

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV.

OCTOBER 1838.

No. 10.

PETERSBURGH CONFLAGRATION, ONCE MORE.

WE had neither lot nor part, in originating the *Conflagration at Petersburg*, farther than as we were the occasion, which bad men used, for their own purposes: and it appears that we are to have but small hand in *extinguishing* the blaze, which Mr. Converse, Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Shore lighted up. Our own estimate of our conduct in the premises, is, that we have acted throughout, with a forbearance and moderation, which are entirely lost on those who have so wantonly assailed us. And now, we are ready to conclude, that they are resolved on agitating a matter so singularly disreputable to the country, that for its sake, we were ready to let it sleep,—until thereby, they shall have fixed the attention, and won the contempt, of the whole land.

Step by step, we become better and better informed; each new revelation confirming what we knew, that was important, before; and at the same time, letting us into new secrets.

We published some articles, in a press avowedly and peculiarly free, and containing sentiments openly condemned by us: but upon a subject intensely important to us all, whether as men, as Christians, or as citizens; and in terms, not only decorous, but unexceptionable. For this, Mr. Hutchinson, an old acquaintance, and a brother minister, causes his post-master, to write to us, a most insulting and calumnious official epistle; and then when after two months delay, we find him not disposed to explain himself in private, and call him publicly to account, he defends his outrageous conduct, and heaps all manner of abuse on us.

But his defence revealed one new and rather strange fact: namely, that he was the tool of the post-master, and not the post-master his. Thinking the latter, we had passed by the post-master, mere-

ly with a civil notice of the respectful expressions which interlarded his letter,—as it now appears in utter duplicity.

This post-master, then became the leading figure in the show. We saw he had trepanned General Pegram, into a correspondence, and then published it. We saw he had by solicitation, obtained the publication of this correspondence, in one or more political newspapers, and in a Baptist one at Richmond; all of which had really nothing to do with the secret springs in the *conflagration*. We ascertained that he had got up the burning, of one copy, or perhaps several, of our Magazine, publicly, and by authority, in Petersburg: and that a man or two,—a boy or two, and a negro or two,—glorious assembly! had celebrated in this distinguished and dignified manner, the wrath of the commonwealth of Virginia, upon a penny tract, which amongst many innocent, had one naughty article!—Illustrious fete! Renowned city! Glorious post-master! Mighty men, boys and negroes!!

But thought we, this hero of fire, men, boys, and negroes,—this inquisitor and expurgator of tracts, this Mr. Shore, who is he? We asked divers. Said one, Is he not the man who subscribed a shot gun to some benevolent cause? A what? A shot gun with two barrels;—bona fide,—and some dogs also!!

Said another, he will cane you on sight; he says so; and is furious enough to attempt it. What, said another, he cane a preacher, after being *so* caned himself by John Allison?—And added a third, he a deacon in a Presbyterian church, and cane his own sort?

Gently here. We vouch nothing as regards gun, dog, or caning: let all that be as it may. But the deaconship in the Presbyterian church, shed a ray of light, on a new part of the subject; and by following it, we came full but against the gentle, wise, tolerant and meek, Rev. Mr. Converse, at Richmond.

As Mr. deacon post-master Shore, made Mr. Hutchinson his tool: so, Mr. Converse had before, made Mr. Shore his.—Mr. Shore applied to Mr. Hutchinson to be allowed to write us the first letter; this Mr. Hutchinson asserts in substance in his published defence. He applied to General Pegram for his opinion. He applied to the Recorder of Petersburg to get up the bonfire. And all this is capable of the clearest proof, in spite of all the guns, dogs, caneings, burning men, boys and negroes, in the noble borough of Petersburg; backed by every post-master and deacon in the place.

Now one step farther back, lands us in Mr. Converse's study. And after our reverence, this may assure him, that he is spending his breath for nought in denying a word of what we have said about his part in this affair.—It is very natural that he should know better than we can, what he wrote, and who he wrote it to. But we are informed, by those whom we believe, in preference to believing him; first, because they are better men; secondly, because they have less interest than he, to tell what they know is untrue in the premises; and thirdly, because all the collateral circumstances confirm their statements to us, and contradict his to the public; we are thus informed of every thing we have said implicating him. And we fully believe, when he is arraigned by his Presbytery, for slan-

der and falsehood, which they cannot in fidelity to God or man omit, if he remains in it,—that not only more than we have asserted can be proved in this case, but that in many other cases, such a body of facts can be made out against him, as never was before, in this country, against any one professing Godliness; and which, in the judgment of all men, will render his deposition from the ministry a most clear and sacred duty.

There seems to be a volunteer lately entered into the case, in the shape of a *loco foco*, political paper at Petersburg, called the *American Constellation*, and edited by one H. Haines. Some one has sent us a single copy of that paper dated July 27, in which two long columns and a half, are taken up with the *conflagration*; and the article which appears to be editorial, breaks off in the midst, promising the remainder afterwards. This remainder has never reached us. Of the part published it is enough to say, that Mr. Converse praises it. Mr. Haines ought to consider, that as the most unmannerly persons are by common consent expected to behave themselves, when they intrude amongst their betters; so he, if he considers it his duty to meddle in ecclesiastical affairs, ought to leave behind, the stench and the swagger of the stews.—We have no vocation to contend with the like of him.

We have said the remainder of the article in the *Constellation* never reached us; whether withheld by design or accident, the author knows best. But this is an old and very common trick. Mr. Converse, has practised it constantly towards us. From the origin of this Magazine, until recently it has exchanged with his paper: but always, we believe without exception, he has failed to send us, those numbers containing any thing which required or was likely to receive a notice from us. For example, he publishes in his paper of July 12, a very violent attack upon us, accompanied by notes from Mr. Shore and Yale and Wyatt, of Richmond. *This paper is not sent us: why Mr. Converse?* Then in his paper of August 2, he boldly refers us to his former demands for proof—as if he had not done all he could to keep us from knowing he needed any!! The fact is, we never saw either of those papers, till about the middle of August, and then only through the kindness of a friend: nor did we know of the existence of the publications by Converse, Shore and Yale and Wyatt, until above a month after they were made.

Upon a second perusal, of all these articles, we can only repeat over and over, our entire confidence, in the information on which we have acted; and in the inferences, we have felt obliged to draw from the whole progress of the affair. Mr. Converse may swear he never wrote the controverted letter to Mr. Shore; we can only say in reply, Sir, the letter has been seen by persons well acquainted with your hand-writing!! Mr. Shore may swear in response he never received such a letter; we can only reply, *Sir, you yourself showed that letter*, to those, through whom we get our information; you have endeavoured lately to get at least one of those, to whom you showed it to deny having seen it; *and we have been written to, in order to exonerate at least one person who saw it.* Yes Sir, since you wrote your public denial, you have admitted, as we can prove, to a

particular individual that Converse had written to you, of the senior editor of this Magazine, "*He is dangerous, and his influence must be destroyed.*" Mr. Converse and Mr. Shore, must both be aware, that the public have the right and will exercise it, to set their positive declarations, which are as irreconcilable as they are positive, down for what they are worth.—If any confidence can be reposed in human testimony, then the present denial of Mr. Converse that he wrote the letter in question, is utterly incapable of belief; and the present denial of Mr. Shore that he received it, is simply answered by the fact, that he showed the letter, which he declares he never received!!

We have pleasure in seeing that Yale and Wyatt have again broken silence. As they consider one part of our information worthy of contradiction, why not reply to the other part? Is it not as important for Mr. Yale to explain when and how, he ceased being an abolitionist—as to explain when and how, he did not act as the colleague of Mr. Converse?—There are two, and only two modes of explaining his readiness to speak in one case, and to be silent in the other; 1. it may be that one case can be explained, and the other cannot; 2. it may be, that it is more disreputable in Mr. Yale's opinion to be identified with Converse, than with the abolitionists. We are not sure, which is the more probable solution of the conduct of Mr. Yale.

Not the least amusing part of the defence of Mr. Converse, is his bold challenge to us, to use his columns, as the medium of communication with the public, in proving our case against him. Bah! Mr. Converse; we are rather credulous—but it is too soon, to play this device on us, after the same was so fully and so cunningly practiced not a year ago, in the matter of the Synod of Philadelphia.

We desire the public to understand distinctly the true condition of this matter. Personally we never saw Mr. Shore, or Mr. Yale; and consider Mr. Converse, as having no sort of consequence, except such as results from his accidental connexion with a newspaper. But there are two most important matters connected with and illustrated by, their personal, malignant and intense hatred of us. The first and most direct is, the Pelagian controversy in the Presbyterian Church: the second and collateral one, the agitating question of the black race.

Now we solemnly believe that the hatred of Mr. Converse to us, and our Magazine, arises from its and our constant and decisive support of evangelical doctrine, order and practice, and opposition to Pelagianism, in all its forms and projects: and that this can be made clear as light.

Moreover, the violent outcry of Converse, Hutchinson, Shore, Yale, and their compeers, north and south, against us, upon the subject of abolitionism, when every man of them, great and small, knew perfectly well that we were hostile to every distinctive feature of abolitionism—was a mere pretext; and had no other design than to play upon the ignorance, credulity and passions of the public, for the advancement of secret, personal and party ends.

Then the interest the public has in the case, is vital; so far as the

Pelagian and Pro-slavery Pelagian party, are worthy of public notice or regard.

Will the Presbyterian Churches in the slave holding states, allow the Pelagians scattered through them, with the few middle men, who can be seduced through vanity and gain, to unite with them?—will they allow this party to turn them aside from their duty to God, to the church, and to the truth, in this time of rebuke and blasphemy, by a false, pretended and hypocritical outcry about danger to them, from an abolition coalition? We humbly pray God, to keep them from this folly and snare!—

Will the calm, sober and enlightened men of the slave states, allow the rank and pestiferous humours, which are bred and extended chiefly by northern men come down amongst them, to run the country mad on the subject of slavery? Are such fellows as these, to drive the republic to disunion, the churches to schism, the country to bloodshed? And then when they have ruined us, run back to their native hive, and revile and mock us?—May the Lord keep us from this shame and sin.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH ABROAD.

No. VII.

The case of Maynooth College. State of Education amongst the Irish Priests.

AT the end of more than forty years' experience it may fairly be inquired, of what benefit has the establishment of Maynooth College been to Ireland; and are the public funds advantageously expended in its support? In order to obtain satisfactory answers to these questions, it will be necessary briefly to review the circumstances which led to the founding of that seminary,—to examine the system of education pursued in it,—and to trace its effects in the character of the Roman Catholic Priests who have been disciplined within its walls. The information on these subjects which shall be laid before the reader in the following pages, is drawn from the most authentic sources. The opinion of no individual shall be quoted, who is not allowedly competent to enlighten us on the point for which his testimony shall be adduced, and who is not entitled to be listened to with attention and have full credence given to his statements.

Previous to the year 1793, it was contrary to law to erect or endow any Popish university or college in Great Britain. In consequence of this restriction, the Roman Catholic clergy were obliged to seek for education in other countries; and to assist them in obtaining it, considerable funds were supplied in France, Spain, Italy, and Belgium. Foundations for their support, called *burses*, were established in several of the continental colleges; in some cases by the liberality of the respective governments, in others by private munificence. The following return was made to Parliament in

1308, of the "state of the establishments on the continent for the education of Irish Catholic secular clergymen, previous to the French revolution."

In Paris, College des Lombards,	4	masters	100	scholars.
Community Rue Cheval vert,	3	"	80	"
Nantz, - - -	3	"	80	"
Bourdeaux, - - -	3	"	40	"
Doway,, - - -	2	"	30	"
Toulouse, - - -	1	"	10	"
Lisle, - - -	1	"	8	"
			<hr/>	
Total in France, - -	17	"	348	"
In Louvain, - - -	2	"	40	"
Antwerp, - - -	2	"	30	"
Salamanca, - - -	2	"	32	"
Rome, - - -	2	"	16	"
Lisbon, - - -	2	"	12	"
			<hr/>	
Total on the continent,	27	"	478	"

"The scholars generally went to the public schools or universities, otherwise the number of masters would have been at least double. The whole number of scholars in the colleges of the Lombards, Nantz, Doway, Antwerp, and twenty in Bourdeaux, received priest's orders before they went abroad, and by the exercise of their functions were enabled to support themselves during the course of their studies. In the community of Paris, there were foundations for about sixty scholars made by various persons; in Toulouse twelve; in Bourdeaux twenty were defrayed by pensions from the King of France; in Salamanca thirty-two by the King of Spain; in Rome sixteen; in Lisbon twelve; in Louvain twenty, by foundations of different persons. Of the whole number there were supported, by foundations, 166; and by the exercise of their functions as priests, 260."

Thus it appears that by far the greater number of Irish students who frequented these foreign colleges, having previously acquired a knowledge of the Latin classics and other rudiments of learning, in some of the inferior schools in their own country, were ordained before they left their native shores, and by means of chaplancies, and performing some clerical duties, earned sufficient to maintain themselves until they completed their theological studies. As they were almost all descended from persons in the humblest circumstances, who could not afford the requisite means for so long and expensive a journey as they were thus compelled to take; it was usual for the Roman Catholic gentry to assist the son of a deserving tenant, not only by presenting him to a burse when in their gift, but by equipping him for his travels, and by smoothing his way, and advancing his interests through their acquaintance with persons of high station, and of their own creed, on the continent. The gratitude with which such kindness was repaid, formed a strong link of attachment between the Roman Catholic aristocracy and the clergy in those days. In some cases, where the young wanderer setting out for the continent was a general favourite in his

own neighbourhood, a collection was made in the parish chapel, or in the chapels of several contiguous parishes.

Such was the mode of obtaining clerical education, up to the period of the French Revolution. In the convulsions attendant on that event, the property belonging to most of these colleges was destroyed or alienated. And the subsequent wars rendered the continent very difficult of access to the students from Ireland. Hence it became an object of pressing importance to the Roman Catholics, to provide a home education for their clergy. It is curious to observe, how parties of the most opposite sentiments in politics concurred in endeavouring to carry this design into execution. The Roman Catholic aristocracy and prelates, dreading the importation into Ireland of those principles, which had overturned all rank, property, order, and religion in France, wished to remove those who were to be the future pastors of their countrymen, from the danger of imbibing the atheistical and republican opinions which tainted French society. The English government was influenced by the same motives, and also by a desire to withdraw the Roman Catholic clergy from those foreign connexions, which were dangerous to the state, and which had been the means of keeping up an interest in the exiled Royal Family; while the leaders of the popular party, the democrats, had their own deep reasons for wishing that the priests should be educated at home. For many years the Popish aristocracy and clergy had held back from taking any active share in politics; they were advocates for peace and submission to the existing laws; but a third class had risen up between them and the people, and became possessed of considerable and increasing influence; these were the successful merchants and shop-keepers. Persons, who having known by experience the pleasure of emerging from obscurity into importance, were anxious to push on to the acquisition of still greater power than the British constitution at that time permitted them to enjoy. By these men the cause of emancipation was eagerly urged forward; by them the society of United Irishmen was organized; and many of them ultimately became leaders in the rebellion of 1798. The clergy had hitherto been attached to the party of the aristocracy, a party that discountenanced and stood aloof from these new aspirants to political leadership. It was in order to break off this union between the aristocracy and the clergy, that the democratic party were anxious to have the latter educated at home in the midst of their old associates; and thereby prevent the wearing away of national prejudices, antipathies, and recollections, in the expansive range that was formerly taken through other countries, and a long sojourn far away from the bitterness of Irish politics. "*This country will never be well,*" observes Theobald Wolfe Tone, in his private journal, August 15th, 1792, "*until the Catholics are educated at home, and their clergy elective.* Now a good time, because France will not receive their students, and the Catholics are afraid of the revolution." Hence it formed one of the designs of the United Irishmen, to found a national college. In Tone's journal, under date of October 16th, 1792, it is mentioned:—

"Dr. Bellew, Catholic Bishop of Killala, wants subscriptions to

found a Catholic seminary in Connaught. Mr. Hutton [the feigned name by which Tone designated himself in his journal] suggests that it would be advisable to extend the plan, and educate all the Catholic clergy at home; an object which has long been a favourite with that gentleman. Agreed that T. Braughall and Mr. Hutton [Tone] shall wait on Kirwan the philosopher, to talk over this plan. If a good system were devised, it would execute itself; that of the Catholic Bishops a poor one, on a pitiful scale. Gog [i. e. John Keogh] and Mr. Hutton [Tone] have been talking over something of this kind already, in their last expedition to the north; as may be seen in the journal of it. Gog [Keogh] then afraid that the clergy would be adverse; Mr. Hutton [Tone] of opinion that the breaking up of the seminaries in France would oblige them to consent, and that in that light, as in ten thousand others, the Revolution was of infinite service to Ireland. *This education business appears to me of infinite importance, for a thousand reasons, which I shall detail hereafter.* Hope we may get Kirwan to make a sketch of the proposed plan. October 18th.—Hear that D. D. Troy and Reilly, the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin and Catholic Primate, refuse to concur in a general system. October 24th.—Gog [Keogh] has been disgusted with Dr. Bellew, Catholic Bishop of Killybegs, on the subject of a national college. The bishop wants to get money from the laity to endow it, and to exclude them from all share in the management.”—Vol. i. pp. 196—198. of Life of T. W. Tone.

Although it appears from these extracts that the Roman Catholic prelates were averse to the plan proposed by the United Irishmen, they at a subsequent period acquiesced in it, or rather, *feigned* acquiescence. The relief bill which was passed in the spring of 1793, besides conferring the elective franchise on Roman Catholics, and other political privileges, permitted them to endow a college and schools. In consequence of this, the General Committee or Convention of the Roman Catholics, when dissolving, at their last meeting, on the 25th of April, 1793, appointed a committee, consisting of the following gentlemen; Hugh Hamill, Thomas Broughall, John Sweetman, John Keogh, Edward Byrne, R. M'Cormick, and D. T. O'Brien, Esqrs. “to consult, communicate, and correspond upon the best and most effectual means of procuring an improved system of education for the Catholic youth of the kingdom of Ireland, and of forming, when practicable, such establishment as may be most conducive thereto.” Plowden, Vol. ii. p. 393.

The only notice which we have been able to find of the proceedings of this committee, is contained in the following extract from “Part of an Essay towards a History of Ireland, by T. A. Emmet.” To understand his remarks, it is necessary to observe that a conspiracy had been organized, and was spreading very extensively among the middling and lower classes of the Roman Catholics, who assumed the name of Defenders. In order to suppress their outrages and illegal meetings, the government resorted to vigorous measures. The Roman Catholic Bishops, on the 17th December, 1794, presented an address to the King and to the Lord Lieutenant, expressive of their unshaken loyalty, and grateful affection to

his majesty's person, approving of the suppression of defenderism, and deploring that the majority concerned in that unhappy system of infatuation were of their religion.

"The indignation and astonishment," (says Mr. Emmet,) "which this address excited among the Catholic laity, can be easily conceived. It seemed called for by no particular occasion. It was clandestinely conducted, and even remained a profound secret until after it had been some days delivered. It was a violation of solemn declarations which those very prelates had made from time to time, amounting to the fullest assurances that they would never take a step of a political nature, but in conjunction with the laity. It was also generally considered as an unprincipled coalition with those who exhausted every effort in resisting the claims of the Catholics, and whose intolerance compelled that body to look upon them in no other light than that of enemies. But it was not without an object. The persons to whom the general committee entrusted the formation of a plan for the education of the youth of their religion, had made considerable progress. After several meetings in the early part of the summer, they had agreed to these general principles: that the plan, while it embraced the Catholic youth, should not exclude those of any other persuasion; that it should depend on the people for its support, and be subject to the joint control of the clergy and laity. They had, by correspondence with different parts of the kingdom, assured themselves that there would be no deficiency of ample resources for carrying it into effect. They had also submitted their general principles to the prelates themselves, the majority of whom expressed the most decided approbation. They had even held meetings with those reverend persons upon the best mode of bringing those principles into action. At one of those meetings, Dr. Reilly the Catholic Primate, Dr. Troy the Archbishop of Dublin, and four others who were present, made very considerable offers of pecuniary aid, more than might have been expected from their limited incomes. Dr. Reilly likewise proposed the sketch of a plan nearly as follows: that there should be a grammar school in each diocese, where the lower branches of education should be elementarily taught; that there should be four provincial academies, where such youths as were designed for the church, for other professions, or literary pursuits, should be received from the diocesan schools and instructed in the languages and sciences; lastly, that there should be one grand seminary, in which those who had passed through any of the provincial schools, should be entered for the purpose of standing public examinations; such as were destined for the church, to receive the necessary testimonials for their ordination, and such as were otherwise disposed, to qualify themselves for degrees in whatever college they should think fit, which might be authorized by law to confer those dignities.

"This outline, with some other materials, had been referred to Dr. Ryan, Dr. M'Nevin, and Mr. Lyons, three gentlemen extremely well qualified for digesting a more detailed plan, and they were actually occupied on the subject.

"They hoped by its accomplishment to deserve, and probably

to acquire to themselves and their fellow-labourers, the gratitude of their countrymen and of posterity, for a wise and comprehensive system of education, which should not only benefit the Catholic body, but also embrace the general civilization of Ireland; which, independent of its direct advantages, might, by the force of emulation, awake the established institutions from their present torpor, and perhaps even excite the silent sister of the English universities into something like literary exertion. But while they were indulging their enthusiastic expectations, there is strong reason to believe that the Catholic hierarchy had privately stated these proceedings to the administration, and given it the option either to permit the members of that religion to establish a popular system of education, which might not be conducted exactly to the satisfaction of the court, or to assist the prelates with its influence and resources to establish another, over which they having entire control, could so manage as to make it subservient to every purpose which government might wish to derive from such an institution. On these latter terms a bargain appears to have been concluded, in which the address to his excellency was to be part of the price for court protection. Certain it is, that after that address was presented, all co-operation and confidence between the prelates and the laity was destroyed, and the gentlemen who were preparing a popular plan, were assured they might desist from their labours, as an arrangement had been made for Catholic education, which should be solely conducted by the bishops, under the auspices of government and the sanction of parliament."—pp. 61—63. of *M'Nevin's Pieces of Irish History*.

On the 14th of January, 1794, the following memorial was presented to the Lord Lieutenant. We find it in Plowden's *Histor. Review*, vol. ii. p. 446.

"To His Excellency, JOHN EARL OF WESTMORELAND, Lord Lieutenant General, and General Governor of Ireland. The humble Memorial of the Prelates of the Roman Catholic Communion in Ireland.

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

"Your memorialists beg leave, with the greatest deference, to represent to your Excellency—

"That a great number of his Majesty's subjects in this kingdom are attached to the Roman Catholic religion, insomuch that they have submitted to legal penalties rather than abandon it.

"That the duties of morality have been taught, and religious rites administered, in the manner most acceptable to this portion of his majesty's subjects, by a body of clergymen educated according to the discipline of the Roman Catholic church. The conduct of these clergymen has never suffered the reproach of disaffection or irregularity; on the contrary, they have been complimented, on many occasions, for assiduously instructing their respective flocks in the sacred precepts of charity, and for inculcating obedience to the laws, and veneration for his majesty's royal person and government. Memorialists humbly apprehend, that the labours of a body

of men thus occupied are useful to the state, and that considerable detriment would ensue to the cause of religion, and to that of good order, which is connected with it, if the public were to be deprived of their services.

“Under the laws which formerly existed, your excellency’s memorialists were obliged to resort to foreign countries for education, particularly to the kingdom of France, where they had procured many valuable establishments. Four hundred persons were constantly maintained and educated therein, for the ministry of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland. In the anarchy which at present afflicts that kingdom, these establishments have been necessarily destroyed; and even although lawful authority should be restored, memorialists conceive the loss to be irreparable; for the revenues would not easily be recovered; and as the profligate principles of rebellion and atheism, propagated by the faction which now rules that kingdom, may not be speedily effaced, they would expose their youth to the contagion of sedition and infidelity, and their country to the danger of thus introducing the pernicious maxims of a licentious philosophy. Memorialists therefore are apprehensive, that it may be found difficult to supply the ministry of the Roman Catholic church in Ireland with proper clergymen, unless seminaries, schools, or academies be instituted for educating the youth destined to receive holy orders according to the discipline of their own church, and under ecclesiastical superiors of their own communion; and they beg leave further to represent, with all due respect to your Excellency’s wisdom, that said institution would prove of advantage to the nation at large, and be a matter of great indulgence to his Majesty’s subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland.

“Whilst sentiments unfavourable to the members of their communion prevailed, your Excellency’s memorialists were discouraged from seeking the means of education in their native country; but conceiving that the demeanor of the Roman Catholics has removed such ill opinion, they humbly hope, that the moral instruction of a people who have been legally authorized to acquire landed property in this kingdom, and upon whom many other valuable privileges have been conferred under your Excellency’s administration and auspices, may appear to his majesty’s ministers a subject not unworthy of his royal consideration and bounty. Your Excellency’s memorialists are confirmed in this hope, by the opinion often and publicly expressed by respectable individuals of their Protestant fellow-subjects, that it would conduce to the public good to educate the Irish ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic religion within his Majesty’s dominions.

“Your Excellency’s memorialists also beg leave humbly to present, that although the mode of education practised in the University of Dublin, may be well adapted to form men for the various departments of public business, yet it is not alike applicable to the ecclesiastics of a very ritual religion, and by no means calculated to impress upon the mind those habits of austere discipline, so indispensable in the character of a Roman Catholic clergyman, that without them he might become a very dangerous member of society.

"That a distinct place of education is also necessary, because the regulations of the Roman Catholic church enjoin, that candidates for holy orders shall be proficient, in certain branches of learning, which are not included in the exercises of the University of Dublin. That even where the Roman Catholic is the established religion, candidates for holy orders are obliged to receive the most important part of their education in seminaries distinct from the public universities. That many persons who destine themselves to the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland, are not sufficiently opulent to bear the expense of education in the University of Dublin, and of constant residence in the metropolis; it is therefore the more necessary to provide literary instruction for them on more easy conditions: and although the liberality of the present heads of the University might induce them to receive persons on the foundation, yet neither could a sufficient number be thus accommodated, nor would it prove grateful to the feelings of the parties; and many other inconveniences might arise, if young men should observe great temporal advantages conferred upon their fellow-students, whilst they were restricted to the humble walk of a subordinate ministry.

"From these considerations, and conceiving that piety, learning, and subordination would be thereby essentially promoted, your Excellency's memorialists are induced to undertake the establishment of proper places for the education of the clerical youth of their communion. Being advised by counsel, that his majesty's royal license is necessary, in order legally to secure the funds which they may appropriate for that purpose, they humbly beg leave to solicit your Excellency's recommendation to our most gracious sovereign, that he will be pleased to grant his royal license for the endowment of academies or seminaries, for educating and preparing young persons to discharge the duties of Roman Catholic clergymen in this kingdom, under ecclesiastical superiors of their own communion.

"JOHN THOMAS TROY,

"R. C. Archbishop of Dublin,

"For myself, and on behalf of the Prelates of the R. C. communion in Ireland.

"January 14, 1794."

In the sentiments put forward in this memorial, the prelates seem to have been guided by the advice which Edmund Burke had given in his letter to Lord Kenmare, in the year 1782, on the subject of educating the Roman Catholic priesthood.—See his Works, vol. vi. pp. 280—288.

The government not only complied with the request of the bishops, that leave might be given to *them* to found a college to consist exclusively of ecclesiastics, but made arrangements for aiding them with money to carry their plan into execution. Lord Fitzwilliam, in his speech to the Irish parliament, on opening the session of 1795, recommended the subject to the attention of both houses. And the Rev. Thomas Hussey, (a very clever Roman Catholic clergyman, who had been employed by the British Minister, in 1780, in some secret diplomatic negotiations with the court of Spain, and

returned from that country to London as chaplain to the Marquis Del Campo, the Spanish ambassador, and was greatly in the confidence of the leading Roman Catholics of England,) was brought to Ireland under the protection of government, for the express purpose of preparing and superintending the plan of education. Lord Camden, on succeeding to Lord Fitzwilliam, found that the government was pledged to carry this measure into effect. Accordingly, on the 23d of April, leave was given to bring in a Bill for *applying the sum of £10,000 granted to his Majesty, or part thereof, for establishing a college for the better education of persons professing the Popish or Roman Catholic religion, and intended for the clerical ministry thereof.*

Accordingly a Bill was introduced on the next day; and Dr. Hussey was ordered to attend the committee of the house when it should come under consideration. It is curious that the words of the leave given for the introduction of the bill, here printed in italics, were omitted in the title of the act, nor was there any clause in the body of it, limiting the college to the admission of those only who were candidates for the priesthood. This discrepancy was not noticed until after the bill was read a second time. It was then withdrawn; and fresh leave given in an amended form, omitting the words alluded to; and the Bill was reintroduced on the 1st of May. By this act, the 35 Geo. 3. c. 21. twenty-one trustees (namely, the chancellor, and three chief judges, six Roman Catholic laymen, ten of their bishops, and Dr. Hussey) were appointed for the purpose of "establishing, endowing, and maintaining one academy for the education only of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion." It authorized these trustees "to receive subscriptions and donations," to enable them to carry this object into effect; and to purchase and acquire lands not exceeding the value of £1000 per annum. It vested in their hands the appointment of the president, masters, professors, fellows, and scholars on the foundation; and the allotment of their salaries. It gave them power to make by-laws for the regulation of the college, subject (except where they affected the exercise or discipline of the Roman Catholic religion) to the approval of the Lord Lieutenant. It committed to them visitatorial power over the institution and all its members; and it authorized them to fill up vacancies in their own body. No Protestant, or son of a Protestant, was to be received into the college, under certain penalties; and £8000 were to be granted towards establishing it.

Against this bill a petition from the liberal party among the Roman Catholics was presented by Mr. Grattan. Their objections were, that in the proposed plan of the college, trustees different from the principal and professors, were empowered to regulate the course of education, and to appoint professors and scholars on the foundation without any kind of examination into their merits or qualifications; and also that the plan, so far as it operated, obstructed the educating together of Roman Catholics and Protestants. The petitioners, therefore, strongly reprobated it as tending to perpetuate a line of separation, which the interest of the country required to be obliterated, and as preventing early habits from produ

cing a liberal and friendly intercourse through life. This petition, however, produced no effect. The act was passed without alteration, almost without discussion or debate, and received the royal assent on the 5th of June, 1795.

The liberal Roman Catholics were not the only persons who objected against the plan of this college. Archbishop Magee, in his evidence before the House of Lords, May 13th, 1825, thus expressed himself with reference to Maynooth:—

“At the time when that college was founded, I felt the danger of an exclusive establishment for Roman Catholic students so strongly, that I then expressed my objections to it openly, and interested myself as far as I properly could against it; having urged to the representatives of the University of Dublin, of which I was then a member, the propriety of opposing the bill for founding that college, in its passage through Parliament. The disadvantages of the contracted and monastic plan, which a separate college for Roman Catholic priests would require, were strongly contrasted, in my mind, with the advantages which would redound both to the character of the Roman Catholic clergy itself, and to society at large, from the mixture of the two denominations, Protestant and Roman Catholic, in the same university. At that time, Roman Catholic students abounded in Trinity College, and there was nothing of the hostility between the two religious descriptions that has since unhappily so much prevailed in Ireland. It seemed then most desirable to bring the two classes together within the same seminary; and for this great facility was afforded, there being nothing in the regulations of our university that would throw impediments in the way; nothing whatever to excite apprehensions as to proselytism, and no academic rules interfering with the religion of those who did not belong to the Established Church. The custom had uniformly been, and still continues, to exempt both the Roman Catholics and the Dissenters, who entered themselves as such upon the dean’s list, from attendance upon chapels, and all other duties connected with religion; requiring only the discharge of those duties which ministered to education, and to the attainment of the Bachelor’s degree, which Roman Catholics were enabled to take by a special act of Parliament. It appeared to me and others at that day, that, under these circumstances, an arrangement might be formed, whereby the Roman Catholic student might have every benefit of a liberal university education, and at the same time be provided, through some distinct scheme of religious institution of their own formation, with the instruction peculiarly requisite for their future profession, the heads of the university being at all times ready to offer facilities for such a plan on their part. With these views I was induced, at that day, to object, in my capacity of an academic, to the establishment of the college of Maynooth.”

The trustees, in the exercise of the power thus vested in them, chose Maynooth as the site for the college, a small town situated about eleven miles from Dublin, and adjoining the residence of the Duke of Leinster. A house was purchased for £4012 10s. and fifty-four acres of land were granted by the late Duke, on a lease of lives renewable for ever, at the annual rent of £74.

Twenty acres of land, immediately contiguous, were afterwards obtained on a lease for ever from Mr Stoyte, at an annual rent of £140, and have been added to the property of the college.

[To be Continued.]

ARCHBISHOP ECCLESTON'S PREACHING.

THE Roman ministers of religion, are not set apart to *preach*, but to *sacrifice*: their system intending to save men by ordinances, and not through the truth, taught of God, and received in the enlightened love of it. This is a characteristic, and all-pervading distinction, between the religion of God, and that of the pope; and between the ministers of one and the other. The ministers of God teach the people; this is their mission, their work, their vocation:—"teach all nations" is our great and divine warrant. The ministers of the pope, *sacrifice* for the people; this is their faculty, their ordained office; "receive power to sacrifice, for the living and the dead" is their word of induction.

It is most natural therefore, that we never offer any sacrifices; above all, we never pretend to repeat the crucifixion and to sacrifice again the Lord of life. It is equally natural, that they should teach men nothing; and least of all that they should make public instruction in vital godliness, the end of their ministrations.

In countries truly papal, there is no regular preaching of the priests. During most of the year, none of the priests,—not one, preaches at all: and during their period of riot and excess, called lent, when they fast on the luxuries of the earth, a very few, specially set off for this service, deliver discourses, to the public, about every thing but grace and truth. In all countries the bulk of the papal priesthood, are utterly incapable of preaching; thousands of them never attempted it, in their lives; and very few of those who do, are equal to the poorest preachers in the poorest Protestant sects. In general, the higher the dignitary, the poorer the preacher, and the less he pretends to speak in public.

A very strong confirmation of these remarks is to be found in the condition of the papal clergy in the United States. There is not one tolerable public speaker amongst them: and of a dozen or fifteen bishops, hardly above three ever attempt to preach. Of these, Bishop Purcell and Bishop England, alone make any serious pretensions. The former we apprehend, will be apt to consider the laurels won, in controversy with Mr. Campbell, enough for one "servant of the servants of God:" unless indeed, he condescends to appear before the vulgar crowd once more, to give them a new version of Lagori, or a further exposition of his sentiments on the subject of public schools.—Poor Bishop England, ought to keep in practice somewhat more regularly—or he will forget how to speak English, and spoil his attitudes by disuse. The last time we heard him,—he could hardly lap his arms over his chest, in his favourite mimicry of the posture of Napoleon, (though he had this excuse for awkwardness and obesity, that lent was just over) and, his enun-

ciation was so thick, and so milesian that we had difficulty in following him.

We are happy to be informed that Mr. Eccleston, who honours our good city with his habitual abode, has some thoughts of turning out orator. The following letter, will be joyfully read by the archbishop's Protestant friends; for we have generally heard him commended for much better skill in a dinner than a sermon, and far more elegant taste in fasting, than in discoursing the people.

As to the sample of a sermon, from him, furnished us below, there is nothing to be said. The doctrine is stereotype papal: you will hear it from all the draymen of their party about town. We must make allowance, however, for a beginner: and no doubt, when the weather gets cooler and the worthy gentleman ventures a few more times, in the villages about, he may be able to make a pretty fair debut in his spacious cathedral. This is greatly to be desired; for really the people who pretend to preach there, are a great scandal to holy mother, and a terrible bore to the hearers.

We are the more encouraged about the archbishop, as we happen to know, by report, on undeniable evidence, the nature of his vocation to the ministry. And by way of encouraging his present efforts, we will tell the story, to his praise. We had it from the mouth of him who was actor in the scene.

The archbishop was born and raised an Episcopalian; as was his immediate predecessor. When just grown up, his wish and purpose was to enter the army; and he and the individual who told us this story, applied for cadets' warrants, for the military academy at West Point. We stood, said our informant, at the corner of Gay and Baltimore streets, anxiously looking to see the carriage of Mr. Harper drive up to his door. It came. I was deputed to call on him, and ascertain the success of our application; while Eccleston waited my return at the street corner. The quota of cadets for Maryland was full; but we were told, we could get midshipmen's warrants in the navy.—This was reported to the embryo soldier; and the two young men consulted a moment and pondered in deep thought in our most public street. Well, said he, breaking silence, and ripping out an oath,—good evening—*I will turn priest!!*

Here is the vocation, of the vicar of Christ in North America!
 “*Good evening,—I will turn priest!!*”

This may be about twenty years ago. Behold the fruits of that divine call to the holy ministry!

Alas! upon what slender threads do our destinies hang! Upon what slight and accidental things do the tenor of our being here, and the issues of our eternal interests depend! Here stands a protestant boy meditating a career of honour and activity. He is hid from you for twenty years; and when the curtain is drawn, you behold the proofs only of apostacy, superstition, luxury and indolence. Here is a moment's idle conference, at a street corner; and it so unjoins the soul, that the loss of God's favour here, and the deep risk of his endless curse, spring therefrom! How true is that word of our Saviour, that without him we can do nothing! How solemn is that providence, which in a sense, alas, how opposite, leads us, or permits us to wander, through unknown ways!

R. J. BRECKINRIDGE,

Rev'd Sir:—You are far from being unknown to me by character, though I am an entire stranger to you, yet as such, I have no doubt you will comply with the request which is the object of this letter. My request is, that you would be so good as to send me by mail, one copy of the Pope's encyclical letter, which I think you had published some time ago in Baltimore.

One reason for troubling you to send me a copy, is, that the jesuit priests seem to have their eye on this part of the country in which I reside, to establish one of their *people traps*, called by them seminaries of learning. Along this river (the south branch of the Potomac) lies a portion of the richest land perhaps in the United States, though small in extent; but it has wealth enough to form the principal attraction for those priests. They have frequently visited it, and have talked of such an establishment to be located in this section of country.

Their Archbishop Eccleston has been here. I heard him preach; and although in the course of my life, I have often been engaged in controversy with infidels who denied the truth of the Bible; yet I never heard one of them, I think, say more in disparagement of that book than this Archbishop did.

He said that the Roman Catholics took it as part of their rule of faith; but not as their sole rule; that it was not sufficient to be the rule of any man's faith; that no man by reading the Bible without other instruction, could find out a system of religion on which to venture his soul's salvation, or indeed any system at all. That the Bible was a compilation of writings made at different times, for particular circumstances *more* suitable for the occasion that called for them, but not suitable for Christians in all ages of the world. That the authority of the Roman Catholic church was superior to the Bible. That there was no evidence on which to believe the Bible but what that church gave it; without that no man could have any evidence of its truth.

He defended many of their abominations to an extent which I had not anticipated; such as auricular confession, absolution, indulgencies, &c., I was shocked and disgusted at the effrontery of the man.

You know that they are making great efforts to propagate their religion in this country, and flatter themselves that they will succeed. My apprehensions are formed chiefly on that religion being so agreeable to corrupt human nature. It offers salvation so cheaply through the labour-saving machinery of the priesthood, and has so many attractions for the bodily senses. I was for a long time anxious to see some Protestant, or Protestants, have the courage and ability to meet that arrogant hierarchy in their strong hold Baltimore; and I am highly gratified to find that you so sufficiently supply that desideratum. My heart is with you every blow you strike.

August 7, 1838.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

STATISTICS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

THE following facts drawn from a comparison of the tables in the General Assembly's minutes for 1838, with those of the preceding year, will give a view of the present state and progress of our church. It is of vast importance that the members of our church should be acquainted with them, for they awaken peculiarly solemn reflections; they present uncontestable proof of the inefficiency of the ministry and the lukewarmness of professing Christians.

In 1836, there were in the church

	PRESBYTERIES,	MINISTERS,	CHURCHES,	COMMUNICANTS,
	128,	1972,	2807,	219,126,
in 1837, there were	135,	2140,	2865,	220,567,
showing an increase of	7,	68,	58,	1431

In 1837, the four Synods of Utica, Geneva, Genesee and Western Reserve were declared not to belong to the Presbyterian church; this took away

	28,	501,	559,	43,601,
thus leaving	* 107,	1637,	2306,	176,956,

In 1838, there were reported

	* 107,	1690,	2343,	177,665,
showing an increase of	1,	51,	37,	709.

In 1836, the whole number added on examination was 11,512, in 1837 the number was 11,580; of which number; 2828 were added to the churches in the excluded Synods, so that the number added to the Presbyterian church in 1837 was 9352, and in 1838 the number added was 9562,

The number of ministers in 1837 above the number in 1836 was 68, and the number of persons added on examination in 1837 exceeded the number added in 1836 only by 68; this year the increase of ministers is 51, and the increase of communicants is 210.

If the whole number of new members received in the year were divided by the whole number of ministers, there would be hardly six persons to assign to each minister as the result of his year's labour. This proportion has varied little if any, during the last three years. Now as there are about from 210 to 230 ministers who are without any pastoral charge, and about 60 or 70 who act as agents, teachers, &c., we may say there are 1390 devoted to the ministry, and we shall only increase the average number to 7. How melancholy is this,—the labours of the great body of our ministers, aided by the prayers, the example and the endeavours of 170,000 professing Christians, producing such small results. If the average be so small, how many must there be in the sacred office, who preach

*The 3d Presb. of Philadelphia was dissolved in 1837, leaving 106 Presbs.—Greenbriar Presbytery was formed in 1837.

from year to year, without gathering even one person, into the visible church. It may be said, "*It is God's work to convert souls,*"—yes, but it is the duty of the church to pray the Lord to work,—to humble herself before God with his ministers, and deplore the sins on account of which he hath hidden his face, and to unite in earnest prayer that he will return to bless his people.

Of the churches, 770 report that they have had additions on examinations, while 1573 churches either state that none have been added to them, or make no report. 550 churches have received from 1 to 10, 120 from 10 to 20, 53 from 20 to 30, 13 from 30 to 40, 9 from 40 to 50, 6 from 50 to 60, 5 from 60 to 70, one has received 86, one 128, one 141. Many churches have received two or three, many more only one.

Of 1690 ministers, about 300 are employed as agents, or teachers, or are in declining health, or are advanced in years; 523 are settled as pastors, the remainder, 867, as stated supplies. Two Presbyteries, Tombeckbee and Arkansas, report no pastors,—and four, French Broad, Nashville, Western District and Louisiana, have only one each*. Four ministers have died during the last year, Rev. T. E. Hughes of the Presbytery of Beaver, Rev. Wm. F. Houston of Newcastle Presbytery, Rev. James W. Douglass of Fayetteville N. C. and Rev. George B. Bishop, professor in the seminary at South Hanover, Ind. Fifteen have removed from one pastoral charge to another,—there have been 84 installations, and 38 have ceased to be Pastors and are either Professors, Agents, Stated Suppliers or without charge.

There have been 2692 adults baptized, while last year when the 501 ministers in the four Synods were counted, there were reported only 2729,—37 churches have been organized during the year. We have 212 licentiates and 228 candidates for the ministry.

The amount given to benevolent objects in 1837, was (subtracting what was given in the four Synods) as follows.

	MISSIONS,	EDUCATION,
	\$146,239,	\$89,126,
in 1838—	88,356,	35,408,

showing a falling off of \$57,883 from the missionary cause, and \$53,718 from the education cause. This is partly to be accounted for by the fact that the Presbyteries whose delegates went off with the session, are put down as having given nothing,—no reports from them having been given in; but we notice that the only Presbyteries in which there has been any increase in the contributions to missions are Albany, Bedford, Long Island, 2d. New York, New York, 2d. Elizabethtown, Newton, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Huntingdon, Stubenville, Madison, Louisville, North Alabama, S. Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas and Louisiana. In all the rest, there has been a decrease, in some to a great extent,—by one-half, and even by two-thirds.

Six Presbyteries, New York, 2d. Philadelphia, Carlisle, Huntingdon, Ohio and Indianapolis, have considerably increased their do-

* The Presbytery of South Carolina in her report, has given no means of distinguishing Pastors from Stated Supplies.

nations to the education board,—in all the rest there has been a decrease,—in some it is shameful and lamentable.

In 1837, the average sum given by each church member to missions was 91 cents, in 1838 it was 49 cents, a diminution of nearly one-half; and as this includes what was given to domestic and foreign missions, it appears that 28 cents and a half is the average sum given in aid of the destitute at home and the perishing abroad.

In 1837, the average sum given to the cause of education, was 50 cents,—in 1838, it was hardly 20 cents; less than one-half what was given the preceding year. *To what is this owing? to the want of an efficient agency, or to want of zeal in pastors and lack of Christian feeling in professors?* Much undoubtedly to the first, but oh, how much more to the state of the hearts of the ministers and people.

One remarkable fact is, that in 1836 we had on our lists 219,126 communicants; in 1837, there was reported an addition of 11,580, and yet the total of communicants was stated that year to be 220,557, exceeding the preceding by only 1431, and showing a loss in some way of 10,149 communicants. In 1837, after separating the four Synods from us, we had 176,958 persons in communion with us; in 1838 there were reported 9562 new members, yet the whole number in 1838 was only 177,665, exhibiting an increase of only 609, and leaving 8953 members unaccounted for. Now, can it be possible that there was in 1837 a removal "by death or otherwise," of 10,149 of our communicants? or that during the last year we have lost by death, by suspension, by departure to other denominations, as many as 8953 persons? We have examined the reports of the 46 Presbyteries first in order on the minutes for 1838. Of these, 35 report an increase, and 11 a decrease in the number of communicants—although they have had additions of new members; thus showing an actual loss, or carelessness in not reporting.

	<i>Diminution,</i>	<i>Increase,</i>		<i>Diminution,</i>	<i>Increase,</i>
Hudson,	513	110	Detroit,	325	229
North River,	212	282	Lancaster,	37	382
New York,	831	590	Louisville,	67	507
Philadelphia 2d.	20	368	Ebenezer,	187	64
Ohio,	588	399	Long Island 2d.	8	40
Allegany,	421	160			

13 other Presbyteries have lost or neglected to report so many, that their number is only slightly increased, though the additions have been considerable.

The rest report an increase in the total of more, in some instances by two, three, four and even five hundred, than they have added by examination and certificate, showing that some churches reported this year which did not last, and that others have neglected the new members, giving only the total.

Great carelessness exists in the Sessional and Presbyterial reports,—churches fail year after year to report,—vacant churches hardly ever report. Accuracy is necessary to make statistical tables valuable; *ought not the Assembly and the Synods to enjoin on the Presbyteries proper attention to this matter?*

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

UNSUCCESSFUL PREACHING.

"Most of the people who attend meeting, think they are converted already, and to produce a contrary impression is the first thing to be aimed at and the most difficult to effect. More than half of my preaching is, I think, directed to this single point: viz,—to show the people that they are not Christians."

This sentence is extracted from the journal of the Rev. Mr. Armstrong of the Sandwich Islands, published in the *Missionary Herald* for July. It contains a distinct statement of the real cause of the unsuccessful preaching of the ministry, and we greatly mistake if this is not the cause of the little good that attends the ministration of the gospel in our own land; the right sort of truth is not preached.

The Sandwich islanders think themselves converted,—or as the phrase is among church going people with us, *good enough Christians*, that is, they are utterly indifferent to divine things, and wholly insensible to their true condition, and they care so little about their souls that they do not direct a single thought to their eternal interests, much less feel a fear that they are in danger of hell. Now to wake up such sluggish minds, at home and abroad, powerful truth is necessary; to set before them the evidences of acceptance with God and the proofs of their impenitence, is to describe to a dead man the symptoms of dissolution and to teach what acts and feelings distinguish a living body from a corpse. The difficulty to be encountered and overcome is apathy,—complete, stupid, soulless apathy, an apathy arising out of inordinate fondness for worldly gratifications and sensual pleasures, and strengthened by disrelish for self denial and holy obedience. It cannot be subdued by the weapons of mere reason, by argumentative dissertations on the nature of religion, on the characteristics of believers, and the distinguishing marks of true and spurious conversions, nor by exhibiting the benefits of religion or the necessary consequences of sin in this life. These are all of use as subordinate truths, but to preach them to a careless congregation in the hope of awakening them, is like giving gentle medicines in cholera; the disease is too rapid in its progress, too violent in its effects, to permit weak and slowly operating agents to do good.—So the sinner, dead in trespasses and sins, passing, as it were, from the state of collapse into death, is only trifled with and not benefitted by being taught these secondary truths. They are of use for the instructing, warming, establishing and comforting the weak but growing Christian; but only powerful truth—only *the truth*, as the Bible emphatically styles it, can rouse up the perishing soul and assist the prostrate energies of nature to rise and resist the paralysing effects of sin.

Paul's conduct is in no instance more worthy of our admiration, study and imitation, than when he determined to know nothing among you but Jesus Christ, and him crucified. The carnal, contentious, self complacent Corinthians would have been delighted with his discourses on experimental religion, the testimony of a good conscience, and the means of knowing ourselves to be in

Christ; but their divisions would have been as great, their glorying would have been as unworthy, and they would have been as much puffed up for one against another. He preached only Christ and him crucified,—only the ruin of man, and the way of salvation. He plied them with this great truth, he held up Christ manifestly crucified for them. Thus he drew their attention from the insignificant matters that had so completely engrossed them, and so miserably embroiled them,—and giving them a worthy object of interest and an absorbing subject of thought, he excited their minds to steady thought and profitable reflection. By this means, he united all true believers, however they might have differed; he strengthened their faith, increased their love to their Redeemer and each other, and attached them more strongly and intelligently to himself; while at the same time he silenced every pretender and false brother, crept in unawares, for they could not deny that he preached the truth,—only the truth and the truth in its glorious fulness. By this decisive course, he subdued all contention, and while he put to silence evil men and seducers, he built up the church on the word of God, and animated her members to livelier exercises of grace, and increased diligence in good works.

There is a twofold advantage to be derived from the preaching of strong truth, and a twofold disadvantage flows from the opposite course of taking up the minor points of the sacred volume,—those which are mainly to be supported by human rather than scriptural proof. The first advantage is to the preacher; his mind can act far better when powerfully wrought upon by some great fact, which fills the soul with a sense of its importance.—If following Paul's advice, he meditate on the chief concern of man, and give himself wholly to it, his profiting will appear to all, his conceptions will be enlarged, his affections deeply interested, and all his faculties brought into willing co-operation. The vastness of the subject, its connexion with the Most High, its bearing on the immortal soul, will awake his latent energies, and excite and enable him to efforts of which before he would have deemed himself incapable. The greatness of an emergency develops the resources and prowess of a commander; so the greatness of his subject draws forth, and by drawing forth, strengthens the preacher's power of thought, and invests him with a command of the subject, and an influence over the hearer which art cannot give. Does he dwell much on the work of redemption? his mind expands as he studies, he catches the spirit of the Bible, he becomes imbued with its fervor, and words suited to the theme rise and throng upon him, and utterance instead of being a labor is a relief, and being from the heart, its effect is direct, deep and abiding. The truth of this is evident, for how many men of slender abilities have, through their love of the doctrines of the cross, risen above themselves, and become eminent as faithful, acceptable, powerful and successful preachers.

If on the other hand a man leaves the greater for the less, he receives no inspiration from the subject; he may be in earnest to do good, but he must bring his energies to the subject, instead of having them drawn by it; and he cannot receive aid from it, he expends his force upon it, without being acted upon by it, and stimulated

and prepared for further exertion. As the body acquires new muscular strength, and aptitude by exercise, so the mind by being tasked to noble undertakings, is elevated, becomes vigorous in its stretches of thought, and attains to remarkable facility in conceiving, investigating and presenting truth. And as the strength of the body is according to the amount of exercise, so the power of the intellect is according to the nature of the subjects, and the power with which they act upon it. Hence it is, when preachers content themselves to follow in the beaten track of thought, illustration and manner, of some man or class of men, they before long have that one range of thought, a wearisome barrenness of illustration and a dead glaring uniformity of manner, for

“ The mind becomes like that it works in,
Like the dyer’s hand.”

So the young men, whose first attempts have been extravagantly commended, and who foolishly confide in the judgment of their admirers, and who suppose they can maintain the rank they have taken, by serving the Lord with that which cost them nothing; their mind shrinks and withers as the arm of the sluggard shrinks into puny inefficiency, and while the freshness of youth is on their lip, the torpidity of superannuation is in their souls. And these are the men who have no genuine enthusiasm—no strong glow of feeling, enlivening the intellect, who are most desirous of producing excitement, and who most readily give ear to new doctrines, new modes of presenting truth, and who first call in the aid of the itinerating revivalists. Only the awakening of the Spirit, to teach them the proper duty of their office; the proclaiming of Christ, can rescue their pulpit services from insignificance, and themselves from the guilt and laboriousness of misdirected endeavours.

The other advantage is to the congregation. Where strong truth is preached, there is something to fix the attention, to operate efficiently on the affections, and to exercise the intellect. Thus the lassitude and indifference which have characterized the attendance on the sanctuary, give way; men are stirred up with the desire to know, and they either inquire, because they feel the importance of the truth to themselves, or because they hate the truth and wish to confute those who maintain it. The apathy is gone,—the subject of religion is made a matter of thought, men think, read, converse about it, and hearken attentively, and so they come candidly, seriously and in earnest, to desire to know what God has taught.

This apathy too often characterizes real Christians; they hear and because they are familiar with the words, they are satisfied that they fully understand what is said, and they appreciate its importance; while truly their intellect sleeps, and they regard divine truth with heartless indifference. That they may grow in grace, it is necessary that they be fed with truth, with such truth as is nourishing, the truth with which God sanctifies. When *the truth which ministers are commissioned on purpose to preach*, is proclaimed, the mind grasps it, masters it and understanding it, feels the force of it and obeys it. They cease to be hearers only, and becoming thinkers they become doers, for that truth with which we are most con-

versant, affects our views, feelings and actions, and lays a train for the future actings of our mind, gives a bent to our affections, and thus determinés our character and conduct.

Wherever there has been a genuine revival of religion, it will be found that powerful truth has been the agency honoured of God, that the awakening was preceded by the unfolding of the great doctrines of the Bible, and that the greatest blessing has descended when those truths were most generally understood. Indeed, it is a striking fact, that all the times of refreshing of which we have particular accounts, were times in which the preaching was almost exclusively *doctrinal*, and the periods of luke-warmness and declension, which went before or followed them, were characterized by the opposite extreme of *practical preaching*.

The terms, *practical* and *doctrinal*, are most mistakenly applied in general; for all *truly practical preaching*—(that is, preaching productive of good effects,) is eminently *doctrinal*, while of all inefficient preaching it may justly be said, either the precepts were preached distinct from the doctrines and as having no dependance on them, or the doctrines were preached separately, dissevered from that mutual connexion with each other and the precepts, which subsists throughout the Scriptures. The preaching by which the reformation was extended and established, was doctrinal,—the revivals in Scotland were of the same character, and so were those under the ministry of Edwards and Whitfield; while the moral desolation among the dissenters and the established church of Great Britain,—in the Scottish church when the Erskines seceded and Witherspoon saterized,—the introduction of Arianism and its natural descendants into the churches of Germany, France, and Ireland, and the spread of the heresy which has caused the schism in the society of Friends in Great Britain and America, came from *moral preaching*,—*practical preaching*;—in other words, from the disuse of the doctrinal part of the Bible as unnecessary to the edification of the church. It may be said, those revivals were marked by extravagancies, and that they prove the preaching to have been in a great degree of an improper character; but extravagancies in a revival may either grow naturally out of the means used, and the truths preached, or they may be excrescences; not the legitimate product of the truth presented, or of the mode of its presentation. Deep concern may cause fainting and outcries in some persons, as it may cause tears and intense headache in others,—and where the truth is not calculated to produce a great moral or external effect, means are often injudiciously resorted to, suited to agitate the mind, torture the imagination and create alarm,—in the hope that by doing this, a great effect may be produced. The result is, an effect follows resembling closely in outward appearance, the effect of genuine conviction and the expectation seems to be, that if this effect can be produced in the unregenerate sinner, the grace of repentance will be easily wrought in the hearts, and the act of saving faith certainly put forth. Where the effect of the preaching is to excite great anxiety about obtaining pardon, and vehement desires to be satisfied that the spiritual condition is good, and where this anxiety and desire are so strong that they render persons wholly indifferent to the truth, except as the

means to that end, or where by their violence they incapacitate from considering and valuing the truth, there is proof that though the wind is rushing, the earthquake convulsing, and the fire raging, yet *man—not God is there*. When, however, "*the foolishness of God*" is felt to be wiser than men, and men wait upon him and labour according to his direction, then God draws nigh, in mercy and in power, and that "His name is nigh, his wonderous works declare."

We too often hear ministers disparaged as *good only to edify Christians*, and it is certain that a large number regard much of God's word as *good only to edify Christians*. The same truth is appointed of God for the opening of the eyes, and the turning from the power of Satan unto God, and for the perfecting of the saints, the edifying of the body of Christ; it is fitted alike for both, —but *man's inventions and improvements* can do neither.

THE MYSTERY OF JESUITISM.

No. VI.

Conjunction of St. Bacchus and St. Ignatius.

WE suppose our notice of the literary gluttony of the corporation of Georgetown college, must be henceforward omitted: unless indeed we take special pains, to get information and keep the run of their debaucheries in honour of the muses and the Jesuits; strange conjunction and aptly celebrated in rude and coarse bacchicals! For since we began to pay our respects to this annual glorification, at the capitol of the nation, of the principles of those whom all nations abhor,—either the public press is getting shy, or the revellers are getting ashamed of day; and what was once blazoned in all the glory of capital letters and lead lines, in the entire daily press round about, is now hid in thin Burjois, in the form of an anonymous letter, in one corner of an humble monthly, hardly more pretending than our own, in its outer man. In short, what took place on the 24th of July, at Georgetown, creeps tardily out in the September No. of the *Southern Literary Messenger*: and except this notice by us, has received no additional observance, that we have seen or heard of, from the American press. One single step more, half as long, as many already taken—will carry back these annual wine-bibbers to St. Ignatius and St. Bacchus, into the darkness most congenial to both Saints, and all the worshippers of each.

"Commencement Anniversary Georgetown college. The dinner, &c.," such is the caption of the article commencing "*My dear White*," and written by a hand full of affection for the college, the dinner, the music and for aught that appears, the drink; as well as for the respectable editor whom he thus fervently addresses. We have no doubt the writer of the article, is every inch a gentleman; albeit, the company was none of the best: and we are equally sure he was perfectly *composed*; albeit, men are sometimes sin-

gularly affectionate, at the close of a regular set to, even more humble and meagre than this undoubtedly was.—Nay, he says the treat was in a high degree “interesting, intellectual and social.” If it were the two last, the first manifestly follows. And that it was *social*, who can doubt, who knows the powers of a full stomach and a light head? And as *intellectual*, may be defined, that which pertains to the *inward* or *spiritual* parts,—we presume this feast was intellectual, in both respects; although, not perhaps, in the strict sense a feast upon any man’s intellect in the proper notion of a meal, as the words naturally imply. A truce to this, however; for with all respect for the author and the article, we only concern ourselves with the feast.

It is rather difficult, always to keep things in perfectly good taste and proportion. We have admitted that a revel was a suitable mode to celebrate the conjunction of Bacchus and Loyola; but we submit that a *very large* feast was out of taste to celebrate the exit of a *very small* class from the college. As there were but four graduates, we are inclined to think, that a lunch, or a breakfast, or a tea drinking would have been more in keeping. It is a strong exemplification of the low state of morals in the country, and the indifference of the people for letters, that this venerable and noble college, where boys not only *may* learn to read, but *must* learn to feast, should be so neglected; and that these pure, abstemious and patriotic Jesuits, who inculcate a taste and judgment in drinking as well as in studying, should be left with a patronage so shamefully inadequate!

We shall pass by the criticisms of the author on the performances of these four graduates, so far as they are personal; remarking only, that they seem to us, rather harsh than otherwise, towards the young gentlemen. Those criticisms, however, relate in a secondary sense to the teachers in the institution: and deserve a moment’s consideration in that regard. It is said, for example, that G., and not D. who received it, was entitled, according to general belief, to the first place amongst the four graduates. A hard insinuation this; but one that Mr. Elder, who presides with so much impartiality over St. Joseph’s College, at Bardstown, in Kentucky, and writes such superlative English—will comprehend without an explanatory note.—Again, G. though thus distinguished, and deserving, was allowed to deliver an oration, remarkable for being “strongly imbued with sectional feeling.” A sad fault, we suppose, in men charged with the education of youth. Another young gentleman (F.) delivered himself of a very “common place” oration. And a fourth, (L.) though very clever, is said to have spoken indistinctly, and too fast, and to have pronounced shockingly; in which last excellence, G. who was the best of all, largely partook. The sum of the criticisms on these four performers, leaves us at a loss how to express our admiration of a college faculty, which teaches its pupils to speak too fast and indistinctly, to pronounce badly, to write in a common place manner, and to entertain improper sectional feelings; and which itself, out of four such alumni confers the first appointment on the wrong person!—To make this part of the treat “*interesting, intellectual and social*”

—required, manifestly, neither meat nor drink. This part of the ceremony, was, moreover, presided over, by the Archbishop himself, in great style; and the whole enlivened by a good band of music. So that on the whole, when Mr. Eccleston came to award the prizes and premiums, which he did “with much imposing ceremony”—the people retired about noon—all wide awake: a signal proof of the deep interest excited in all.

This finished the literary, or *pretence* part of the affair. The *real* performance was yet to come off: and the real actors therefore remained behind. They sauntered about the college,—for the dinner was not quite ready. They admired the fine prospects—examined one thing and another, in dalliance with languid time—till the signal—the joyful signal was struck; and “I had the honour of sitting down, with other invited guests, at (to, Sir, if you please) one of the most sumptuous and social banquets, it was ever my happiness to partake of.”

So, to work they went; man and boy, priest and layman, from the Archbishop down to the most timid freshman; at it they went, eating and drinking; drinking and eating; toasting and spouting, spouting and toasting; “the *venerable* (??) Archbishop of Baltimore presiding, with much dignity and urbanity over the festive board.”

Well, what of all that?—will some reader say. Not much perhaps. But in these temperance times, the table feasts of ecclesiastics, are not perhaps their most honourable ones; nor the capacity to teach children how to “revel in the day time”—the highest recommendation of a college. Still more; it is hardly decorous for those who despise all the dainties of life—to manifest such an unbecoming publicity, in their greediness to enjoy them upon every tolerable and some intolerable pretexts.

It is not, however, chiefly because we can amuse ourselves or our readers, with the fooleries of these vile hypocrites—and in doing so turn the public ridicule and contempt upon their doings and pretensions—that we condescend to notice them. It is a small matter, that Priest Mulledy, even though lately principal of the college, should make a fool of himself in his cups, and give silly sentiments with his wine. It is nothing to us if he should, at a hint from *Mr. Custis*, (whose misfortune it seems to be, to be ever ready with a speech)—bring in a pantomime to amuse the reverend company, and sweeten the intervals of drink, with *Punch and Joan*, or any other vain trifling. Nor do we care, for the poor scamps who are ever ready as hangers on, to make one in a dumb show, or degrade themselves for good meat, or sing ribald songs as the price of good drink, or smirk in approval of the infamy of a host, in repayment for the good cheer had and expected. These things move us not, except to deep pity—or strong sorrow, or merited contempt.

But at these dabauches, ever and anon, things of high import leak out: things which challenge the public notice, which confirm the warnings of the people’s friends, and reveal the true character and wicked designs, of the pope’s minions in this country. Take for example the following:

Wm. B. Lewis, Esq., being called on for a toast, gave the health of the

Archbishop of Baltimore, the President of the Day,—who happily replied,—and offered a sentiment in honor of the Order who had founded and reared the Institution, in whose halls the company were partaking of the pleasures of cordial hospitality. To this the Ex-Rector of the College responded appropriately, and gave the health of

William Joseph Walter, Esq., of England—one of the guests present, a literary friend and brother; who, in his turn, gave “The sons of St. Ignatius; the great promoters of enlightened education, and the firm upholders of truly liberal opinions, throughout the world.”

So then, it stands confessed before all mankind, that Archbishop Eccleston is the patron of the Jesuits; and that even in his moments of most complete relaxation, his mind never wavers in its purpose to honor them! Still farther; a company of American citizens are so far lost to all sense of shame, all love of liberty, and all reverence for God, as to drink repeated toasts in honour of the Jesuits! And further still, a vagabond Englishman dares to insult the country by propounding anew such sentiments!

Here then, is the final settlement of this most important question. Archbishop Eccleston is a Jesuit. The Jesuits direct all the affairs and shape all the principles of the Papal church in the United States.

These are startling facts. Though we have long known them—we are shocked at the contemplation of those approaching evils, which this new proof brings so clearly before our minds. Yes, we repeat it; the nation cannot avoid the most dreadful calamities—from this fatal and corrupt society, unless prompt and vigorous measures can be taken to deliver it from the impending curse.

The Society of Jesus is the enemy of man. The whole human race should unite for its overthrow. Earth and heaven should rejoice together over its tomb.—For there is no alternative between its total extirpation, and the absolute corruption and degradation of mankind.

For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.

DR. TAYLOR'S EARLY OPINIONS.

About twenty years ago this correspondent resided in New Haven, (Conn.) at which period the then called *professors*, Fitch and Taylor in Yale College, came out in pamphlet form with some of their peculiarities concerning the introduction of *sin*; and as professor Fitch sent me a copy of his little treatise, I gave it a candid perusal during the succeeding evening; and on the following morning called at his study to let him know what I thought of it. The sentiments advanced by him, as far as they could be ascertained or decyphered, through the clouds of mysticism in which they were enveloped, were in my view, of the most dangerous and frightful tendency! I told him that “I was sorry he had published such a treatise, that Taylor would now be emboldened to shew his restless temperament, and great evil would be the result.” I had been somewhat acquainted with Taylor at his father's house, whilst he

was studying theology, under *Dr. Dwight*; and it was, unfortunately for him, generally known among his relatives and acquaintance, that his *notions* respecting cardinal points in Divinity were emphatically and unqualifiedly condemned by *Dr. Dwight*. And when the reverend Council of Fathers had examined Taylor, with the view to give him a licence, some expressed opposition, or strong doubts at least, whether it would be safe, and wise to do it. Time, which annuls or confirms all such prophesies, or forebodings, *has confirmed theirs*. And as I recollect, I will relate here a conversation which passed between myself, (at the period when Taylor published his *Notions*,) and a venerable Father, whose name I need not mention, in which I told him, that "if the God of the universe possess such qualities, and exercise his attributes to accomplish his purposes in the manner represented by Taylor, neither the *Apostles*, nor *Jesus Christ himself*, had any correct knowledge of him,—but, so far from being any thing like the "*God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, was the *character* presented by Taylor, that I never could desire any acquaintance with him; and should do my best to put both down, as by no means worthy of the respect of any rational being."—I have seen no reason, yet, to alter my purpose.

A CHRISTIAN.

Baltimore, August 29, 1838.

LETTER FROM MR. WILSON IN INDIA.

Ship Edward, Cheyney, March 16th, 1838.

Indian Ocean, Lat. 2° 54." N.—Long. 88° 46."

REV'D AND DEAR BROTHER:—

THE tender and peculiar relation which I am kindly permitted to sustain towards you and your dear people, both by providence and (I humbly trust) by grace, leads me often to think of you and pray for you, and when an opportunity offers, to write freely and affectionately to you. I wrote hastily to you from New Castle—to some of your people from Madeira, and Mrs. Wilson has just written at large to the ladies of your church. This makes it less necessary for me to write; especially as I have so little to communicate. But I shall feel anxious to hear from you, by *every opportunity*, and be disappointed if any vessel is suffered to leave the shores of our *dear native land*, for India, without some friendly communication from you, I have therefore determined to observe the golden rule—"do as you would be done by." I might occupy my paper with a minute detail of the ordinary occurrences at sea, and the manner of life to which we are subjected on board of a ship: but all this would be stale and uninteresting to you, who have been so much of a "sea-faring man." Indeed, Mrs. W. and I have read with much interest, since we have been on board, your description of "*A Life at Sea*." But I will speak of that which ought deeply to affect our hearts, and which cannot fail to

interest you—viz: "the goodness of God." This has been manifested to us, in a multiplicity of instances, and a variety of ways. Although our voyage has been a tedious and in many respects a trying one, yet during the whole of the time we have been at sea (more than five months), we have not had a single "storm," nor even a "gale" of wind. We doubled the Cape of Good Hope, which is considered the most dangerous part of the voyage, in fine weather and under "full sail." At one time, when about the latitude of Madagascar we made a very narrow and strikingly providential escape. For several days, we had been striving to make a certain point of latitude; but the winds being contrary, headed us off to the east. After fighting hard against providence, for two days, we caught the *flag end* of a tremendous hurricane, or rather the *effects of one*; for we had very little wind, but the most tremendous seas I ever saw, "they literally ran mountain high," and threatened to swallow us up. Our captain and all who knew anything of the sea, had no hesitation in saying that if we had been one or two degrees further north, we must inevitably have perished. How often is this the case with the child of God, in a moral point of view? How frequently, and perseveringly, and obstinately does he strive to obtain that station or secure those objects, which if obtained, would not only occasion his unhappiness, but even his everlasting destruction? And how uniformly is this the case with the mere child of nature, who madly strives to rush upon the thick bosses of Jehovah's buckler? But that unseen hand that upholds and directs the universe, holds them back from their own destruction. "O the riches both of the goodness and forbearance of God: His goodness is unsearchable and his ways past finding out." His way is often "in the deep." Again; when we had like to have suffered for want of water (several of our casks having burst and discharged their contents,) the Lord sent us a plentiful shower, in a latitude like the desert, where ordinarily they have no rain. In this, His providential hand was very evident. The Lord has also been trying us with affliction; but though the furnace bore a "seven fold heat, yet He who was with the three children of Israel, was with us in the midst of the furnace, so that we were not "burned, neither did the flames kindle upon us". About the middle of January, both Mrs. Morrison and my dear wife, were taken very ill, and brought into the very "*gates of death*." It was at a time too, when the sea was very rough, and several of the other members of the family were indisposed. For some days, we were kept in a state of fearful suspense. At different times sister M. was supposed to be in the agonies of death; and at one time I was called as *really* to give up my beloved wife, as Abraham was, to sacrifice his son Isaac. But here the Lord dealt most kindly and tenderly with us, binding up the bleeding hearts of those who wept, and tenderly supporting and cherishing those whose feet were placed in the swellings of Jordon, so that our bitter tears of anguish were mingled with joy and thanksgiving, for the triumphs of his *free grace*. He also graciously inclined his ear to the voice of supplication,— "Father if it be possible let this cup pass from us;" nevertheless, not "our will, but thine be done," and when the expiring flame was flickering in the socket, He breathed upon it with his life-

inspiring breath, and bade it "live." Oh that *He* would give us hearts to praise him for his mercy, and grace to make a sanctified use of these afflictions, so that they may not only "work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," but also tend to the furtherance of *His* cause, and the glory of *His* name among the heathen. We have been labouring (whether faithfully or not is known unto God) for the spiritual good of the officers and crew of this ship. We have preaching on deck every Sabbath, attended generally by the officers and most of the men. We have also a Bible-class, a weekly conference meeting—observe the monthly concerts for prayer in behalf of missions, Sabbath schools and seamen; and occasionally other religious services. Our family worship is frequently attended by some of the crew, and sometimes the cabin has been crowded. Convinced that much harm has been done by the injudicious publication of remarks, from the pens of missionaries of a *personal* kind, we have concluded to say nothing about the religious or irreligious views—moral conduct, or future prospects of those with whom we are here associated. Such a publication could do them no good, but might do much harm, while the withholding of it can do no harm.

Suffice it to say, that we find a hard and barren soil to cultivate, nevertheless, we are not discouraged. "Is any thing too hard for God, what wont he for his people do!" With him is the residue of the spirit, and he has the hearts of all men in his hands. "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thy hand, for thou knowest not which shall prosper, this or that, or whether both shall be alike good."

We feel very anxious to hear from you, "to know your state," and what the Lord is doing for you, and you for his cause. It would give me much satisfaction to know what was done at the meeting of our Synod in your city, and what steps were taken by the newly appointed Board of Foreign Missions; and whether we are under its patronage and direction. Or does the P. F. M. Society remain distinct. My great business is, to publish to the perishing heathen, the truth as it is in Christ Jesus; but I wish to do it under the banner of the Presbyterian church, which, although I do not hold to be *infallible*, or the *only* church of Christ, I believe to be nearest the scriptural rule, and as I have occasion, to maintain its order, peace and purity. *Presbyterianism*, or the order and doctrines which we profess to hold, are just as important among the heathen as among nominal Christians; nay, if possible, I have found them more indispensable.

I find, dear brother, for want of room, I must close for the present, as I wish to add a line, if spared to reach Calcutta. We are near the mouth of the bay of Bengal, and had we a good breeze might reach Calcutta in one week; (about twelve hundred miles,) but as we are nearly becalmed and can expect but little wind in this latitude, we may be a month on board. I have hastily written this, with the faint hope that we may meet a vessel on our way up the bay. Have the goodness to remember me with Christian affection, to the flock over whom the great Head of the church has placed you, and beseech them to bear me and mine in remembrance,

at a throne of grace. Please, also, to make my kind requests to Mrs. B. and the dear children. God bless you.

Your brother in Christ,

HENRY R. WILSON, JR.

Rev. R. J. Breckinridge.

Calcutta, April 13th, 1838.

Dear Brother :—

THE Lord has at length brought us in safety to this land of darkness. We anchored on Friday the 6th inst. As the brig Gardner (which left Philadelphia since we did,) leaves in the morning for America, I hasten to send this. Mrs. Wilson, and Mrs. Morrison, were both taken very ill on our arrival—are better to-day. We found brother McEwen here, on his way to America, in ill health; this we regret, but cannot help. We will be obliged to remain here, for the rainy season, about two months. I shall write to you again, by the return of the Edward, in which Mr. McEwen goes. Remember me kindly to Mrs. B., and all your good people.

Yours, &c.

H. R. WILSON, JR.

Rev. R. J. Breckinridge.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

No. I.

I. THE Apostle Paul, (*in 1 Cor. x. 16, 17,*) speaks of the table of our Lord, as of an obligation to concord; but the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, has been the subject of much dispute, and dissension, yet it is not the cause, but only the occasion of evil. Men change their opinions, but the nature of this sacrament remains unchanged. The human mind is ingenious in the arts of perdition. Men love better to *follow* others, than to *know* for themselves. They often call voluntary ignorance, *docility*. But they are subtle and exact in every thing except that which concerns the salvation of their souls.

II. The doctrine of Calvinists, upon this point, is supported, not only by the word of God, but by reason, the testimony of the senses, experience and the testimony of the primitive church. The Romanists in other matters err, either from not respecting the Holy Scripture sufficiently, or for not caring to understand it. In this matter, they do not understand even what they say themselves. Upon other points, they lack faith: on this, they lack faith and common sense. If they could be prevailed upon, to consider their own principles, and trace them to their consequences, they would change their views.

III. We proceed first to treat of the *name* given to this sacrament, and then of the sacrament itself.

It is called the Lord's Supper by the Apostle Paul. (1 Cor. xi. 20.) It is so called, because our Lord celebrated it in the evening, after eating of the lamb; seated at the table with his disciples. The papists say, that Paul does not intend the Eucharist, by the word *supper*, but the agapæ or love-feasts, spoken of in Jude 12; and by Tertullian (in *Apol. chap. xxxix.*) But they err in this. This appears, because, (1.) These love-feasts were not instituted by our Lord, nor celebrated by him. They cannot therefore be called the Lord's Supper. (2.) They cannot, with propriety, be so called merely because they were celebrated in the church; for if that were a sufficient reason, a false doctrine preached in a church, might be called the Lord's doctrine. (3.) It would have been out of place, for Paul to have narrated the institution of the Lord's Supper, unless that to which he referred was such. The institution of the Lord's Supper, would not have been appointed as a corrective of an abuse committed in the celebration of the *love-feasts*. (4.) The early teachers maintain, that by the word *supper* in this place, Paul means the Eucharist. *Augustine, Ep. 118, says, Apostolus dicit, convenientibus ergo vobis in unum non est Dominicam coenam manducare, hanc ipsam perceptionem Eucharistiae dominicam coenam vocans.* Theodoret says, the supper of the Lord signifies the Sacrament of the Lord. Oecumenius says, that St. Paul, *Dominicam coenam vocat divinum mysterium.* Jerome, in his Commentary on chap. 11 says, *Coena ideo dicitur, quia Dominus in coena, tradidit sacramenta.* So Thomas Scotus, and even Bellarmine admits it to be a probable opinion. To these, Chrysostom is opposed, but he cannot outweigh them. Theophylact lived in the 10th century, and is no authority. The fathers often call the Lord's Supper, a sacrament, Augustin does so, thrice in one sermon. A book on this subject is ascribed to Cyprian, which has this title, "Of the Supper of the Lord." Ambrose (*upon 1 Cor.*) indeed says, *Mysterium eucharistiae inter cœnandum celebratum, non coenam esse*, but he means that the Eucharist is not a *common* supper.

IV. The ancients also called this sacrament *Dominicum*, and *αιτιολογια* and *συναξις*, that is, Divine service, or the congregation; because in most churches they celebrated the supper at every solemn meeting, once a week at least, and in others daily. They called it also, the Eucharist; that is, *thanks giving*, or the act of giving thanks; because our Lord gave thanks when he broke the bread. (*Math. xxvi. 26.*) The catechism of the Council of Trent is incorrect in declaring that the word signifies (*bona gratia*) good grace, and Pope Pius V. by approving of it, has sanctioned an error.—The Latin language began sensibly to decline, after the time of Tertullian and Cyprian, and it was then they began to use the words *Remissa peccatorum* for *Remissio*—and the word *Missa* for *Missio*; so that *Missa*, then signified dismissal or dismissal, *i. e.* of the congregation. Thus Augustine uses it (*Missa fit catechumenis*) after the sermon, the catechumens are dismissed, but the faithful remain. (*Sermon 237.*) So the 4th council of Carthage, canon 84, *Episcopus nullum prohibeat usque ad missam catechumenorum neque hæreticum neque Iudæum neque Gentilem Ecclesiam ingredi et audire verbum Dei.* After the reading of the gospel, and before the cel-

ibration of the supper, the Deacon said aloud, "if there be any catechumen here, let him go out." This dismissal was called *missa* according to Pope Innocent III, (*book 6, chap. 12, of the mysteries of the Mass.*) Cassian, very frequently uses the word *missa* in this sense. So in the Roman Catholic service, the phrase *Ite, missa est*, can properly mean only this, "go; it is dismissal."

V. The word, however, has entirely lost its signification. By degrees it came to be used to signify a part of the service. Hence the phrases mass of the catechumens—mass of the faithful, the first being before the Eucharist, and the second being the Eucharist itself—(*missa catechumenorum—missa fidelium.*) Afterwards the words were used sometimes to signify the Eucharist, but more commonly a propitiatory sacrifice in which the priest professes to sacrifice Christ himself, for the living and for the dead. So that the mutations which the word has undergone, are these: 1, it signified dismissal: 2, a part of the service: 3, the Eucharist: 4, a propitiatory sacrifice. In Germany the word has received another sense, *viz*: a fair, or market, even among those who belong to the Roman church; (*misse*, old German) solenitas, solennia, mundinæ, mercatus, solennis. *Messe* (modern German) Jahrmarkt—a fair, probably because these occasions were perverted to purposes of traffic.

VI. The word (*Missa*) Mass, was not used in the Greek, Arminian, Syrian, or African churches. The word is Latin, and was used only in the Latin church. This fact sufficiently refutes those who pretend to derive it from the Hebrew. (*Deut. xvi. 15.*) For if it were so, the Syrian and Maronite churches would have retained it; for in that country, the vernacular tongue was similar to the Hebrew, until the ravages committed on them by the Saracens.—But Pope Innocent should be authority enough for these etymologists. Besides, even the Latin church did not use this word till late. It is not found in Tertullian, or Cyprian, or Arnobius, or Lactantius, or Jerome, and once in Augustine, in the sense of dismissal, (*Serm. 237,*) once also to signify prayers, after the dismissal. (*Serm. 91.*) Ambrose uses it in this last sense, in *Epist. 33*, to Marcella, but not in the sense of communion of the Eucharist; much less to signify a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

VII. Barbarisms are pardonable, provided they do not introduce incongruity in the faith, or mar the purity of doctrine; but with the change of the sense of the word, has come, in this case, a change of doctrine. *Coena* signifies a common supper, which implies communion. This is Paul's view. (*1 Cor. x. 16.*) And even the Priest, when he eats alone, speaks as though several ate. His prayer is, "*ut quot quot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus etc*, that as many of us, as shall have taken of the communion of this altar, the holy body and blood of thy Son, may be filled, &c. This form of prayer is more ancient than the mass, without communicants. We conclude, then, that the fathers who used the word *supper* to signify the congregation, or the sacrifice of thanksgiving, indeed suited their language, to the nature of the thing, yet they would have done better to adhere to the

phraseology of Scripture; for they opened the door to an abuse, and gave an example to their successors, to invent *other names* much less appropriate. Satan has often had the address to change a metaphor into a heresy, and to deduce from a novelty of expression, novelties in the faith. "From the beginning it was not so," as said our Lord to the Pharisees. (*Math. xix. 8.*) The Romanist, therefore, incurs no risk by resuming the word used by the Apostles to designate this sacrament, *viz*: The Lord's Supper.

VIII. It is proper in this place, to state the doctrine as it is received by the Calvinistic churches.

We believe that on the day of Christ's ascension, he actually did ascend into heaven, (*Acts i. 9.*)—that the heavens must retain him until the time of the restitution of all things, (*Acts iii. 21.*)—that in his Divine nature, he is truly omnipresent, but that his human nature is no longer on the earth. (1.) Because he said that we should not have him always. (*John xii. 8.*) (2.) Because his body was like ours in all respects, (*Heb. ii. 17.*) and therefore it cannot be in different places at the same instant of time, nor inclosed under the accidents of bread. The doctrine of our Lord's humanity, is one of the foundations of our faith. To destroy that doctrine, is to undermine our faith, and destroy our consolation, which depends upon the union which we have with him. Now the bond of this union, or the medium of it, consists in this, that he is our brother, a man like ourselves, having a body as we have. His body is indeed glorified and immortal, but it has not lost the nature and essential properties of a human body. Besides, at the Lord's Supper we do not speak of his body as glorified, for it was not so, when that sacrament was instituted, but infirm like our own.

IX. Upon this subject we hold simply, that which we find in the gospels and in the epistles of Paul, *viz*: that Christ Jesus the evening before he suffered on the cross, after he had celebrated the passover with his disciples, took bread and brake it, and gave it to them, (*Math. xxvi. 26.*) so that we cannot doubt that he gave them bread. The words of the Evangelist, are express, and the Apostle Paul (*in 1 Cor. 10 and 11*) says four times, that we break and eat bread.

We believe, that this bread is the body of Jesus Christ; because he said of that which he broke and gave to his disciples, that it was his body. We neither add to, nor alter the declaration of Scripture. The gospel teaches two things, (1.) that our Lord gave bread and that we ate bread, (2.) that what he gave was his body, and we believe both these assertions. The Romanists do not believe the first. If we could not comprehend how these things can consist with each other, still we should believe them, because we have the Divine testimony. But the gospel explains and removes the difficulty.

(1.) Our Lord having said that the bread which he broke and gave to them, was his body, adds immediately that it is a memorial, (a commemoration) of himself; therefore it was not himself, because a memorial of a person must be different from the person.

(2.) Our Lord also said at the giving of the cup, "This is my blood." Luke and Paul explain or interpret these words thus, "this cup is the New Testament in my blood." We infer, therefore, that

the bread is the body of our Lord in the same sense that the cup is the Testament of our Lord. Now neither a cup nor that which it contains can be a *Testament in substance*, but it may be *in sacrament*,

So the bread cannot be the body of our Lord substantially, but only sacramentally. The Scriptures often give to sacraments and sacred signs, the names of the things signified. Thus circumcision is called the covenant of God, the lamb, the passage, the ark, the eternal, the rock, Christ, baptism, death and burial; and the cup, a covenant.

X. Further, if we must understand the word *cup* in the sense of *blood*, Luke and Paul are not intelligible; for by substituting the word *blood* for *cup*, the passage cited would run thus, "This blood (cup) is the New Testament in my blood." Again: the words "This is my body," are paraphrased by Paul (1 Cor. x. 16) thus, "The bread which we break, is the communion of the body of Christ." Therefore we understand the words "this is my body," to mean "the bread which I break, is the communion of my body." Moreover the word "this" must be understood to be demonstrative of that which our Lord gave to his disciples. But the Evangelists unanimously inform us, that *he took bread* and after having given thanks, *broke it and gave it*. The word *this* points to the bread taken, and we understand the words "This is my body," to mean, *this bread is my body*. But the Roman Catholic church hold that the priest does not break nor eat bread. We hold it to be a memorial of our Lord's death, to be observed *until he come*, (1 Cor. xi. 26.) that is, during *his corporeal absence*, which could not be, if the doctrine of transubstantiation be true, for that teaches that the body of our Lord is *corporeally present*; still, by teaching that the bread and wine are memorials and sacraments of the body of our Lord, we do not reduce them to mere abstract signs. They are not only significative of the grace of God, but also exhibitivè of it, and conjunctive to the participation of that which they signify. They not merely *represent* Christ to us, but *present him*. The bread which we break, *is* the communion of the body of Christ. (1 Cor. x.) But this communion with Christ is spiritual; the Holy Spirit being the medium, teaches us by faith, as Paul says, in Eph. iii. 17,—Christ dwells in your hearts by faith; this accords with the declaration of our Lord in John xiv. 23. These passages shew how our Lord will dwell in us, and how he is present in the sacrament.

XI. *Presence* may be understood in many senses; that which is present to the *eye*, may not be present to the *hand*; that which is present to the *hearing*, may not be so to the *sight*; that which is present to the *body*, may not be so to the *mind*;—things present to the *mind*, are often absent to the *body*; for things are present which make themselves perceptible to our senses or our souls.—Jesus Christ, then, is really present at the sacrament of his supper, when he makes himself perceptible or communicates himself to us. He does not make himself perceptible to our senses, but to our souls. He is, therefore, *really present* to our souls, but not to our bodies. His presence is spiritual, not corporeal as in Romans viii,

XII. Having stated briefly the doctrine of the Calvinistic churches

upon this interesting subject, we proceed now to state the doctrine as taught by the Roman Catholic church.

The Council of Trent (*session 13*) laid down this doctrine in three canons, which in substance are as follows: (1.) That the body and blood of Jesus Christ, together with his soul and Deity, are contained truly, really, and substantially, in the sacrament, and that he is entire in each part of the *species*; that is, in each crumb of the (*hostia*) host, and in each drop of the cup. This is what is termed the *reality* of his presence. (2.) That in this sacrament a conversion of the entire substance of the bread into the body, and of the entire substance of the wine into the blood of our Lord takes place, so that only the *accidents* of the bread and wine remain;—that is, the colour, taste, shape, weight, quantity of the bread, remain, but not the bread. And so of the wine; this conversion is called *transubstantiation*, so that the blood is in the host, and the body in the cup by concomitance; hence the priest, in drinking of the cup, takes the body of our Lord. The catechism of the Council of Trent adds, that the body of Christ does not come to the sacrament—that it does not change place, but that it is there by the conversion of the bread into the body of our Lord. (3.) That *that* which is within the hands of the priest ought to be adored with the worship of *lat-ria* (that is, the worship due to GOD)—that it is proper to order the carrying of it in procession to be adored by the people—that whoever holds the contrary is anathematized. Still the council (Can. 11) add one exception or condition—this *namely*—that to constitute this sacrament, it is indispensable that the priest should *intend* to consecrate and to do what the church does; for they hold that if the priest have not this intention, there is no consecration, and consequently there is no transubstantiation. Hence it may happen from the fault, fraud or inattention of the priest, that the people may adore a *host* not consecrated, and call that GOD which, according to their own doctrine, is only bread; and no one can certainly know the intention of the priest. Pope Innocent III. says as much, (*Extra de Celebratione Missarum Tit. 41, cap. de Homine*) and Adrian VI. (in his book de Quolibets, quest 10, supposito 2,) lays it down, that the host should be adored conditionally; by saying tacitly in his heart, (*adoro te, si tu es Christus*) “I adore thee if thou art Christ,” and he relies on the authority of the Council of Constance. Thomas of Salisberry adds, (*chap. 25, in his book concerning the art of preaching*) that no one ought to believe precisely, that it is the body of the Lord (*Nullus præcisè debet credere hoc esse corpus Domini,*) Now such a condition as this, is inconsistent with faith. Faith is consistent only with *certitude*—it excludes doubt. This is the doctrine of the Apostle James, i. 6, “Let him ask in faith, *nothing doubting.*”

Bellarmino remarks, in reference to the priest's intending to do what the church does, that it is sufficient if the priest intends to do what is done in the church of Geneva, which is as much as to say that in order to effect a transubstantiation, an intention *not* to effect it, is sufficient; for such must be supposed to have been the intention of the church of Geneva.*

* Quid si quis intendat facere, quod facit ecclesia aliqua particularis et falsa, ut Genevensis, et intendit non facere quod facit Ecclesia Romana? Respondeo id etiam sufficere. Bell. lib. 1. de Sacrament, Ca. 27, § Petes.

XIII. This conversion having been made, the accidents, they say, remain without a subject, and they (*i. e.* the accidents) sustain themselves. Pope Innocent explains this in his book about the Mysteries of the Mass, chap. 11. They mean this, *viz.*: that after consecration by the hands of the priest, there is colour, taste, quantity and quality, but nothing which has colour, taste, quantity or quality. The first of these propositions is contained in the catechism of the Council of Trent (*cap de Euchar*) which says of the accidents, *ipsa se, nulla alia re nisa, sustentant*; and Innocent's words are *Est enim hic color et saper et quantitas et qualitas cum nihil alter utro sit coloratum, aut sapidum, quantum, aut quale*. This change, they alledge, is made by virtue of these five words, *hoc est enim corpus meum* (for this is my body) pronounced over the bread, (*i. e.* the substance itself and its accidents,) but which act only on the substance, without transmuting the accidents. These words, according to the catechism of the Council of Trent, are not only significative, but *effective* of the thing signified. Durand (*in his Rational. lib. 4, chap. 35,*) and Innocent III, (*in the third book of the Mysteries of the Mass, chapter 1,*) relate, that formerly, some shepherds having learnt these words by hearing the Mass, uttered them one day over their repast. It was immediately converted into flesh and fire, the lightning descended from heaven and struck them. Bellarmine repeats this narrative with some variations, and defends it, (*in his second book of the Mass, chapter 12.*) To avoid occurrences of this sort, it was ordered, that the words should be pronounced in a low voice, that the people might not learn them.

XIV. In all the Bibles, even in that used by the Roman church, there are but four words, *hoc est corpus meum*. To make the number uneven, the word *enim* has been added; but it must by no means be omitted by the priest. These words are called the words of consecration; but upon this point, the Roman church has changed her faith; for the canon of that church, which begins with the word *corpus*, says, that the consecration is made by the mystical prayer.* But the words "this is my body," are not a prayer, because they are not addressed to God. They are an affirmation only concerning the bread.

XV. A sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace. This is according to the Council of Trent. (Sess. 13, c. 3.) The Roman church teaches, therefore, that after the consecration, the *accidents* are the sign, and that the body of Christ, which is really present, is both the sign and the thing signified; that is, in the Mass, the body of Christ is the *figure* or sign of itself.—See Bellarmine, book 2, chap. 24, who follows ~~the~~ Lanfrancus.

XVI. The doctors of the Roman church, are not agreed upon the meaning of the words "this is my body." Bellarmine admits this, in chap. 11, of the first book concerning the Eucharist. The common opinion, is that of Thomas Aquinas, which Bellarmine adopts; it is this: The words "this is my body," signify *under these species is my body*; so that the word *this*, signifies *under these*, and

* Corpus dicimus illud quod ex fructibus terræ acceptum et prece mysticâ sanctificatum.

demonstrates *indeterminately* the substance, which is under the accidents. This *demonstrative* pronoun being thus *indefinite* is called by them, *individuum vagum*, which, (*individuum*,) however, is arrested, and becomes determinate, by the addition of the word *is*. This is the doctrine of Dominic a Soto, one of the fathers of the Council of Trent,—of Thomas, Bellarmine and others.—*Dominicus a Soto*, in 4 *dis.* 11 *qu.* 1, *art.* 5.

But Bonaventure, and some others, will have it, that these words signify *the bread will become, or be transubstantiated into my body*.—Marsilius, and Occam, and some others, understood by *this*, the body that *shall* be, after the words. But all torture them, and make them figurative; and they are obliged to do so, because they are obliged to confess, that when our Lord pronounced the word *this*, he spoke of bread, which could be only *figuratively* called his body. (*See Thomas 3, quest.* 78, *art.* 5. *Bonaventure*, in 4 *Sententiarum*, *dist.* 8, *qu.* 1. *Marsilius* in 4, *ques.* 6. *art.* 1. *Occam*, *quadlib* 2, *qu.* 19. *Bellarmino*, *lib.* 1, *chap.* 11.)

XVII. As to the *manner* in which Christ is present in the Mass, the Roman Catholic doctors teach; that he is present between the hands of the priest, *in body*, but not *corporeally*, that he is *in that place*, but not *locally*, that he is *in that place*, but he does not *occupy any place*, that his *body* is present, but *spiritually*, that it is great, but not *as great*, having *length* without *extension*, having natural quantity, but not *as* having quantity. Created substances may be within a place *circumscriptively*, as bodies; or *definitively*, as souls and angels, yet they say, that the body of Christ is not present in any such way, but *sacramentally*, that is, in a way appropriate to a sacrament, to which, however, they give no name. They teach, that the entire body is in each particle of the host, as the entire soul is in each part of the body; and that the entire length or stature of our Lord is under a point, without any extension, and not, that one part of the body, is in one part of the host, and another part of the body, in another part of the host; for the entire body, in the dimensions, which it possessed on the cross, is in each particle of the host. And as the mass is often celebrated in a great number of places at once, they hold, that the body of our Lord, is at the same time in heaven, and in an infinite number of places on earth, but not in the space intermediate between heaven and earth.*

XVIII. We pass over the miraculous facts alledged in proof of this doctrine; because the mere statement of them might be imputed to a willingness to employ ridicule, but in truth we feel that it would be irreverent to repeat them in connection with so solemn a subject. The reader may consult the Angelical Doctor Thomas, 3d part, quest. 76, art. 8. Gabriel Biel, upon the canon of the Mass. Paschasius, chap. 14, of the book concerning the body of

* Catechis. Tridentina. Bellarmine, lib. 1, chap. 2. Christus est in Eucharistia vere realiter substantialiter sed non corporaliter, Vide § 3 and § 4. Council of Trent, Sess. 13, chap. 1 Thomas in 3 questione 76, art. 5. Dicendum quod corpus Christi, non est in hoc sacramento defenitive etc., and a little after, non est in hoc sacramento circumscriptive. Bellarmine, lib. 1. chap. 2. sec. 3. Non habet Christus in Eucharistia modum existendi corporum. Sed potius spirituum, cum sit totus in qualibet parte.

our Lord. Bellarmine, lib. 3, chap. 8, concerning the Eucharist. And vol. 4, page 238 of this Magazine.

XIX. Again, the Roman Catholic church teaches that it is not bread which the priest breaks, although we are told (*in Math.* xxvi. 26,) that Jesus took *bread*, and blessed, and brake, and gave to the disciples; and Paul (*1 Cor.* 10) says, the *bread* which he brake.— (*Sole species formaliter videntur tanguntur, franguntur. Bellarmine, lib. 3, chap. 24.*) But it should be observed, that the Roman Catholic priest does not pursue the order which our Saviour did, who brake and gave the bread to his disciples, before he said "this is my body." That church also holds that it is not the body of our Lord that is broken; for that is incapable of suffering, and cannot be broken; but the priest breaks only the colour, taste, quantity, in one word the *accidents* of the bread, (or the *species* of the bread,) which have been separated from the substance. The Latin word *species* signifies the *exterior form and figure* of a substance, but it never signifies taste, weight, hardness, &c. The word is properly used in respect to *one* object only, in the *singular* number, because one body, *can* have but *one exterior form or figure*. But the Roman Catholic church uses this word in this case in the plural, in reference to one thing, *exterior form or figure*; for such a use of the word is necessary to suit its sense to the doctrine.

XX. We pass over the rules which that church has adopted to be observed in case of unforeseen occurrences to the *host*. They are not necessary to the statement of the doctrine. The following brief extracts and references will supply the information which we omit to give. *Species distinguantur et reverenter sumantur et vomitus comburatur et cineres in sactarium recondantur.* See, also, *Decret. part. 3, de consec. 94, Penitential Canons, at the end of the decree, sec. 42. Quando mus corridit vel comedit corpus Christi.*

The Roman Penitential, *tit. 5. chap. 7. Fecisti vomitum corporis et sanguinis Domini propter ebrietatem, carinam unam paniteas.*— (*Carinam* is quadraguita dies; hence Quarantine Angl.) *Decret. part 3, de consec. dist. 2. (§ 28.) Si per ebrietatem vel voracitatem Eucharistiam, evomerit, &c.* Some hold that a second transubstantiation, or re-transubstantiation into bread may take place, but Thomas (*in quest. 80, art. 3*) denies it.* The doctors of that church hold that after the wine has been consecrated, if it congeals, it is not the blood, but only the accidents of the wine which congeal, *i. e.* the lines, figure, taste, weight, &c.—*See, also, Innocent III, lib. 4, chap. 16.* (Book concerning the Mysteries of the Mass.) He is followed by all the doctors of that church, (*Bellarmino, chap. 8, of the second book concerning the Eucharist, sec. ad Secundum,*) who are contrary to the gloss of the canon *Tribus gradibus 2, De Consecr. Bellarmine, lib. 3, de Euchar. chap. 8, sec. 4.* We might add other references, but we feel an invincible repugnance to the mere statement of this kind of doctrine, though the books referred to have received the approbation of popes, universities and faculties of theology.

* Quidam dixerunt quod statim cum sacramentum tangitur, a mure vel cane, desinit ibi esse corpus Christi, quod derogat veri tati sacramenti,—animal brutum per accidens corpus Christi manducat.

XXI. We are very glad to have reached another general topic. Having stated the doctrine of the Calvinistic churches and the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church upon the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, it is in order now to show the sentiments of the fathers (as they are called) of the Catholic church. It will be found that although some of them have mistaken the doctrine in some respects, yet they by no means teach what the Roman Catholic church has taught for several ages. We do not use the fathers as authority, for we have the scripture; and they taught many things which we cannot assent to. Besides, the writings of the fathers have been in many places falsified in order to countenance more modern superstitions. But we must preface this part of the subject with a brief account of the customs and of the belief of the church during the times in which the fathers lived.

XXII. Jerome (in 1 Cor. xi.) says, that after the communion, they made a common repast at which all that remained of the sacrifices was eaten.* Now would this use have been made of the remains of the Eucharist if they had believed the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as it has been stated (ante. xii.)? Justin Martyr, who wrote A. D. 150, in his second apology narrates the manner of celebrating the sacrament in his time, but he says nothing of elevating the host nor of its adoration. He says all present communicated in both species. "Those," says he, "who are called deacons amongst us, give to each one of the persons present, *some bread and some wine* with water, consecrated by thanksgiving, and they carried some to the absent." Here we observe, that Justin calls that which was given to the people *bread and wine*, and he ascribes the consecration to the thanksgiving in the prayer.

Dionysius, improperly called the Areopagite, in his book concerning the ecclesiastical hierarchy, (chap. 3,) describes exactly the ceremonies used in the sacrament in his time, *i. e.* some 500 years after Christ. But he says nothing about the adoration of the *hostia* nor about elevating it, nor about a change in the substance of the bread: On the contrary, he says that all were invited to communicate in the sacred symbols which he calls *θεια, σημεϊα & αντιτυπα* (divine symbols and figures.)

Hesychius, book 2, upon Leviticus, (chap. viii.) says that the custom was to burn the remains of the Eucharist. If they had believed the doctrine of Transubstantiation it would have been impiety and a profanation to burn them.

Evagrius (*lib. 4, of his Hist. Eccles. chap. 35; in the Greek chap. 36,*) says, that the ancient custom of the church at Constantinople was, to give the remains of the body of the Lord to the little children who frequented the school. Necephorus (*lib. 17, chap. 25,*) says the same thing.† We deduce the same inference from this, as from the passage in Hesychius.

[To be Continued.]

* *Past communionem quaecumque de sacrificiis superfuissent illic in ecclesia communem coenam comedentes pariter consumebant.*

† "*Vetus fuit consuetudo Constantinopoli, ut si quando multae particulae corporis Christi superessent pueri impuberes, quicholas frequentabant arcesserentur easque manducarent.*"

[Chap. III. Continued from page 425.]

THE RELATIONS OF ADAM TO HIS POSTERITY, WITH THE
MODE OF CONSTITUTING THEM.

SEC. VI. *The mode of Constituting the Representative Relation.*

OFFICIAL stations may be occupied by men whose labours may be useful to the public and honourable to themselves, and yet in whose appointment there may have been some irregularity. Paul himself was not called to the apostleship in the same way as were the other apostles. If therefore the question be raised, about the mode of constituting the relations official and moral of any individual, we shall find that great diversity exists whilst the reality of the thing is acknowledged. The social and moral system of even our country is susceptible of considerable variety. In our own State, for example, the Governor, who represents the whole commonwealth, is appointed by the bare plurality of qualified voters who may and shall choose to vote, though that plurality may be a minority of all the votes polled, and may not be one-twentieth part of the entire population. And yet no man who did not attend the election—no woman or minor or foreigner, or other disqualified person, thinks of challenging the Governor's authority, because he did not vote; or because he was not permitted so to do. In the state of New Jersey, the Governor is elected by the Legislature. The President of the United States is appointed in still a different manner. And thus it is in almost all departments of our political system. Different modes of creating the representative relation exist: different qualifications for office and for elector exist: but in all women are excluded. The conditions also, of the term of office, both as to duration and extent of honour, are infinitely diversified. In some it is for a single year or even less; in others for a term of years; in others for life.

Now, the point to which your special attention is invited, is this, viz: that no diversity as to the manner of constituting the relations of representer and represented, destroys or invalidates the acts of the representative. A notable instance of this has recently occupied the world's attention and received its sanction. The late French indemnity, the refusal to pay which, had well nigh lighted up the torch of a bloody war, was for acts of violence to American property, under the reign of Napoleon. In pressing our claims, it was alledged, that the imperial government, however irregularly constituted, was in fact the representative of the French nation, and therefore, that nation was bound to pay for all its spoliations on American property. The voice of reason and the force of truth, more resistless than the swords of Napoleon and Wellington both, prevailed. The French government and people, and the world confessed, that even great irregularity in constituting the representative, did not nullify his acts.

With these views before us, we may meet the question of mode, as to Adam's becoming the representative of the race. And we see, (1) at once, it was not by a popular election, wherein a bare plurality of votes decides the question. When this arrangement was entered into, there was no man upon earth but Adam; there could be no such election.

(2.) Yet no doubt, had God withholden this covenant until the race had been developed, so that the globe should have been covered with the sons and daughters of Adam, all living in perfect holiness and harmony and love: and had God then made proclamation to the race and proposed to grant them confirmation in eternal felicity upon the simple condition, that one of their number should stand such a trial as he would prescribe; and had there been a general election and every son and daughter of Adam been called on for his vote, the venerable Father of the whole, would have been unanimously chosen. Without one dissenting voice, no doubt, the exclamation would have been, Who so fit for such a trial and to secure such glorious results as the Father of us all? But not thus did God proceed: he chose himself, the representative of the race; and what would have been wisdom in holy men, cannot be folly with God.

(3.) Hence we see, the unreasonableness of objecting to the doctrine of Adam's representative character, because we had no voice in his appointment. If I am not mistaken this is one of the most serious objections to the whole doctrine. We feel it to be hard, men say, that a man should act for us before we were born, and that for his acts we should be exposed to suffering and death, when it was impossible, and accordingly, we did not appoint him, and gave no expression of consent to his deed. To which objection we present three distinct replies; (1.) Had you been present and been called on for your vote, you would undoubtedly have appointed Adam to act for you; your objecting now, is therefore unreasonable, and is a result of your sinfulness. (2.) God knows better what is good for man than he does himself. He lacked neither wisdom nor goodness to direct his choice of a representative to stand or fall for the race. (3.) Your not having an actual and personal choice in appointing Adam as your representative, is no valid objection to that doctrine, and that it is not, is evident from the general practices of the freest people on earth. Do not the laws of our country bind all our citizens, whether they have voted for the representatives or not? Are not all minors, all women, cut off from the elective franchise? And do not they feel the binding obligations of our laws? If arraigned for any offence, can they plead in bar, that they never gave their consent to them—they had no voice in choosing the representatives who enacted them? Clearly, there exists no government, however democratic, wherein, every individual's personal assent is essential to the existence of the representative relation and to the authority of the law. On the contrary, the most determined opposition to the law and the man who made it, does not free men from its obligation. Suppose the Pennsylvania internal improvement debt to remain unliquidated, for a hundred years to come; and the stock wholly, as now in the hands

of foreigners; could the generation that will then be, object to its payment, on the grounds that their fathers were opposed to it, and that they themselves never voted for the men who contracted this debt? If you may not be justly bound by the act of Adam, because you did not appoint him to act for you, how can you be bound by the act of the men who contracted this debt? How can you be bound by the act of the men who signed a treaty a hundred years before you were born? Thus you see the principle which subverts the covenant of works, subverts also, the entire commercial and political foundations of human society.

But let us not be understood in those replies, to rest the cause on their efficiency. By no means. It rests on the broad foundation of God's truth. He chose Adam to represent his whole race, and Adam wisely acquiesced in the choice: nor did opposition to his election ever occur until sin produced it. Had Adam stood and all the race been at this moment basking in the sunshine of heaven's love, not a tongue had till this hour moved; not a voice had been lifted in opposition.

SEC. V. The moral relation of Adam to his posterity, viz: as head of the covenant, is principal; and his physical relation, viz: as natural progenitor, is subservient thereto; and not vice versa.

If I am not much mistaken, a frequent mode of speech on this subject conveys the idea that the moral relation of Adam's posterity to him is denominated a physical connexion by natural generation. There was a seminal inhering of all men in Adam; as the future oak is wrapped up in the acorn; and this acorn, with its continual miniature tree, and all the other acorns produced from the same oak, were seminally in the acorn from which that oak sprang; and thus, all trees were seminally in the first acorn. So with Adam. Hence we hear of all human beings, as merely "Adam developed," unrolled as it were. Now to this theory, in itself considered, it is not necessary here to raise objections. Its application in morals, is that to which I object. It is supposed that this seminal or germinic unity, accounts for the moral relations of the covenant of works and the doctrine of representation. All men were present in Adam, and hence can be held responsible for his acts. To this it may be answered, that it would require the theory to run a little farther, viz: that all souls of men were in Adam's body—a dream of the theorising fraternity which has had its day, and like the baseless fabric of other visions has passed off. So far, however, from explaining representation, this theory destroys the doctrine altogether. For if all souls were in Adam and acted in him, then there could be no federal representation; because each man being present, there was no room for another to act for him, he acted for himself. Hence it is obvious, that the theory of all souls and that of all bodies and that of both souls and bodies being present in Adam, are as inefficient towards accounting for the sin and misery of his race, as they are visionary and without foundation in themselves.

In opposition to these, I maintain, that the moral connexion with Adam is the principal, both in the order of importance and of nature—that God first determined to create rational souls, who

should be for a time connected with bodies material—should then be tried, and being left unrestrained by divine power, should fall—that they should be put under a remedial law, and a part of them be recovered to a state of holy and gracious acceptance with Him, and taken from the body to heaven, and subsequently the body should be raised, and the entire redeemed persons be made the instruments of reflecting the glory of God's mercy forever—that this last is the main design of the creation of our world and peopling it with life, vegetable, animal and rational. Now, I believe that the soul and its relations are paramount—the moral connexion of all men with Adam is the principal, and the mere physical and animal connexion is an incidental circumstance—no more than the incidental matter of scaffolding to the building. The building rests on its own foundation, and the scaffolding is necessary in its place. God's moral creation and the great moral constitution, viz: the covenant of works is the building, whose entire body consists of all human persons. These human persons are the component parts of the structure, and the great builder sees proper to bring each to its position by the material mechanism according to whose laws the human race exists. Hence, I infer, that to make the *natural* connexion with Adam, the basis of the moral, is to found the building upon the scaffolding—to make the mere physical connexion the reason of the representative relation, is to interchange the cause and effect. A few distinct remarks seem necessary to illustrate my meaning.

1. The soul or spirit is of more importance than the body. The redemption of the soul is precious, and its value is seen in the ransom that is paid for it. Ye are not redeemed with corruptible things, such as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.—The infinite price bespeaks the estimate of the soul in the mind of him who paid it. What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? It is entirely superfluous to occupy time in proof of this remark. Its truth is readily conceded by all who feel that they have souls to be saved or lost. How far a correct belief prevails in practice is another thing; but in the theory, all except atheists and materialists agree. The spirit is valuable above the flesh.

2. The soul will exist, in a state of blessedness or of misery, apart from the body. "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise." It is therefore not dependent on the body either for its existence or for the consciousness of that existence. Its moral relations therefore do not depend absolutely and necessarily upon its material connexions. Those exist after these have ceased. The soul apart from the body stands in the same relation to Adam and to Christ, as when connected with it. Why then should it be supposed that the moral connexion with Adam is dependent upon and results from the natural? Why not rather believe that the natural relation results from and is dependent upon the moral?—That the body is produced, and lives and dies and will revive again mainly to subserve the interests of the soul?

3. The principal of these remarks is applicable to the whole material fabric of the world.

All things are yours—the whole structure is adapted to the development of the intellectual and moral powers of man, and for this end are they put under his government. He is Lord of all below, that by a right use of them he may expand the powers of his immortal part, and fit it for its permanent state of residence. True, the material universe contains much beauty and order; many manifestations of the divine power and wisdom, and may be said to have had this in view. But the powers of mind and heart which can discover these beauties and kindle to devotion, belong to the soul only, and make their approaches to perfection by the legitimate use of all things placed within our view. “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handy work,” but to whom? to mere animal nature! It is manifest that the soul only is capable of perceiving their beauties: and if so, they were surely created for its advantage.

Thus, from the analogies of the case, we conclude, that all material things, animate and inanimate, are subservient, and ought to be subservient to the interests of the soul. In very deed, the grand purpose for which this world exists, is to display the glory of God’s mercy. The Bible represents God as having purposed, before creation, such a display. Speaking of God’s believing people, the great apostle informs us that God the Father gave them a high character among the heavenly inhabitants, and *that*, before the creation of the world.—“Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly *places* [among the heavenly inhabitants.] According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world.” This eternal purpose or decree in the order of nature, is anterior to its execution; and between the purpose and its fulfilment, in the actual sanctification of his people, lie the creation and adjustment of the whole material system, including the bodies of all men. All this must be as a means toward the accomplishment of the grand end. Other worlds displayed the wisdom, power and goodness of God, and these less or more shine forth from the ball we inhabit. But *mercy*—boundless benevolence toward sinful creatures—this attribute was unknown, for aught we know, in all creation. To reveal this, this world was spoken into existence—man was created—the covenant was made with him—he was permitted to fall—the gospel was preached to him—and the entire system of divine truth and ordinances was established. No man, I apprehend, has or can have just and adequate conceptions of the condescension and benevolence of God, and of the scheme of his providence and grace, who does not transport himself in imagination away back beyond the period of the world’s creation, and there contemplate the councils of infinite wisdom planning the whole. In such exercises was the enraptured prophet engaged when he exclaimed “O Lord, thou art my God; I will exalt thee, I will praise thy name: for thou hast done wonderful things; thy councils of old are faithfulness and truth.” (Isa. xxv. 1) And when he introduces God as exhibiting the same views. “I am God, and there is none like me; declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, my council shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.” (Isa. xlvi. 9, 10.) And again, “I am the

first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God; and who, as I, shall call, and shall declare it, and set it in order for me, since I appointed the ancient people? And the things that are coming and shall come, let them shew unto me." (Isa. xlv. 6, 7.) Thus transported beyond the period when time began and motion first measured it, you behold the councils of infinite wisdom, devising the glorious scheme for the display of mercy, and selecting its objects, "according as He hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world,"—you hear Jesus, in that blessed council, offering himself, "Lo I come—to do thy will O God, I take delight;" you see his appointment by the Father; you hear the eternal word pronounced, and see the world of matter spring into being, as the instrument and means of displaying mercy; as the theatre on which is to be acted the splendid drama, whose middle scene you witness on Calvary, and whose closing act you will witness, when in the light of this flaming globe, you shall behold the judgment set, and the books opened. You see the mortal, and yet immortal race of man, "midway from nothing to the Deity," "a God, a worm"—waking into life under the breathing of the spirit, pressing onward in a long succession of ages towards his destined abode. You see his living spirit—a being entirely distinct like Adam, from the fleshly tabernacles, connected for a time with its earthly house and then pass onward toward the divine throne. For the accomplishment of this glorious display—for gathering in the hearts of God's people over all the world, you see nations rise and fall; continents and islands discovered and peopled and Christianised; peace and war; agriculture and commerce; literature and science; arts and manufactures; the entire frame of human society and all its complicated machinery running their perpetual round.

All—all these are to terminate; they all work in the hands of God our Redeemer, to the one grand and glorious end—the *display of divine mercy*, to the admiration of the intelligent universe.

Now with such views, is it possible for a man to cherish the belief, that any real or supposed natural, physical, material identity or oneness with Adam, can account for our being affected for good or ill, by his first act? Is it credible, even supposing the ineffable absurdity, that there is a certain germ or particle of matter in my body that was in Adam's body when he sinned—suppose this absurdity to be true, is it credible that this is the reason why I am morally accountable for his acts!

Take the doctrine of the infinite divisibility of matter, and let Adam be so divided as to give a particle of his material essence to every one of his descendants to the end of time, can any man found his belief of the moral relations upon the physical connexion? Is it the physical unity between a man and his children, that makes him in a certain respect, their representative? Can there be pointed out a single case, in all the moral arrangements of human society, in which such unity is the basis of representation? Who believes that his representative in Congress, in the state Legislature, in all the departments of government, in church and state, is such because of a material unity!

But I forbear. The absurdity sickens our imagination and reason flouts it. And yet, notwithstanding, grave theologians have spoken of the physical or material connexion with Adam, as constituting the basis of our moral relations; and attempts are made to fasten this absurdity upon no less a man than President Edwards.— This attempt you may see refuted in "The Vindication" which I published some time since, on pages 80 and 81, where the references to Edwards, will direct you to the parts of his work which bear on the subject. You will see that the identity which he maintained, to use his very words, is "in relation to the covenant"—"there being a *constituted oneness or identity*,"—"that God, in his institution with Adam, dealt with him as a *public* person—as the head of his species"—"as the moral *head* of his posterity." These *italics* are Edward's own, and unquestionably they, and the phrase "moral head," were designed to point out a covenant, a federal, or moral headship, in contradistinction from the natural headship or physical connexion as the parent of their mere animal nature.

In conclusion, to sum up and apply; we see, that the general doctrine of representation is indiscribably simple; that it involves, or rather is founded on the doctrine of a moral unity between distinct persons; that this is a simple and original element in morals; that it is contained in the essential laws of human nature, and in the Bible; that human society of no description could exist without it; that especially does it pervade all departments of our free institutions, and is essential to their freedom; that Adam was in fact, the moral head of his posterity, representing them, and acting for them; that this moral headship was created by a divinely instituted covenant, in concurrence with human volition; that this federal representative relationship of Adam to all human persons is the principal, and his physical or natural headship is subservient thereto; that indeed our whole material world, including the bodies of all men, exists in subserviency to our moral world, which was brought into being for the grand and glorious purpose of holding up the illustrious attribute of Divine MERCY, to the wondering gaze of the intelligent universe.

We close the chapter, with two reflections.

1. The great principles of religion, morals, and politics, are not diverse but identical. In God's covenant with Adam, commonly called "the covenant of works," are contained and taught, the great substance of all politics, morals and religion, so far as natural religion—or the religion of man's primitive state is concerned.— And we shall see hereafter, if God will, that the covenant of grace introduces no new moral principle, but merely applies those of the other covenant in a new case.

2. Mark the condescension, and wisdom, and goodness, and love of God, in making the principles on which our eternal salvation must be secured, essentially necessary to our social existence, our civil and political well-being. How ought we to wonder at such condescension? To admire such wisdom? To melt in view of such goodness? To kindle in rapturous devotion and unfeigned thanksgiving, at such *love*?