a dispensation from the Archbishop of Baltimore to take this dreadful oath! Instead of making this supposed dispensation the ground of charge; I stated it expressly as ground of excuse, better and more likely in itself, and more to his credit, than any thing else I had heard of, or could imagine! If we are now to understand that he got no dispensation at all; then I can only say, the whole weight of criminality of the oath in question, rests on himself; instead of being divided with some ecclesiastic. But if on the other hand, as the tenor of his letter admits of being construed—he only means, to deny that he got the supposed dispensation any where else, than *from his household priest*; I will merely place this

equivocation, by the side of that which passed by the only real charge, to level accusations against me, for admitting as relatively probable, what hundreds, disposed to excuse him, repeated as true!

I assure you sir, that so far from having any personal or sectarian reasons, influencing my conduct, as Judge Gaston insinuates, the fact is all the other way. I do not know his person, even by sight; I greatly respect his public services, his talents, and his love of letters; and I have had private reasons more, than ever he can know, urging me to pretermit this whole matter, so far as it relates to him. But in the providence of God, that gentleman's acts, have given me the means of rousing my countrymen to the dangers threatened them from a *political religion*, which has one grand unwavering principle of action, to effect one great result, ruinous to the whole human race. It is branded into the soul of every papist, *that the whole world belongs to herself as the mother and mistress of all churches; and to the Pope as the Vicar of God.* It is laid on the soul of every papist, *to labour by all means, good or bad, to bring back a rebellious world to that horrid rule.* Behold, illustrated in this case,—public and official as it is—some of the worst results of this tremendous system!

Whatever may be Judge Gaston's elevation, somewhat too boastfully asserted perhaps; or whatever my own admitted insignificance; he should remember that it is only in the church of Rome, that exalted rank, discharges all the obligations of virtue; and that in the hearts of our simple countrymen, truth is yet, stronger than authority. And there are perhaps Mr. Editor, many around you who are able to satisfy even the fastidiousness of Judge Gaston's apprehensions of dishonour, if he should notice a charge from such a source. Thus far at least I may relieve his apprehensions, without the appearance of too great presumption. I have yet to learn that my name, by whomsoever borne, has ever been coupled with an act of formal and deliberate perfidy, perpetrated in the name of God, in the face of a free people.

I am sir your obedient servant,

RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

This letter reached its destination in due course of the mail; and was placed in the hands of the person to whom it was addressed. Instead of printing it however, he returned it, with the following letter addressed to me.

Lexington, Va. February 29, 1836.

SIR,—Your communication for the Gazette with the accompanying pamphlet was duly received, and for reasons which I will proceed to assign, is respectfully declined.

The Catholic controversy terminated in my paper some time since, and (in compliance with the wishes of a vast majority of my patrons) I solemnly and repeatedly *pledged myself* not to admit it again; into the Gazette. Judge Gaston's letter was published as an *act of justice to his private character*, and from no other motive whatever. Now Sir how can I under these circumstances revive this controversy without violating my solemn pledges?

But Sir, I would not entertain this controversy if the Pope were to release me from my pledges, because it would exclude more useful and interesting matter from my paper (a small weekly sheet,) and is entirely uncalled for, there being scarcely an individual in the county who does not consider the Church of Rome as a sink of iniquity; and the enemy of God and man. Why Sir a good many of my subscribers stopped their papers because I dared to defend the Catholics, and *all of them* censured me for saying a word in their favour.

A Catholic controversy is as much out of place in my paper, as a political controversy would be in your magazine. Your *main reason* then for asking the insertion of your communication in the Gazette is overruled.

Judge Gaston's letter was in reply to the charge of "Senex"—that he had obtained a dispensation from the bishop of Baltimore to commit perjury and not in answer to the article in your periodical. He merely mentions that your magazine had made a similar charge against him. But this surely does not make you a *party* to the controversy or give you any "right" to reply through my paper. If Judge Gaston has done you any *specific injury* through my paper, most certainly you shall be permitted to redress it. But you *must confine yourself to that point.*

Most certainly I cannot tolerate a discussion in *my paper*, of the question whether Judge Gaston acted properly or improperly in accepting a judicial office under the old constitution of N. C. What is it to me or my readers whether he acted criminally or not, or whether he and the legislature who elected him, put a right or wrong construction on that repealed instrument? For myself I am firmly persuaded that he acted from the purest motives, and on perfectly sound principles. (See his speech in the late convention of N. C. recently republished in Baltimore.)

You ask me to republish a long article from the Magazine, because Judge Gaston misrepresented its character. I pray to be excused. I cannot admit the principle that a misrepresentation in the opinion of the author, of the character of a disputatious essay in a paper, gives the author of that essay a right to demand its republication in that paper. I am afraid sir, that your Magazine might not be quite as entertaining as it is at present, if you were to acknowledge that right.

If however, you choose to deny the Judge's assertions as to the character of your essay, you can do so, but *you must confine yourself strictly to that point.*

In haste, yours &c. &c.

C. C. BALDWIN.

The italics in this letter, are of the author's own making. The pretexts on which he refuses to publish my letter, may be better judged of from the following facts. 1. This Mr. Baldwin, commenced in his own paper, this very Catholic discussion, spontaneously as we are informed, and published elaborate articles on the *Catholic side* of the argument as now pending, over all christendom: and only shut his columns to it, after *Senex*, proved himself, rather an unmanageable antagonist, and his patrons, as he admits, rebuked his doings. 2. This very letter of Judge Gaston, was elicited by one from this very Mr. Baldwin; and was published, as the latter part of Mr. Gaston's letter shows, against his own views, and on Mr. Baldwin's personal responsibility. That he should under these circumstances, refuse to publish my letter, sufficiently explains his principles and partialities; and might have saved him the disclosure towards the close of his letter to me, that he "was firmly persuaded that he (Judge Gaston) acted from the purest motives, and on perfectly correct principles." *Yet it is undeniable, that this applauded act, was a solemn official oath, by a staunch Papist, that the Protestant religion is true!!!* It is well. Candour is a great virtue. So also are truth, and fair dealing.

It will be observed that Mr. Baldwin's letter is dated the 27th of February, at Lexington, Va. On the next day, the *Baltimore Gazette*, published in this city the letter of Judge Gaston to Mr. B. with his preliminary remarks. This publication was preceded by a short note to the editor; and the copy of the paper sent to me through the post-office, several days after its date, had an impertinent manuscript note in the margin. Both are annexed: first the note to the editor of the *Gazette*; then the anonymous one to me.

To the Editor of the Baltimore Gazette:

SIR,—May I ask the favour of you to publish in your valuable journal, for the information of your subscribers and the public generally, the letter of JUDGE GASTON, which will be found in the "Lexington (Virginia,) Gazette" of the 5th instant; together with the introductory remarks of the editor of that paper. In making this request I am prompted by the sole motive of contributing to the refutation of a calumny heretofore circulated in this city, (where I believe it most wantonly originated) against one of the purest patriots and most enlightened jurists to be found in this or any other country, and a gentleman whom I have the pleasure of numbering among my personal and most esteemed friends.

A SUBSCRIBER.

"Now dear Sir, I hope you may see, whether or not, the Judge has honoured you with a notice; also it is seen that the community at large have caught you in one of your many falsehoods; which you cannot refute without telling another!!!"

This anonymous allusion is no doubt, to a statement, on page 103 of the 2d vol. of this Magazine. In the article commencing on that page of the March No. and headed "COLLECTANEA II. I. Mr. Gaston.—Princeton College;" it is said: "The Hon. Mr. Gaston of North Carolina, has taken no further notice of the article published in this Magazine, in July 1835, page 212, of vol. I, than to return to us, the No. which contained the article, and which had been sent to him by mail." This was then literally true, so far as I was concerned, or informed. After that sentence (and nearly all the remainder of the March No. of the Magazine) was printed, and nearly ready for publication, I saw, for the first time, Mr. Gaston's letter. My letter to Mr. Baldwin is dated Feb. 19; but even then, I wrote, and the printer set up, and want of space alone excluded, a short article stating the existence, and reception of a notice, by Judge Gaston, of that which he was most solemnly bound to have noticed seven months sooner.

As soon as I saw the Baltimore Gazette, containing these articles; I addressed the letter which immediately follows, to the editor of that paper. His reply follows it. Let them be fairly judged by the reader.

Baltimore, March 5, 1836.

To the Editor of the Baltimore Gazette:

SIR,—I beg leave to direct your attention to the several communications accompanying this note, for a purpose which I will immediately explain.

The first is a copy of your paper of last Monday, which I have received to-day from the post-office, containing the letter of Judge Gaston of North Carolina, with the comments of the editor of the Lexington (Va.) Gazette. In the margin you will observe an insolent manuscript note to me, from the unknown person, who sent me your paper. The second is a letter addressed by me, to the editor of the Lexington Gazette, in answer to that portion of Judge Gaston's letter to him, which relates to me. The third is that editor's letter to me, refusing to publish my letter.

My sole object in now troubling you sir, is to ask the publication, in your paper, of the letter addressed by me to the editor of the Lexington Gazette, in reply to Judge Gaston; and which he refused to publish.

It is now above a year since the paper you now edit, (which was then controled by another person,*) published repeated attacks on me; and refused admission to any defence, by me. The Baltimore American at that time, refused to allow me to defend myself through its columns; and having no claim on any other paper in this city so strong as on yours, and it (being a subscriber to one, and assailed in the other,) I applied to no other. So that till this day, I have been denied a hearing in the premises. The recent conduct of the Virginia paper, is a sample of the same proceeding. I make this statement to you sir, in the hope of impressing your mind with the deep conviction which abides on my own; that such conduct is equally inconsistent with the freedom of the public press, the rights of individuals, and the interests of truth.

I make no sort of objection to any man's charging me, in any form and before any tribunal he pleases. I object only to being denied the liberty of defence. I therefore make no complaint whatever of your publishing Judge Gaston's disrespectful expressions of me. On the contrary; I intend myself to publish his letter;—regretting only, that it affords so bad a defence of so strange an act. But it seems to me, that my right to be heard, is as perfect as his. For my character is quite as important to me, as his can be to him; and the solemn and weighty matter in contest between us, to be rightly decided, must be fairly heard.

*This individual, who though nominally a Protestant, was as an editor, the mere creature of the Papist party, and especially of the priests; is now in the Maryland Penitentiary, for robbing the Baltimore post-office. I deplore his unhappy fate. But at the same time, I cannot too gratefully recall the goodness of God, that has so soon, brought to light, and to just punishment, a man, whose position gave him great power; a power which he used in the most cruel manner to undermine my character; at the same moment that other minions of the priests were threatening my life. God has thus far, signally preserved me, from both conspiracies.

I beg the favour of you, to preserve all the papers sent to you; and to accompany the one which I hope you will publish, with as much of the substance of the present statement, as shall be necessary to make the whole case intelligible.

I am, sir, your obt. servt.

RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Baltimore, March 7th, 1836.

REV'D. SIR,—I received on Saturday last, your letter of that date, with three accompanying documents, one of which—a letter from you to the editor of the Lexington (Va.) Gazette—you request me to publish in my paper—intimating your conviction, that you have a right to expect I will comply with your request.

Although I consider the compliance with an application—even from a subscriber—to publish in my paper any communication, other than an advertisement, as an act of courtesy and favour, and not the performance of a duty, or what can be claimed as a right: I would cheerfully accede to your wish, if the contents of the letter you propose to have published, were not of that character, which experience has convinced me cannot be usefully and safely admitted into the columns of a newspaper. I am therefore under the necessity of declining the publication. I return you the documents which accompanied your letter—assuring you that I have no knowledge of the writer of the censurable note written on the margin of the Gazette.

I am respectfully, yours,

WM. GWYNN.

At the suggestion of a friend, that the editor of *Baltimore Chronicle*, would probably publish my letter, in reply to Judge Gaston; I addressed him the note published below. *He replied verbally, that he could not publish my letter, as he had not published Judge Gaston's.*

Baltimore, March 9th 1836.

RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE presents his respects to Mr. Barnes, and begs leave to trouble him, so far as to ask his attention, to the subject contained in the packet of letters sent to him herewith.

The entire object of this application, is to obtain the publication in the *Chronicle*, of the letter addressed by R. J. B. to the *Lexington (Va.) Gazette*; and which was refused, first by that paper, and then by the *Gazette* of this city; for reasons and under circumstances which the letters of Messrs. Baldwin, and Gwynn, will explain.

He is the more urgent, for the publication of the letter which he asks Mr. B. to admit into his journal; because, as he is on the eve of leaving the U. States—he wishes Mr. Gaston to see as early as possible, the position which he is resolved to occupy, as regards a subject, with relation to which all the whole Catholics and half Catholics, in the country, seem already so perfectly organised, for Mr. Gaston, and against the very clearest principles of morality and public virtue.

Alas! sir, if public men, are allowed in the most formal, official acts, to take false oaths;—and those who love truth well enough to remark on it, are to be held up to public scorn; and then denied the only effectual means of defence, because there is a certain superstition in the country which tolerates false swearing; then indeed the public press, and the public morals too are sadly out of joint.

And is it so great a crime to love truth? Has it ceased to be a sin against God, and a crime under our laws, and an offence against good morals for fraud and falsehood, to be formally and even officially committed? No: this is not so, by any means. If I had acted as Judge Gaston has; my sect would have deposed me from the ministry—my congregation would have shut my church doors against me—my friends would have wept over me, as one undone—and the whole world would have had, but one opinion about it—and that opinion would have been, that I was a degraded man. Then why not, mete the same measure to Judge Gaston? I will tell you why. *It is because Judge Gaston is a Papist; and his creed admits and approves his conduct.* And therefore, let every man that loves God, pity and forgive Judge Gaston; and frown

down his pestiferous superstition, as the parent of all vice, and the enemy of every virtue!

But is the public press already Catholic or infidel? Is the whole editorial corpse, converted, subsidised, afraid or totally indifferent? No: this is by no means so. If a Methodist judge was to take a false oath; or a Presbyterian judge, commit a flagrant violation of morality; or an Episcopal judge, outrage public decency; or a Deistical judge, be guilty of deliberate perfidy, in official affairs; in all these cases, the public press, would fully respond to the public feeling—and the judge would be disgraced, if not degraded! Why deal out a different measure to a *Catholic* judge? I will tell you why.—It is because, every Catholic in the world, makes common cause with every other Catholic in the world, and with the Pope of Rome, as the head of all the world, and with the Catholic church, as the mother and mistress of all the churches in the world! Virtue is nothing, truth is nothing, religion is nothing, country is nothing, liberty is nothing;—the church is ALL: and the Pope its head, and *all its true* members, form one universal conspiracy against every good of man, and the honour of God himself. Printers feel the force, though they may deny the reality, of this conspiracy. If Mr. Gwynn abuses me or any other Protestant, in his paper—no one interferes; it is a personal affair to be decided on its merits. If he writes ten lines against Archbishop Eccleston, in eight days, his paper would probably be ruined. And this, although every word he had said of him were pregnant with truth, and vital to the public welfare!—Oh! then let every man, that loves his race—his children—his inestimable rights—his glorious country—rouse himself up to the contemplation of the principles, and designs, of this atrocious society; which aims at no less than the universal monarchy of the world; and which, though it pursues this object, under the guise of religion, is bound by no principle human or divine. Oh! how willingly, would I become their victim, if that might be the means of making my country feel, that every sentiment of patriotism, every emotion of philanthropy, and every principle of true religion, equally impel us to suppress, by all lawful means, this unparalleled superstition, as the enemy alike of God and man.

Balt. March 12, 1836.

RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

UNIVERSALISM.

LETTERS VI, VII, AND VIII.

WHICH ALL THROWN INTO ONE; AS THEY CONTAIN THE ENTIRE ARGUMENT, ON THIS BRANCH OF THE SUBJECT.

Indirect proof, from reason and the nature of things, that there must be a state of eternal retribution.

THERE are many persons who do not even profess to believe that the Bible is the word of God. There are others who if they admit this at all, do it in a sense so loose and general, as to pay little regard to its plainest commands; and when it teaches any

thing which appears to them at all inconsistent, with that which they suppose it should teach, they make no difficulty in disregarding its divine admonitions. We know not where both of these classes of people would be more likely to be found than amongst the patrons of a Universalist newspaper. Although therefore, we consider the scriptures as the only absolutely safe ground on which a man can rest his religious belief; and have in that conviction, attempted to demonstrate out of them, that the eternal punishment of the wicked, is one of the first and clearest principles of revealed religion: it seems proper now, for the reasons stated above, to attempt to clear this doctrine of all charge against it on grounds of reason, and natural religion; to one or other of which, all the various objections against it may be referred. In doing this, we shall put what we have to say into a number of short statements, each of which we design to contain a complete argument stated in a very summary manner. We commend the whole to the conscience and judgment of the reader: praying him to remember, that they who act for eternity, ought to act with amazing fidelity.

1. All nations of whom any accounts have been preserved, have believed that there would be a future, and eternal state of retribution. If there be alledged some few and doubtful exceptions, it is of nations sunk in the lowest conditions of ignorance and barbarism. But the universal assent of mankind, to a truth of this kind, which could be known only by revelation; seems to render it nearly certain, that all nations, having a common origin, have received the common tradition, tracing back to God himself, that the wicked shall be punished forever.

2. If we descend from nations to individuals, the result is still the same. For although a *few* in every age may have rejected this truth; yet *many* in every age have rejected much plainer truths. Some have considered theft as a virtue; others have justified infanticide; and so of most of the clearest truths in morals. As we assert that it is thoroughly proven to be of the nature of man to hear and speak, notwithstanding a few in all ages may have been deaf and dumb: So we assert that the universal assent of all men shows that the belief in a state of eternal retribution, accords with the very nature of man, and is and must be true, even though a few *scoffers* deny it.

3. It is impossible to conceive, constituted as man is, how the idea of a future and eternal state of retribution, should exist and have been diffused and received as it has been, except upon the supposition of its having been revealed by God, and universally received, as fully in accordance with man's nature; that is, with the dictates of his reason, and the convictions of his conscience. It is therefore not only true; but to deny it is to contradict God in his providence, as well as in his word; and to outrage the universal reason and moral sense of mankind.—It may be said this principle justifies many sins; as the knowledge of them and the fact of their universality, stand on the same footing. Not at all. But on the contrary, it is incontrovertibly, and by this very process, established as a truth, that man is a sinner, and that it is of his nature to be so! Which, like this, is also a divine truth.

4. We have no experience, or knowledge, which justifies us in believing that the mere fact of the death of the body can produce any sort of change on the essential moral character, of the spirit that once inhabited it. The body sleeps, and when it awakes, the spirit is unchanged. Why should the sleep of death—and the resurrection change it? The body passes over boundless oceans, bearing in it an unaltered soul. What should change it, in passing the narrow stream of death?—But here are men who drop into eternity, the very antipodes of each other! How shall they become one? If not—how shall one cease to be happy in eternity, in that love of God which made him happy here; or the other cease to be wretched in the sin, in whose love and practice he was wretched here? Or even if it were sin that made the one happy, and holiness that made the other miserable—what shall arrest the eternal action of these causes?

5. Shall we hope that God will at last relent, and put a stop to punishment? If we leave his word out of the question (in which this idea has no place)—from whence *can* we infer, that God will do this? Have we ever seen him in the world of nature and providence stop, in the midst of his work; change his purpose like a weak man, relent, and turn back? Have we any evidence that he considers the relations between cause and effect which he has established whether in the natural, or moral world, either unwise, unfeeling, unreasonable, unjust, or improper? Never once.—Then why suppose, that the law which ordains happiness to be found only in being like him, and misery only in being unlike him, will by its results, so affect him, that he cannot bear its developments, already foreseen and determinately arranged by himself?

6. Shall we rely on that infinite mercy which they tell us, will not allow of any suffering but what is for final good to the very being that suffers; nor of any eternal sufferings at all? But that very mercy, beheld and allowed us in the exercise of our moral freedom, to violate those laws, by obedience to which, alone was it possible to be happy, and the breach of which at once dishonoured him, and ruined us! This, God has witnessed an almost infinite number of times, without interposing in any violent or irregular manner. Why should we presume, that mercy would so interpose, to arrest a foreseen result, on accounts purely personal as to us—when it did not interpose, to stop, the ruin itself, when aggravated by contempt to God—united with it?—What evidence is there that God is less moved by the breaking of his law, than by the effects which he had ordained should flow from that breach? Whence do we gather the fact, that the sight of human suffering on account of sin, moves God more, than the sight of human sin, which produces it?

7. All human experience teaches the uniform fact that God has a fearful controversy with this world. If we shut the Bible, it is perhaps impossible to trace it up, to its cause or origin. But with only a ray of light from it, all becomes clear. We may not indeed, see sin uniformly followed, by retributive and adequate misery, which as we shall show, is a clear proof of future punishments. But this we do see, that wherever suffering exists, there sin has preceded it. Now if any man wishes to estimate the probability of

God's dealing against unpardoned and unrepented sin, less than its desert; whether by reason of his infinite mercy, or from any other cause: he has here a fair field of comparison. Behold the sorrow, the anguish, the pain, the sickness, the poverty, the countless ills, that surround us on every side! What woes in this ruined world since the sun rose this day! What infinite agony, since sin entered the world! Yet at every instant, one word of infinite power, wisdom, mercy—might have relieved it all!—In how many cases, has God interposed, in the way in which some Universalists assert that he will interpose to take the wicked out of Hell? How many cases have been offered to his notice? How many instants of time have there been since satan fell? What is to occur to disunite sin and misery? What can make God more merciful in future, than he has been from eternity?

8. But if eternal punishment, be thought not only inconsistent with the goodness and mercy of God, but absolutely unnecessary in itself; then we ask, if his almighty power can bring all to glory, without the future punishment of any, why cannot the same power, do the same thing, without any present suffering; and why is it not inconsistent with infinite goodness for him not to do it? If God's goodness will prompt him, and his power enable him; to save all sinners from pain at some future period, what is it, that has interposed to prevent him from doing it, in all the ages that are passed?

9. If it be said that none can suffer under the perfectly equitable government of God, any more than is necessary for his own good; several difficulties greatly embarrass such a statement. We suggest one. We see a great many persons, who are not benefitted at all by their sufferings; but get worse and worse under increasing sufferings, till the very hour of death. Witness about thirty thousand persons who kill themselves by drunkenness every year in this nation. Now we wish for evidence that future sufferings will necessarily reform these men. If not reformed, we wish for evidence that either their happiness or ours will be promoted, by placing them and the temperate, eternally, in the same company, or under the same circumstances. If not together, nor under similar circumstances, then there must be *two* heavens; one in which drunkenness is allowed, and the other in which it is prohibited. But this is equally true of every other crime. So that if Universalism is true, there must be twice as many kinds of heaven as there are kinds of crime!—This is the most licentious kind of infidelity; for it deifies sin.

10. But it is absurd to say, that equity forbids that any one should be punished except for his own good. Law, is a rule of conduct prescribed by a superior. Punishment is pain or loss inflicted for the transgression of law. The power that has the right to prescribe the law, has also the sole right to determine the importance which exists that the law should be obeyed: that is, to prescribe the punishment for its breach!—Equity, can require no more than that we should know beforehand, the law and the penalty; and be able to keep the one and shun the other. Voluntarily to incur, a known penalty, and then to claim exemption on grounds of equity, is childish folly. The fundamental idea of punishment,

is to prevent transgression; not to do good to transgressors. So that in a perfect government, like that of God, the very severity of threatened punishment, is a powerful proof, that it will not be remitted; because it is the measure, of the importance that the law should not have been transgressed.

11. The absolute certainty of adequate punishment, would put a total end to all transgression; if two things were true. If men knew this beforehand; and if they acted entirely under the guidance of reason. But men do not believe, practically that every transgression will be punished, either by God or man.—Being sinners they do not realize what is the adequate punishment of sin. And impelled by fierce and unruly passions, they do not always act upon the dictates of reason. What society needs then, is to redress the imperfections of its own code, by making all men feel and believe that there is a future, an adequate, and therefore an endless, retribution. But what Universalism inculcates is, that at death, or at some comparatively short period after it, it will be the same to all men, thenceforward through eternity, whether they had kept or violated, every law human and divine. Such a theory, dissolves and subverts society;—it affords, in the certainty of impunity from adequate punishment, the utmost certainty of the violation of all law. It would finally result from it, that the greatest monster in every land must rule that land, in unrestrained crime; and at last the most malignant of all the passions, which ever that is, would swallow up the universe, and make one all pervading Hell! So stupid is this doctrine, that when right reason is applied to it, it is clear that if sinners universally believed it, the universe would perish. And so corrupt is it, that all communities have wisely, ranked it with blasphemy, and atheism; and while many have disfranchised those who held it; all have set some mark upon them, as the enemies of social order!

12. Universal observation justifies this estimate of those who reject the doctrine of eternal retributions, set on them by all civilized states. Who was ever reformed from sin to virtue by this doctrine? Who ever became more enlightened and tender in conscience through its agency? Who was ever made more rigid in his morals, more exact in all his personal and social duties, more punctual in his religious observances, through its teachings? No one. In every community the great bulk of the people,—who are people of prayer—who sanctify the sabbath—who revere the word of God—who repent of sin—and try to forsake it—believe this doctrine to be false and fatal. But on the other hand, although a few respectable and conscientious persons have perhaps occasionally embraced it; yet if a Deist or an Atheist advocate religion, *for himself*, this is it; if an Agarian, a Tammany Hall infidel, a Fanny Wright *mock*er,—or a reprobate backslider from any christian sect, be found in love with religion, it is this form of it! We assert that it is a system of rank infidelity, which is upheld in your Berean Society, and advocated through your columns. What need Atheists do more, than deny all future punishments, deny the existence of the devil, deny the reality of hell, deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, and ridicule all evangelical religion? Sir, it would be far more to the credit,

of yourself and your followers, to come out openly and avow your real sentiments about the religion of Jesus Christ; than to call yourselves his followers, and deny every distinctive feature of his religion, and labour to degrade his name and ruin his cause amongst men.

13. When we speak of Universalism, we mean to designate all who believe that a period will come, when there will be no more penal suffering in the universe. There are many subdivisions amongst them. But whether it be from the innate propensity of man to become worse and worse; or whether it is that the difficulties which attend all attempts to reason the damned out of tophet, are supposed to be greater than those which attach to a simple denial of all future punishment whatever; or whether, it is, that men become less and less sensible of the real nature and desert of sin, as they become more and more gross, in their scoffing at God; the result, it is evident,—is that the Universalists of this generation, are commonly of the very worst type. We are not acquainted with the sentiments of one single preacher amongst them, who professes to believe or teach, that there is any certainty of any punishment at all, to the wicked after death. But on the other hand, many of them preach, and the current of all their periodical publications which have fallen under our eyes, for several years past is; that instant and eternal happiness in heaven, is the portion of all men, the moment the soul and body are separated in death. This we believe to be the received opinion, sir, of your followers, correspondents, and coadjutors in this city. And we cannot sufficiently express our astonishment, that preachers of such a religion, and instructors of youth of such principles, should find encouragement in a community, whose very municipal laws stamp the religion and the principles with infamy. And they well deserve it. For if the wicked, who die in sin, go at once into a state of joy which is infinite and eternal; then suicide becomes a most imperative duty; the gallows is a blessedness and a triumph to be won at any cost; all the distinctions supposed to exist in human actions, become infinitely insignificant;—the absolute obedience to sensation, is the only true rule of conduct, as your friends of Tammany Hall have discovered and avowed; and death, no matter how attained, is the only real good!

14. We suppose it is impossible that Universalism, should be true, in any one of its numerous phases. For to omit for a moment all consideration of the reasons which prove it to be false, we are unable to perceive or imagine any sufficient reason, why it should be true. If men desire to be happy hereafter, conscience, reason and revelation unitedly, have made the way so plain, that the way-faring man though he were a fool, need not err therein. Now if Universalism be propounded as a system of religion to make men fit for heaven, we have no need of it. For upon the basis of the Christian religion, they who believe in a state of future existence, and prepare for it, by a life of faith and obedience to God—will surely be saved. But Universalism can do no more for them. It is therefore only for those who prefer sin to holiness, and vice to virtue. But those want no religion; they want liscence, to

live without religious restraint.—As a religious system then—there can be no place for it. But if men hate God so much, that they prefer any place, to his presence, and any condition before conformity to him; why should it be thought necessary, against their settled will, and strongest desires, and constant labour to the contrary to force them into a heaven which they abhor? If men are so in love with the pleasures of sin, that no motives can restrain them—are they not bad enough already, without teaching them in the name of virtue and religion, that they are fit for a holy heaven,—or at least far too innocent to be punished forever? Why should Universalism be true? If men wish to be saved, there is way enough without it. If men prefer damnation, is it not better to allow them to have it; rather than confound all sense, reason, principle religion, and moral agency,—and ruin every thing worth preserving in the whole universe, merely to save in sin, and against their wills, those who will not go to heaven itself, unless you allow them to take all their pollutions with them?

15. A future state of misery might be produced in several ways; as indeed the scriptures represent that, which will actually exist, to be composed of several elements. The outward effects of our acts both on ourselves and those around us are not only uncontrollable by us, but appear to be irremediable, in themselves; and that, no matter how much we may regret having committed them.—A man by one act may disgrace himself and destroy his best friend; though he repents of the act, and would gladly prevent all its consequences, if he could. The inward and spiritual effects, of our mental and moral acts, may have and most probably actually do have, just such laws influencing them. So that it follows as a necessary consequence, like cause and effect, that unrepented sins, so affect our mental and moral exercises, that there is and can be “no peace to the wicked:”—as long as the being itself exists. Now this alone, would constitute, eternal misery, to every man who is eternally impenitent. And no matter how much eternal pain in the nature of penal evil was endured,—(even if it should ever be removed, or fully endured, as your sect sometimes foolishly say—or after a while, pardoned by God, as they vainly hope) yet still, he who is still a sinner, must be still a sufferer—and that eternally, on the ground stated above. The only cure for this is, the regeneration and sanctification of the human soul. But nothing whatever leads us to expect such a change in the future world,—especially in Hell. Nor, is it conceivable, how justice or goodness, could require God, to take a man out of this condition at any future moment, in eternity, more than they did, the first moment he fell into sin and misery;—or than they required him, not to create man at all, or not to permit him to sin or to suffer. Therefore neither requires that regeneration should be produced in hell; as we know full well, beforehand, that it can occur only under a dispensation of grace and that exists only *here!* But in no case, occur where it will, can it so occur, as to do Universalism any good. For your Universalism derides such a change as unscriptural and absurd. And we venture to predict that if through God’s infinite grace, it should occur on one of your followers, he would follow you no more.

16. It is further manifest, that even if God in his unsearchable goodness, could entirely overlook all the sins of men and devils, consistently with the good of the universe, and his own nature;—which we have endeavoured to show he could not: still, many might be eternally excluded from, and utterly unfit for heaven on a different ground from the preceding. If a man be sentenced to death, and pardoned; or if the laws take no notice of his crimes and he escape unpunished; it is in both cases clear, that the same bad passions, malignant heart, sinful nature, or whatever else it be called, which prompted him to commit the crimes which we have spoken of, will still exist, to prompt him to commit more crimes. Unless indeed some adequate cause, has changed his heart: and whether impunity, and success in crime, is such an adequate cause, we leave it to the correspondents of the Pioneer to discuss and settle. Now suppose the amazing impiety, asserted by so many of your brethren were true, namely that God will call no man to account after death, for any deeds done in the body; nothing is done, that establishes the universal happiness of men and devils. For the basis of all their evil acts, abides in their evil natures; and as long as they have freedom and opportunity, to act, they will be sinners. But if they have not freedom and opportunity, they must cease to exist at all, as reasonable or accountable beings, and can be no longer either in heaven or hell. So that if sinners have any future existence, it must be in a state of sin, and therefore of misery—even if God should entirely overlook all the sins committed in the body.—We are aware that some “lewd fellows of the baser sort”—attempt to evade such reasoning, by teaching that sin exists only in the body, not in the spirit at all: that therefore, the spirit is pure, as soon, as the body is put off. But this besides flatly contradicting the bible, (which is hardly decorous in a religious teacher who professes to believe it)—is infinitely absurd.—Sin is the violation of the law of God, whether by omission or commission.—But God is an infinite spirit; and spirits, may therefore conform to his likeness, which is holiness, or lose his image, which is sin. And such cases may be provided for by established rules: as is our case precisely. To say a disembodied spirit can be pure hereafter, and therefore happy; is the same as saying it can be like God, who is perfect purity, and therefore the fountain of happiness. But to institute such a rule of judgment and reward, is to admit, that a spirit might be neither pure nor happy—because it wanted conformity to God.—Such nonsense as we are combatting drives men to be Stratonician Atheists, making God and the physical universe identical, and all things controlled by an indwelling physical necessity; or else forces them to reduce all spiritual intelligences to the control of an inexorable fate, which although it necessarily excludes the ideas of accountability and retribution, good or bad, as such, does not at all touch the question of eternal misery. But we will not push this speculation. For Universalists are too shallow to comprehend the suggestion of one of the deepest thinkers who ever lived; that in one view, Atheism itself is not preclusive of the idea of eternal suffering. In which, as in some other respects, it has the better of your christianity.

17. The most direct element of eternal suffering, is undoubtedly, punishment, judicially inflicted, by the command of God—for the past offences of devils and men. The usual objections to this are on one hand the goodness, mercy, or undefined feeling of reluctance on the part of God to witness suffering—which have been already sufficiently noticed; or on the other the injustice and unreasonableness of the thing itself, which we will notice directly. In the absence of clear proof, that none are or can be consistently allowed to suffer forever, it seems to us that if any ever go to hell, the great probability is they will remain there always. If they be put there as a place of discipline; we say that no suffering in itself is necessarily disciplinary. Else why do so many felons, return a second and third time to the penitentiary? Why do all our laws contemplate a second and third offence? But secondly we again demand, if only a limited punishment in hell be inflicted, what is to become of those, who having suffered out their time, and endured the full penalty pronounced against them, come out, as bad or worse than they began? Or if in the meantime they are made better, what did it? And what evidence is there of the change, and the mode of producing it? But if no change for the better occurs, the discipline if that be it, must continue; or the punishment, if it were it, should continue, if it were inflicted justly, as long as it is necessary or deserved. But if a change for the worse take place, (as is most likely, from what we observe in this world, of the force of bad habits, of evil associations, and of unsanctified sufferings, on blinded consciences, and ungovernable passions,)—then the certainty is inevitable that, in a wise and just administration, the pain of the wicked, whether you call it disciplinary or penal, must increase forever!—Alas for the hopes of Universalism!

18. The very ideas of a state of probation, of moral responsibility and free agency, of moral government, and a judge and rewarder of actions, all involve necessarily, an adequate proportion between the rewards and punishments of human conduct. All admit that crime and punishment ought to bear some just proportion. But why not well-doing, and rewards also? Now if there is any conceivable state of the case, on which one can merit eternal life; the reverse of that case involves a demerit, deserving eternal death. If personal merit secure one; personal demerit insures the other, exactly on the same ground of justice. If the life everlasting depend on the merits of another, as Christ, and our participation thereof on some union with him, as by faith, &c.; then, death eternal follows necessarily, if we do not so partake, by such union with him. Or if you call the gift of endless life, mere grace;—it would be childish to say, that the grace could not be justly withheld, so as to allow endless death to reign. If endless blessedness be attainable at all as the result of any action, human or divine; it is a self-existent correlative truth, that endless misery would follow, in default of that action.

19. The very notion of salvation itself, pre-supposes, a sentence of misery. The very notion of Universalism itself, pre-supposes condemnation to have existed and been removed. But when it did exist it was from God, and it was therefore righteous. But what

was it? Let the Universalist himself say, what it is that secures his salvation; and then we demand, what would have been and was his state without it? It was a state of condemnation from God; that is of misery; in itself indefinite—eternal; to be removed, we say by the plan of redemption revealed in the scriptures, but until removed an existing subjection, to the endless displeasure of God. So that this fearful truth seems to be interwoven into the nature, of every conceivable system even of grace itself, that has for its object the salvation of sinners. For if men had not been saved, they must have been eternal sufferers; and this by a divine constitution, for none else could effect it; and on account of sin, for in the nature of the case no suffering could exist, nor would any be just, otherwise. Surely then endless punishment could not be in itself unrighteous: and it may still exist.

20. If we look abroad in this world, every thing we see seems to lead irresistibly to the idea of a future retribution, and of the eternal separation of portions of mankind. The infant who only opens its eyes upon the pollutions of earth, and then redeemed by the blood and sanctified by the spirit of him who has said "of such is the kingdom of heaven," shrinks back again into the bosom of God; cannot surely dwell in the same condition, nor be happy in the same place or employments, with the aged, hardened, corrupted, undone sinner, who lives in the commission of every sin, and dies cursing God! These must be endlessly separated; or if not, produce the evidence, that they can or ought, ever to dwell together. The destiny of all mankind, cannot therefore be the same. But when we behold again, that in this world rewards and punishments, blessings and sufferings, are not distributed, always, alas! how seldom are they distributed, according to the moral desert of men; we are led at once to the firm belief, that in some future state all these things, will be set right. We see very bad men, often uniformly and highly prosperous, to the very end of a long and honoured life; their very wickedness, not known, or often not credited, till they are out of reach of human censure or redress! On the other hand we see, the good suffering every ill that can befall the virtuous; poverty, misery, persecution, disease, and countless miseries, through a life, cut off, in the midst of its half spent years. Is it capable of belief, that these things are not all to be redressed, by a perfectly righteous governor? If not, God must be indifferent to sin, and regardless of the sufferings of the just. But as we have shown above that the good and bad must dwell apart forever—and now it appears, that one will be compensated for unmerited sufferings and rewarded for unrequited goodness; while the other will be called to account for unmerited blessings, and be punished for all their misdeeds;—it follows inevitably, that in this eternal separation, the wicked must be miserable in endless punishment, just as certainly, as that the righteous will be forever happy in the approving smiles of God. To make this assurance doubly sure, we need only consider, that in moral results causation is just as uniform and inevitable as in natural. Gravitation does not act more uniformly and certainly, than all the great laws of morals; and amongst the chief, that which ordains sorrow and suffering to follow, every violation of the law of God, no

matter by what name we call that law. But what amazing results are cut short by death? All those results are perfected in eternity. The very laws of universal nature, tell us like the voice of God—that they operate to this grand and awful result!

21. How then shall we say, the eternal punishment of the wicked, is impossible, because it would be unjust!—Unjust! And in whose opinion? What principle of morals, or what sanction of it, has man left to himself, yet settled? Infanticide, paracide, murder, theft, adultery, deceit; every crime of every grade, has been justified by nations and generations of men. Were such, fit judges, of the *proper* punishment of these crimes? But we are all more or less, blinded by sin, ourselves—and constantly liable to err, in judging of sin too lightly. So again we are judging ourselves, when we judge sin; and are therefore sure, to incline to the side which favours sin. But before we pronounce that to be false which God explicitly declares in his word to be true, and which seems to derive confirmation from such a multitude of sources,—merely because it contradicts some imaginary standard which we have set up, to judge God's conduct by; let us at least find, one point of morals, on which the human race have been more thoroughly, and universally agreed, than that it is both true, just and certain, that the impenitent will be damned!

22. But why should it be thought unjust in God to refuse the enjoyment of his kingdom to those whose long-continued ingratitude has rendered them entirely unworthy of it?—Shall we say, their sins are temporary, and therefore cannot merit eternal punishment? But so is their obedience &c. temporary, and for the same reason, there could be no eternal heaven! But, if temporary sins, could not deserve eternal punishment; it would follow that no sins but eternal sins, could deserve eternal punishment; that is (besides the obvious fallacy apparent from the mere statement,) to establish, the absurd principle, that we should be punished no longer than for a period equal to that which it required to commit the sin! But what possible relation is there, or can there be, between the guilt of a particular sin, and the period of time it required to commit it? At any rate, if the sin be temporary, the majesty of God, which is offended, and his justice which will punish that offence, are both eternal; and so should the penalty be also —If it should be said we are finite beings and cannot commit an infinite offence, nor suffer an infinite punishment; we reply. In the first place, this is a mere play on words; for if our being be finite, though it endure forever, so would the punishment be, though it should endure forever. We do not say that the wicked will endure punishment, infinite in magnitude; but that it will be eternal in duration. And, secondly, we reply, that our offences are the greatest in degree we are capable of committing; for they are committed against a being whom we are under infinite obligations of gratitude and duty, to love and obey; and under circumstances of the greatest possible obligation and motive, to shun evil and to do well. Therefore the highest penalty we are capable of enduring, is most justly our due;—and that is, an eternal penalty!—To alledge that such a punishment is excessive and disproportionate to our crimes; is intolerable blasphemy; for it sets the

the majesty of God so low, that the destruction of one soul, is considered of more consequence than contempt of Jehovah of hosts?

Here we will rest these reflections. We have endeavoured with the utmost candour, to examine this subject, as one in which we, along with the whole human race, have the most profound interest. It is one on which, we have a right to be informed; one in regard to which we might expect the word of God to be very explicit, and the conclusions of reason and the dictates of conscience to be in a high degree clear. And now having gone over the subject in a plain, but somewhat particular manner, we solemnly declare in the presence of the heart searching God; that we are unable to conceive how he could have spoken or acted, so as to have made the facts more certain, than they appear to us to be, that he cannot look upon sin with the least allowance, and that he will cast the wicked into a never ending Hell. That we have given one tythe of the proof, which might be adduced, is not pretended; and will not be imagined by any one who has even looked into the Universalist controversy. That we have given the strongest proofs, or arranged what we have adduced in the best manner, we do not, by any means pretend.—But on a close examination of what we have written, and a survey of what we have yet had opportunity, from all quarters, to examine on both sides of this momentous subject; we are ready to say, that our convictions of the truth, justice, and certainty of the eternal punishment of those who hate and reject God, are not only made more clear, deep and vivid; but we have derived from the reflections and examinations into which we have been led, much stronger impressions than we ever had before, of the extreme absurdity and impiety of the pretences on which a contrary belief rests—and the unparalleled ignorance, blindness, and presumption manifested in the manner in which they are urged and relied upon!

It now only remains that we take such notice as may seem necessary, of what may be urged with any, the least show of reason, in the way of reply to what we have said. We have thought it best on all accounts, to carry forward the course of our argument, to its conclusion, without pausing to make replies by the way. But this course, fortified by the extreme shallowness of what has yet been produced against us; is rendered indispensable by the fact that from a variety of circumstances, we are obliged to write considerably in advance, of the press. Thus we now submit to you, our entire matter, up to the end of this (8th) No. although as yet, replies to only our four first, have been seen by us.

We suppose something should be said, to set right, some of the numerous perversions of scripture texts, in answer to our argument from the Bible: that is, in support of our five first letters.—Whether the same will be considered necessary, in regard to the three next now submitted to you and which contain a different kind of argument; can be decided more intelligently when we see, what may be alledged against them.

To the God of all the earth we now commit this demonstration, for such it seems to us in reality to be, drawn partly from the light of nature and reason but chiefly from his own blessed word. And

we pray, that however it may appear to others, the awful truth established by it, may suitably effect our own wicked hearts, and deeply influence, all our ways, alas! how prone to be astray, through all this feverish dream of life!

HYMNS

Written by Mrs. J. L. Gray.

I.

INVITATION.

- 1 SINNERS! we are sent to bid you,
To the gospel feast to-day;
Will you slight the invitation,
Will you, can you, yet delay?
Jesus calls you;
Come, *poor sinner, come away.*
- 2 Come! O come! all things are ready—
Bread to strengthen, wine to cheer;
If you spurn this blood-bought banquet,
Sinner, can thy soul appear
A guest in heaven,
Scorning heaven's rich bounty here?
- 3 Come! O come! leave father, mother,
To your Saviour's bosom fly;
Leave the worthless world behind you,
Seek for pardon or you die:
"Pardon Saviour,"
Hear the sinking sinner cry.
- 4 Even now the Holy Spirit,
Moves upon some melting heart;
Pleads a bleeding Saviour's merit—
Sinner will you say, "*depart!*"
Wretched sinner,
Can you bid your God depart?
- 5 What are all earth's dearest pleasures,
Were they more than tongue can tell?
What are all its boasted treasures,
To a soul once sunk in hell?
Treasure! Pleasure!
No such sounds are heard in hell.
- 6 Fly! O fly ye, to the mountain,
Linger not in all the plain!—
Leave this Sodom of corruption,
Turn not, look not back again;
Fly to Jesus,
Linger not in all the plain.

II.

AM I CALLED.

- 1 Am I called? And can it be!
Has my Saviour chosen me?
Guilty, wretched as I am,
Has he named my worthless name?
Vilest of the vile am I,
Dare I raise my hopes so high.
- 2 Am I called? I dare not stay,
May not, must not disobey;
Here I lay me at thy feet,
Clinging to the mercy seat;
Thine I am and thine alone,
Lord, with me, thy will be done.
- 3 Am I called? What shall I bring,
As an offering to my king?
Poor and blind, and naked I,
Trembling at thy footstool lie,
Naught but sin I call my own,—
Not for sin can sin atone.
- 4 Am I called? I am, I am,
Meanest follower of the Lamb;
Am I called? O joy of joys,
Earth, I spurn thy gilded toys;
Washed, redeemed by precious blood,
Heir of bliss, a child of God!
- 5 Jesus, master, will thou keep,
In thy fold thy wandering sheep?
Never, never, let me roam,
Never seek another home;
Keep me ever near thy side,
Thy example still my guide.
- 6 To thy bosom Lord I fly,
For thee I'll live, to thee I'll die;
Ever hold me in thy hand,
Guide me to that better land;
Where my soul shall find its rest,
Always pillowed on thy breast.