

THE  
BALTIMORE LITERARY  
AND  
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

---

VOL. IV.

DECEMBER 1838.

No. 12.

---

THE GENERAL COUNCILS : WITH THEIR PRINCIPAL DECREES.  
No. III.

*Decrees of Councils of the first Seven Centuries.*

I. COUNCIL OF NICE, A. D. 315.

CANON VI.—(*Against the Usurpation of the Bishop of Rome.*)

IT is most fitting that a bishop be appointed by all the bishops in the province. But if this be difficult, by reason of any urgent necessity, or through the length of the way, three must by all means meet together, and when those who are absent have agreed in their votes, and signified the same by letters, then let the ordination take place. But in every province the ratification of what is done, must be allowed to the metropolitan.—*Conc. ii. 29.*

CANON VI.—(*Against the Usurpation of the Bishop of Rome.*)

Let the ancient customs prevail, which are in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority over all, since this is customary also to the Bishop of Rome. In like manner also as regards Antioch, and in all the other provinces, let the churches preserve their dignity. This is altogether certain, that if any one become a bishop without the consent of the Metropolitan; the great Synod has determined that he ought not to be a bishop.—*Conc. ii. 32.*

FROM GELAUSIUS'S HISTORY OF THE NICENE COUNCIL, *Book ii. Chap. 32.*

(*Against the constrained Celibacy of the Clergy.*)

They wrote a decree therefore concerning its not being right that those of the priesthood, whether bishops or presbyters, or deacons, or sub-deacons, or any one of the priestly list, should sleep with the wives which they had married while they were laymen. These

things being thus fashioned, the divine Paphnutius, standing in the midst of the crowd of bishops, cried with a loud voice, and said, "Do not make the yoke of the priesthood grievous; for it says, 'marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled.' Take heed, lest by an excess of severity ye rather injure the church; for it says, all men cannot endure the denial of all the affections. No one, I think, will be preserved in chastity, when men are deprived of their own wives. But I consider a man's intercourse with his lawful wife to be excellent chastity; and that she cannot be separated whom God has joined, and whom the man, when a reader, or singer, or layman, has once married." And these things the great Paphnutius spake, though he was himself unmarried, having been brought up in a monastery from his childhood. Wherefore the whole assembly of bishops being persuaded by the man's advice, ceased from that question, and left it to the judgment of all, who were so disposed, by mutual consent to abstain from their own wives.—*Conc. ii. 246—8.*

## II. COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE I. A. D. 381.

### CANON II.—(*Against the Usurpations of the Bishop of Rome.*)

Let not the bishops go out of their diocese (patriarchate), to churches beyond their bounds, nor cause a confusion of churches; but, according to the canons, let the Bishop of Alexandria order the affairs in Egypt only; and the bishops of the East, the East only; saving the dignity to the church of Antioch, expressed in the canons of Nice, &c.

Let not the bishops go out of the diocese for ordination, or any other ecclesiastical offices, unless they are summoned; but, observing the above-written canon concerning dioceses, it is clear, that the synod of each province will manage the affairs of the province according to the decrees of Nice.—*Conc. ii. 947.*

### CANON III.—(*Against the claim of the Bishop of Rome, as successor to St. Peter.*)

Let the Bishop of Constantinople have rank, next after the Bishop of Rome, for Constantinople is new Rome.—*Conc. ii. 947.*

### CANON VI.—(*Against the Intrusion of the Roman Bishops and Clergy, into the English Diocese.*)

. . . . . By heretics we mean, both those who have formerly been declared so by the church, and those who have since been anathematized by us; and, in addition to these, those who, while they pretend to confess to sound faith, have separated themselves and made congregations contrary to our canonical bishops. . . .  
 . . . —*Conc. ii. 950.*

### FROM THE SYNODICAL EPISTLE OF THE BISHOPS AT CONSTANTINOPLE, TO THE WESTERN BISHOPS ASSEMBLED AT ROME.

### (*Against the Claim of the Church of Rome to be considered the Mother of all Churches.*)

"We acknowledge the most venerable Cyril, most beloved of God, to be Bishop of the church of Jerusalem, which is the mother of all churches."—*Conc. ii. 966.*

## III. COUNCIL OF EPHEBUS, A. D. 438.

## ACTION 6.—DECREE OF THE SYNOD CONCERNING THE FAITH.

*(Against the Creed of Pope Pius.)*

The holy Synod determined that it should not be lawful for any one to set forth, write, or compose any other creed than that which was determined by the holy fathers who assembled at Nice in the Holy Ghost: and that if any shall dare to compose any other creed, or adduce or present it to those who are willing to be converted to the knowledge of the truth, either from heathenism or Judaism, or any heresy whatsoever; such persons, if bishops, shall be deprived of their episcopal office, if clergy, of the clerical, &c.—*Conc.* iii. 689.

## ACTION 7.—DECREE OF THE SANOD, COMMONLY CALLED THE EIGHTH CANON.

*(Against the Usurpations of the Bishop of Rome.)*

Our fellow Bishop Rheginus, beloved of God, and the bishops of the province of Cyprus, who are with him, Zeno and Evagrius, beloved of God, have declared a transaction which innovates against the ecclesiastical rules and canons of the holy Fathers, and which touches the liberty of all. Wherefore, since common disorders require a more effectual remedy, as being more productive of greater injury, and especially since there is no ancient custom alledged for the Bishop of Antioch ordaining in Cyprus, as these pious men, who have had access to the Holy Synod, have shown both by books and word of mouth, the prelates of the churches in Cyprus shall have the right uninjured and inviolate, according to the canons of the sacred Fathers, and the ancient customs, themselves to confer orders upon the pious bishops; and the same shall be observed in all other dioceses (patriarchates) and provinces whatsoever: so that none of the bishops, beloved of God, take another province, which has not been formerly and from the beginning subject to him. But if any one has taken another, and by force has placed it under his control, he shall restore it; that the canons of the Fathers be not transgressed, nor the pride of worldly power be introduced under the cloak of the priesthood, nor we by degrees come to lose that liberty wherewith our Lord Jesus Christ, the deliverer of all men, has endowed us by His own blood. It seemed good, therefore, to the holy and general synod, that the proper rights of each province, which have before time from the beginning, by ancient custom, belonged to it, be preserved to it pure and inviolate.—*Conc.* iii. 802.

## IV.—COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, A. D. 451.

## ACTION 5.—DECREE CONCERNING THE FAITH.

*(Against the Creed of Pope Pius.)*

This is a repetition of the decree of the first Council of Ephesus, given above.

## ACTION 15.

CANON I.—We have thought it right that those canons should be observed which have been set forth by the holy *Fathers*, in every synod, up to this time.—*Conc.* iv. 755.

*Neocæsarea.*

CANON I.—(*Against the Marriage and Impurity of Clergy after they are in orders.*)

If a presbyter marry, let him be degraded. But if he commit fornication or adultery, let him be thrust out altogether, and brought to repentance.—*Conc. i. 1479.*

*Gangra.*

CANON IV.—(*Against the Decrees of the Second Council of Lateran.*)

If any one shall contend against a married presbyter, that it is not fitting to communicate in the oblation when he celebrates the holy offices, let him be accursed.—*Conc. ii. 419.*

*Antioch.*

CANON XII.—(*Against Appeals to Rome.*)

If any presbyter or deacon, being deposed by his own bishop, or a bishop being deposed by the synod, shall dare to trouble the emperor's ears, it is right that he be referred to a greater synod of bishops, and set forth before more bishops that which he thinks appertains to justice, and await their examination and judgment. But if, despising these, he trouble the emperor, let him be judged unworthy of pardon, nor let him have room for defence nor hope for future restitution.—*Conc. ii. 568.*

CANON XXII.—(*Against the Intrusion of the Roman Bishops.*)

Let not a bishop go into another city or district not pertaining to him, to ordain any one, or to appoint any presbyters or deacons to places subject to another bishop, unless with the consent of the proper bishop of the district. If any one dare to do otherwise, let the ordination be invalid, and himself be punished by the synod.—*Conc. ii. 572.*

*Laodiceæ.*

CANON XXXV.—(*Against the Invocation of Angels.*)

It does not behove Christians to leave the church of God, and go and invoke angels, and make assemblies : which things are forbidden. If, therefore, any one be detected idling in their secret idolatry, let him be accursed, because he has forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and gone to idolatry.—*Conc. i. 1504.*

CANON XLIX.—(*Against Transubstantiation.*)

That it is not right to offer *bread in Lent*, except only on the Sabbath, and Lord's Day.—*Conc. i. 1505:*

CANON LIX.—(*Against the Apochrapha, the Legends and the Homilies.*)

That it is not right that private psalms, or uncanonical books should be read in the church, but only the canonical books of the New and Old Testament.—*Conc. i. 5007.*

CANON LX.—(*Against the Roman Canon of Scripture.*)

These are the books which ought to be read from the Old Testament; 1, Genesis; 2, Exodus from Egypt; 3, Leviticus; 4, Numbers; 5, Deuteronomy; 6, Joshua; 7, Judges and Ruth; 8, Esther; 9, Kings, first and second; 10, Kings, third and fourth; 11, Chronicles, first and second; 12, Ezra, first and second\*; 13, the Book of Psalms, 150; 14, Proverbs of Solomon, 15, Ecclesiastes; 16, Song of Solomon; 17, Job; 18, Twelve prophets; 19, Isaiah; 20, Jeremiah; [and Baruch, Lamentations, and Epistles;] 21, Ezekiel; 22, Daniel.—*Conc. i. 5007.*

## CHALCEDON resumed.

CANON IX.—(*Against the Roman Supremacy.*)

If one clergyman have a matter against another, let him not leave his own bishop and go to the secular courts; but first let him lay open the cause before his own bishop; or else, with the consent of the same bishop, before those who shall be chosen by both parties. But, if any one shall do contrary to this, let him be subjected to canonical censure. If any clergyman have a matter against his own bishop, or against another, let it be judged by the synod of the province. But if a bishop or clergyman have a dispute with the Metropolitan of the province, let him have access either to the Exarch of the Diocese, or to the throne of the Imperial Constantinople, and let it be there judged.—*Conc. iv. 759.*

CANON XXVIII.—(*Against the Roman Precedency.*)

We, every where following the decrees of the holy Fathers, and acknowledging the canon which has been just read of the 150 bishops most dear to God, do also ourselves decree and vote the same things concerning the precedency of the most Holy Church of Constantinople, New Rome; for the Fathers, with reason, gave precedency to the throne of Old Rome, because it was the imperial city: and the 150 bishops beloved of God, moved by the same consideration, awarded equal precedency to the most holy throne of New Rome, reasonably judging that a city which is honoured with the government and senate, should enjoy equal rank with the ancient Queen Rome; and, like her, be magnified in ecclesiastical matters, having the second place after her: but so that the Metropolitans alone of the Pontic, Asiatic, and Thracian dioceses, and also the bishops among the barbarians in the said dioceses, should be ordained by the aforesaid most holy throne of the Holy Church of Constantinople; to wit, that each Metropolitan of the said dioceses, with the bishops of the province, as it is stated in the divine canons; but that the Metropolitans of the said dioceses, as has been said, be ordained by the Archbishop of Constantinople, where there has been an agreement in the election, according to custom, and a report been made to him.—*Conc. iv. 770.*

\* i. e. Ezra and Nehemiah.

## VI. COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE, III. A. D. 680.

FROM THE 13th ACTION.—(*Against Papal Infallibility.*)

. . . In addition to these we acknowledge also Honorius, who was formerly Pope of Old Rome, to be among those cast out of the Holy Church of God, and anathematized, because we find, from his letters to Sergius, that he altogether followed his opinions and confirmed his impious dogmas.—*Conc.* vi. 943.

FROM THE 14th ACTION.—(*A Pope's writings ordered to be burnt.*)

The Holy Synod said, let the devout deacon George, the keeper of the records of this great and holy church, bring here before us the books which he mentioned, and other papers relating to the present doctrinal disturbance, that, when we have examined them, if we find them contrary to orthodoxy, we may order them to be destroyed in a fitting manner. And let the same George deliver the Latin Epistle of Honorius, formerly Pope of Rome, which he said he had just found and has in his possession, together with the interpretation of it; to be read, in order that we may have knowledge of these things. And this Latin Epistle of Honorius was produced. . . .

The Holy Synod exclaimed, after having examined the books and papers and other compositions presented to us by George. . . . We find that they all relate to one and the same impiety; and we direct that they be immediately burned, as profane and hurtful to the souls of men. And they were burned.—*Conc.* vi. 967—971.

FROM THE 17th ACTION.—(*A Pope Anathematized.*)

. . . They all exclaimed . . . anathema to the heretic Honorius!—*Conc.* vi. 1010.

## ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH ABROAD.

## No. IX.

*Effect of Maynooth College upon the Character of the Roman Catholic Clergy.*

THAT a great change has taken place in the political character of the priests within the last forty years, especially in Great Britain and the United States, is a matter of historical fact; and that it is to be traced, in part, to the influence of the system of education pursued at Maynooth, is not the prejudiced assertion of the opponents of Roman Catholics, but the testimony of their own leaders and friends.

The fact and the mode of accounting for it are thus briefly stated by Mr. O'Connell, in his examination before a committee of the House of Commons, March 4th, 1825. In answer to the question,

"Have you observed any difference in the loyalty of priests who have been educated abroad, and those who have been educated in Ireland?" he replied,—

"No, *with this exception*; the priests who were educated in France were old, I may say, when I became a man, and they had a natural abhorrence of the French revolution, which bore so much on the Catholic clergy. They were very strong anti-Jacobins, if I may use the expression. By that means there was among them a great deal of what is called ultra-royalism; but, with the priests educated at *Maynooth*, the anti-Jacobin feeling is gone by, and they are more identified with *the people*, and therefore, in the phrase that is *usually called loyalty*, they do not come within the description of it so much as the priests educated in France, for that reason; but then, in the time of my father and uncle, the priests educated in France were Jacobites. They were *enemies* to a certain extent; while they submitted to the laws, their own opinions ran against the succession of the present family on the throne; and they were perhaps dangerous before the French revolution in that respect."

That is to say, the old Roman Catholic clergy were rebels at heart, and Mr. O'Connell with respect to loyalty observes "no difference" between them and the *Maynooth* priests; the only exception is, that the old were attached to the exiled royal family, the young are "more identified with the people," and do not come within the description of what is "usually called loyalty." There is another difference arising out of this, the former inculcated passive obedience, "they submitted to the laws; the latter teach passive resistance.

The history of the progress of this change, and its connexion with the education received at *Maynooth*, are thus recorded by Mr. Wise, a Roman Catholic gentleman, and member of Parliament for the county of Waterford.—*Hist. Sketch of the late Catholic Asso. of Ireland.*

The first effort of the Irish Roman Catholics to regain political power, after the abdication of James II., was made in 1753 under the leadership of Mr. Charles O'Conner, Dr. Curry, and Mr. Wyse.

These fathers of the cause, says Mr. Wise, vol. i. p. 49, 55, had many and nearly insurmountable difficulties to contend with. They first looked to the aristocracy, with whom, both by habits and birth, they were more intimately associated, and subsequently, though with less expectation of concurrence, to the clergy. The people were still, if I may so express it, in obedience; not only were they passed over in all late acts of a coercive tendency, but they were not even invoked by the sympathy or hopes of their regenerators. But from the *clergy* and aristocracy they received nothing but coolness, and sneers, and disappointments. . . . Forced by the impolicy of the legislature abroad, they [the clergy] had, in many instances, been educated under the immediate influence of the court and principles of the Stuarts. The passive obedience doctrines of that despotic school had been sanctified in their minds by every stirring circumstance of former sacrifice, and by every additional stimulant of actual suffering and wrong. They would not risk *le bien pour le mieux*; deeming even an interval of suffering, leniency, and an absence of pain repose. In the first very effort for the redemp-

tion of the Catholic, every opposition was made to the regenerators: nor is it probable that, for many years after, any similar attempt would have proved successful, had not in a quarter least suspected of any disposition to such coalition, new materials for the nucleus of the future body offered themselves, nearly formed to their hands. The aristocracy and *the clergy* not only had refused all aid collectively and individually to the projected measures, but had strongly deprecated all efforts for redress. Their exertions, natural under the circumstances, were fortunately inefficient. A third body arose, if not more weighty in intrinsic consequence and influence, from the strong elements of activity and energy which had been generated within them by their daily habits, infinitely more intelligent and powerful. While the estates of the aristocracy were mouldering away by the slow, but certain attrition of the gavel act, there was gradually arising behind them, and in some instances taking their place, a new order of men, enriched by commerce, unimpoverished by the rebellion of their children, unplundered by legal inquiry, and tolerated, even in their advancing affluence, by the wants and necessities of their enemies themselves.

"The merchants of Dublin were its [the society formed by O'Connor, Curry and Wyse] first, and for some time its sole members. It was the first collection of individual Catholics since the revolution, who dared to meet and consult on Catholic affairs. The gentry and *clergy* not only kept themselves cautiously and reprehensibly aloof, and scorned all connexion with its members, but laughed contemptuously at its labours, and interposed every obstacle to prevent, to discourage, to neutralize its success."

"On the accession of George III. Mr. O'Conner, by direction of the Committee, drew up an "Address to the King," which was approved of, and signed in almost every part of the country. Not less than 600 names were annexed. But the lords and *clergy*, particularly the nobility of Meath and Kildare, still inexorable, refused not merely their approbation but their concurrence. They held a separate meeting at Trim, and passed a separate address. For many years afterwards *the clergy* stood altogether aloof from *the people*. The late association was the first to operate a perfect and entire consolidation of action, as well as interest, amongst all classes of the Catholic community." "The association rather gradually melted away, than abruptly separated by any formal act, in the year 1763. It is a remarkable feature in the early history of this body, that it seems throughout to have had no communication or sympathy with *the people*. Neither in a collective or individual capacity do the Catholic gentry and clergy appear to have had much control, or at least much of a political control, over the lower classes of their communion. Mr. O'Conner frequently complains, in terms of just bitterness of the more than Protestant severity of the Catholic landholders; and the thunders of the episcopacy, and the exhortations of the lower clergy, in the insurrection of Munster, fell idly on the affections and fears of the infuriated peasantry. A similar line of demarcation runs on through all their proceedings down to the year 1793."



"A considerable period now elapsed without any remarkable effort on the part of the Catholics; but in the year 1773 they again attempted a new organization: of the relics of the *first* committee was gradually formed a *second* under the immediate auspices of Lord Kenmare.

In 1776 an act was passed (18 Geo. 3, c. 60,) which repealed a part of the penal code.

"The gratitude of the Catholics was for a time extreme, but they soon recollected, that the striking off of a link or two was not the striking off of the entire chain. They began to renew their exertions for a restoration to those rights, which they now considered themselves more fully entitled to, from the rising wealth, and intelligence, and numbers of their body, consequent on the late concessions."

Dissensions, however, sprung up in the Committee, in the year 1783.

"The downfall of feudal tyranny was acted, in little, on the theatre of the General Committee. The influence of their *clergy* and of their barons was gradually undermined, and the third estate, the commercial interest, rising in wealth and power, was preparing, by degrees, to throw off the yoke, in the imposing, or, at least, the continuing of which the leaders of the body, I mean the *prelates* and aristocracy, to their disgrace be it spoken, were ready to concur."—*Life of Wolf Tone, vol. i. p. 48.*

"The triumph of the young democracy was complete; but though the aristocracy were defeated, they were not yet entirely broken down."

A plan was formed for electing delegates from every part of the country to represent the people in a General Committee in Dublin, in the year 1792.

"For the bishops, whose opposition," says Tone, the secretary to the committee, "gave us great trouble, four or five different missions were undertaken by different members of the sub-committee into the provinces, at their own expense, in order to hold conferences with them, in which, with much difficulty, they succeeded so far as to secure the co-operation of some, and the neutrality of the rest of the prelates. But whatever might at first have been their doubts and diffidence, when they saw the great body of the laity come forward and unanimously demand their rights, they manfully cast away all reserve, and declared their determination to rise or fall with their flocks, a wise and patriotic resolution, which was signified to the General Committee by two venerable prelates, Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, and Dr. Moylan, Bishop of Cork, who assisted at the meeting, and signed the petition in the name, and on behalf of the great body of the Catholic clergy of Ireland."—*Vol. i. pp. 66, 86.*

In 1793 a still further relaxation of the penal laws was effected: The gratitude of the Roman Catholics for this concession was to have been commemorated by a statue of George III. which the General Committee at their last meeting resolved should be erected at their expense in the lawn of Leinster House.

The third General Committee was organized in the year 1809.

It was in a great degree the revival of the old General Committee. Connected with it were a "few of the prelacy, who now for the first time had the courage or indiscretion of lending their names and exertions to those of their suffering fellow countrymen. What forced them to come forward at this time seems to have been the controversy about the veto. In 1799 the Roman Catholic prelates had a private negotiation with the government, in which they agreed to certain terms with regard to the appointment of bishops, in case the payment of their clergy were agreed to by the state.— This private arrangement was disclosed by the advocates of Catholic Emancipation in parliament, in the year 1808.

"The moment the reports of the parliamentary debates arrived, [in Ireland,] there was a general burst of indignation throughout the country. The public mind was thrown into the utmost agitation. The laity revolted at the idea of the ministers of their religion becoming exposed to the corruption of the minister. The clergy were roused, by a common impulse, to the assertion of their spiritual independence. A national synod was summoned. It passed a condemnatory resolution of the late proposition, signed by twenty-three prelates, three only of the entire body (originally subscribers to the resolutions of 1799) having dissented."—*Wyse, vol. i. p. 170.*

It seems probable that it was to recover their hold over the bulk of the laity, after this disclosure of private negotiations with government, that any of the prelates took part in the proceedings of the third General Committee. It was in this Committee that Mr. O'Connell and other barristers for the first time appeared on the side of the people. It was put down under the Convention Act in 1811.

The fourth General Committee, or Catholic Board, was soon constructed out of the ruins of its predecessor. But great disunion still existed among the Roman Catholics on the subject of the veto, which paralyzed their exertions.

"The clergy unanimously, and much the majority of the laity, still retained their opposition to the measure; but the aristocracy for the most part were favourable. Application was finally made to the Pope, and in his absence and detention in France, Cardinal Quarantotti addressed, in 1814, his celebrated letter to Dr. Poynter, which, instead of calming, added only new fuel to their dissensions."—*Wyse, vol. i. p. 182.*

The fifth Committee or Association was formed by Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Sheil, in 1828. It soon embraced all classes in the roll of its members. Almost the entire body of the gentry took part in it.

"The clergy too sent in from time to time their adhesion: *Maynooth began to be felt*; Irishmen who had never left Ireland were the priests whom it sent forth; and though in some instances *the proprieties and decencies of their ecclesiastical station considerably lost*, the country gained on the whole by the infusion of a more popular spirit amongst the body. They had long felt that they were far more dependent on their flocks than their flocks were upon them; and though in the outset of a popular movement they were able to control; the decision once taken, they often had no choice

but to follow. The recruits, therefore, from the *second order of the clergy*, were numerous beyond precedent; and in proportion as they attached themselves to the new association, they advocated its principles and executed its measures, not merely with the fidelity of a tried friend, but with the zeal and enthusiasm of a proselyte."—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 203.

After the passing of the Algerine Act, provincial meetings were held in various parts of the country. At these assemblages—

"The clergy of the entire neighbourhood assisted; the people saw with their own eyes a junction, which made little impression as long as it was casual or distant; they saw the priest honoured by and honouring the layman; they saw him seated on the same bench, supporting the same propositions, expressing the same sentiments, concurring in the same appeal, and invoking in the same tone the same spirit of constitutional regeneration. A *sort of religious sanction* was thus communicated imperceptibly to a cause, which to those not immediately engaged in its promotion appeared purely and altogether *political*: the very principle upon which the exclusion had originally been founded was religious; the persecution was religious; and the late efforts at proselytism by the opposite church had enhanced not a little this conviction in the mind of a large mass of the population, that the whole struggle was religious. But the general abstinence of the Catholic clergy from all political deliberations of a *public nature* had *hitherto* very much neutralized the force of such feelings. A great many of the clergy still retained the indistinct and shadowy recollection, rather than the body and reality, of their former fears; and affected, too, by a sense of the *decencies of their order*, and thinking that the still small voice of reason, and the slow dropping of the stream of time, were better calculated to win the reluctant, and to wear away the obstinate, than the broad and bold complaint, and the hurried march of assembled multitudes, very constantly refused every inducement to add their voices to the voices of the people. The Catholic rent in the first instance, the provincial meetings in the second, roused them from this apathy. But both these measures, it must also be observed, fell upon dispositions which had been already prepared."—*Ibid.* pp. 227-9.

Mr. Wyse then describes the controversies and public discussions arising out of the efforts of the Bible and Education Societies.

"The immediate consequences of these encounters were perhaps injurious, and certainly disagreeable; but they left behind them some salutary fruits. The Catholic clergy had been roused to a spirit of combination by the necessities of self-defence. The priesthood no longer refused co-operation in every expedient of constitutional *annoyance*; they seized with alacrity every opportunity of legitimate attack: they joined every meeting, they seconded every proposition, they lent their aid to the execution of every project which the laity had judged at all likely to gall or defeat their common foe."

"It cannot be denied that the priesthood, though they may have lost in some particulars, in others gained materially by this active union. The doctrines of passive obedience, once so popu-

lar in the Irish Catholic Church, and in so many other churches on the continent, have altogether disappeared from the political creed of the modern ecclesiastic. A revolution, not less miraculous than that which occurred amongst the peasantry, spread upwards through every order of the clergy." "Some of these opinions [*i. e.* respecting civil and religious liberty,] a few years earlier would have been considered political heresies by the entire body; some are still considered such by a few of the older priests. There are Eldons in every party; in every question men who pique themselves on being the last to be convinced. But the immense majority of the present priesthood are fresh and young, both in mind and body. They started into life when every thing about them was in agitation; they passed through *a course of education necessarily democratic*, from the situation in which every Catholic more or less has been placed. Many of them born in the class immediately above the peasant, share all his passions; in contact with the upper classes by their daily functions, they share their judgment and understanding also. Such a being, when brought into action by events, must be very powerful. Accordingly the Catholic priesthood has displayed a union of energy and discretion in the late transactions rare in the clergy of any country, but until this moment, altogether unknown amongst the Catholic Clergy of Ireland."—*Ibid.* p. 240.

The election for the County of Waterford was the first occasion on which a great effort was determined to be made to detach the tenantry from their landlords. In effecting this, in displacing the Beresfords from their influence in the county, the priests were the chief actors.

"The clergy, at the outset, were as usual divided into two parties, the old and the young. The old were averse to all species of disturbance, and with very indistinct views of civil rights, thought it an indecorous departure from ecclesiastical character, the engaging even remotely in the tumult of a contested election. The young were of a very different temper; for the most part they had been educated at *Maynooth*, and had carried with them, as I have already remarked, all that spirit which of late years has more or less become the character of *every description* of Irish Catholic education. They were full of the spirit of the times, and thoroughly acquainted with every detail of recent politics. No wonder then that they should have seized with the utmost earnestness the first opportunity of exerting themselves, in a cause which they believed to be that of every Catholic in the country."

"It was determined to make an almost individual appeal to the forty-shilling constituency of the county. A certain number of the committee were deputed to address each parish in rotation. **THEY CHOSE SUNDAY FOR THESE ASSEMBLIES!!** And for two months previous to the election, they were to be seen before the altar of their respective chapels, haranguing the people on the discharge of their approaching duties. *The priest* then stepped forward, and addressed them in their own vehement and figurative language. Resolutions were next framed and proposed by priest, gentleman, and farmer indiscriminately."—p. 287.

In 1828 Mr. Sheil recommended simultaneous meetings to adopt

petitions to Parliament. "On the same day and at the same hour, (21st January,) meetings were held in upwards of fifteen hundred Catholic Churches."

Distinct and sufficient proof has been produced in the above extracts, of the change that has taken place in the political conduct of the Roman Catholic priests: and that change has been traced in a great degree to the effect of a Maynooth Education. Instead of appearing as peaceable ministers of religion, they have become violent agitators and politicians. But it is worthy of notice, that among the principal reasons which hurried them into this course, Mr. Wyse mentions the zealous efforts of Protestants to circulate the *Bible* and to diffuse *education*. Unable, it would appear, to keep the people from inquiring into the doctrines of the Reformed church by any other means, they occupied their minds with the turmoil and excitement of politics, rather than permit them quietly to search for themselves into the grounds of the difference between the two communions. And by the disturbance which was thus kept up in the country, they endeavoured, as their historian says, to "annoy" the Ministers of the establishment.

In 1829 the Relief Bill was passed, and the gratitude of the Roman Catholics, as in the year 1793, was to be commemorated by a public statue,—a statue of the Duke of Wellington.\* We need not trace the development of the political principles of the priests since that period. In the agitation which has ever since been kept up in Ireland, they have been, together with a few barristers, the principal performers. The "repeal" meetings, and anti-tithe meetings, and the intimidation at the late elections, bear witness to their political character and exertions.

---

\* At a public meeting, 6th May, 1829, Earl Fitzwilliam in the chair, "on the motion of James Grattan, Esq. M. P., seconded by F. S. Flood, Esq., it was resolved, that, in order to perpetuate to the remotest generations these feelings of just acknowledgment, and at the same time to record that religious freedom was won by the same great captain who restored national independence to Europe, and gave security to this empire; a voluntary subscription be now entered into for the purpose of erecting, in or near Dublin, a statue of his grace the Duke of Wellington, commemorative of this the most glorious of his public services."

"On the motion of O'Gorman Mahon, Esq. seconded by Thomas Wyse, Jr., Esq., it was resolved, that our committee be hereby empowered to record on the pedestal of the statue just voted, the names of those illustrious men, as well the dead as the living, who, in either house of Parliament, have at different periods supported the measure of Catholic emancipation which has now passed into a law under the benignant auspices of his Majesty."—*Wyse's History*, vol. ii. Appendix, p. 305.

## MONUMENT TO ULRIC ZWINGLE.

THE No. of the *Archives du Christianisme* for Sept. 8, states on the authority of the *Nouvelle Gazette de Zurich*, that a monument to the illustrious Patriot, Scholar, Christian and Reformer, whose name heads this article, is recently erected on the battle field of *Kappel* on the confines of the cantons of Zurich, Zug and Schwitz; where that true Christian hero was slain, bravely fighting for God and his country.

The monument consists of a simple block of granite, twelve and a half feet high, by eight feet wide, and two feet thick. On the opposite faces of it are two inscriptions, fixed in iron letters; one inscription being in Latin, the other in French. We transcribe both—and add a free English translation.

*Hic Udalricus Zwinglius, post sexdecim a Christo nato secula liberae ecclesiae Christianae, una cum Martino Luthero, conditor, pro vero et pro patria, etiam cum fratribus fortiter pugnans, immortalitatis, certus, occidit, die xi. mensis Octobris, MDXXXI.*

HERE, ULRIC ZWINGLE, THE RESTORER, WITH MARTIN LUTHER, OF THE LIBERTY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY AFTER CHRIST,—BRAVELY FIGHTING AMONGST HIS BRETHREN, FOR THE TRUTH AND FOR HIS COUNTRY—FELL, CERTAIN OF IMMORTALITY,—ON THE ELEVENTH OF OCTOBER, 1531.

*On peut tuer le corps, mais non pas l'âme. C'est ainsi que parla en cet endroit Ulric Zwingle, en morant heroiquement pour la verité et pour la liberté de l'Eglise Chretienne le 11 Octobre 1531.*

THEY CAN KILL THE BODY, BUT NOT THE SOUL. THIS, AND UPON THIS SPOT, WAS THE TESTIMONY OF ULRIC ZWINGLE, AS HE HEROICALLY LAID DOWN HIS LIFE FOR THE TRUTH AND THE LIBERTY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, ON THE 11th OCTOBER, 1531.

It is in full view of the glorious mount Rigi, and just beside the beautiful Lake of Zug—almost in the centre of Switzerland—that this simple and touching monument, of the gratitude of a free and Christian people—stands. When no monument, erected by human hands, adorned the spot—we passed over it and around about it,—refreshing our spirit, over the ashes of the illustrious martyr. These mighty mountains, and this placid lake—such were our thoughts—will re-echo to each other the sacred legend—until the enduring freedom of the Swiss, and the reviving piety of their churches, will blush, not to whisper in their turn, in this silent dell, a name which ought to fill the world!—That duty is at last fulfilled; simply, severely fulfilled. And Switzerland, far more than Zwingle, is honoured by the act.

Where is Luther's, where Zwingle's, where Calvin's monument with us? These mighty men—above all the leaders of God's people in their day or since; these "first three"—amidst the benefactors of ages and of nations—where are their monuments with us?

Would that every Protestant's heart thrilled as ours does—and that our voice might reach every corner of the land—when we cry—*Come let us build to those glorious names, a visible monument,—worthy of them and of ourselves!*

[Continued from page 518.]

## ADAM'S JUSTIFICATION.

*Chapter V.**The Requisites to Adam's Justification by the Covenant of Works.*

We have examined into the nature of moral government, in general. We have enquired into the peculiarities of that institution which was given to man immediately after his creation, as it involved the great essential principles of moral rule. We have discussed the extent of the covenant, and the representative character of Adam. We have settled the meaning of the term Justification, and those allied to it. Out of these views naturally arises the enquiry, What must Adam do, in order to his justification by the terms of the Covenant under which he was placed? What is indispensable before God can pronounce him a just man?

The obvious and only correct answer to this is, Righteousness—action according to law. He must *do* the things required of him, before it is possible that God should declare him just. The law must be fulfilled before it can confer the reward proffered to its fulfilment. The work must be performed or it would not be right to give the wages.

The truth here will be clearly perceived by adverting to three particulars, viz. Innocence, the positive requirement of the covenant, and the necessity of a limit to probation.

Sec. I. *Innocence.*

Innocence, we have already seen, is as it were, a negative virtue. It implies freedom from positive evil: a harmlessness, rather than any positive action. This simply entitles to a negative reward—the absence of penal evil. The innocent ought not to suffer. So long as Adam shall remain free from sin, he shall experience none of its evils. And this is the utmost he can expect. Unless we have been entirely mistaken in our exposition of the general nature of moral government, exemption from sin is accompanied by exemption from punishment. The essence of moral government consists in linking indissolubly together sin and suffering: freedom from sin and freedom from pain: positive compliance with law and positive enjoyment of happiness. To multiply words here were to darken counsel.

Sec. 2. *On the positive requirements of the Covenant.*

In treating of the covenant given to Adam we saw, that under the prohibitory clause, regarding the fruit forbidden, there was contained a positive requirement of action in the case. The mind of Adam in view of the fruit must decide either to eat or not to eat: and it is not conceivable that this decision involves no activity of the mind. A choice cannot be made without mental action. Had Adam determined not to eat, that determination would have been as really an *action*, as what occurred when he determined to eat.

We also saw that under the commination, "Thou shalt surely die" was presented the opposite alternative as a consequence of the opposite course of conduct. "Thou shalt surely live" was as really held up before his mind as a motive to obedience, as the threatened death was as a dissuasive from disobedience. As with the people of Israel when God set before them life and death, cursing and blessing, so life was promised to Adam as the reward of obedience, and death was threatened as the consequence of disobedience. To obtain life, he must not only avoid sin, he must also perform duty. If then Adam will have life, he must keep the commandment given to him. If he do this, the promised blessing must be conferred. Faithfulness on God's part secures this. Here then is the simple requisite to Adam's justification—he must do what God enjoined upon him—he must obey God—he must keep the commandment—he must fulfil the covenant engagement. Should he do this, all that is right, and holy, and just, and true, in the character of God, is pledged to secure him in the enjoyment of the promised life: and the declaration of his having so fulfilled the law given him, is his *justification*. Hence it is evident, that the only requisite to Adam's justification under the original covenant, was *obedience, righteousness, conformity with that law*.

### Sec. 3. *The limit to probation.*

There is a third element here, viz: the limit to probation.—Probation is trying, proving, testing a thing to ascertain whether or not, it be what it professes to be. A state of probation or a probationary state is a state of trial. Adam under the covenant of works was in a state of probation. The whole period between the time of a moral creature's being ushered into existence, and the time when he passes under the judgment of the law, and is condemned or justified, is *probationary*; and to this period the word *probation* has been generally restricted. Recent writers and preachers have indeed, with characteristic laxity of thought and expression, applied it to the present state, under the gospel: and if due care were taken to limit and define its meaning to the testing, proving, trying, of men whether they will hearken to the invitations of mercy, or reject them, little or no injury would result. But it is much to be feared, that the very use of the word in application to our present state, gives encouragement and strength to that pride of heart, which, amidst all its defects and corruption, still looks to the old broken covenant, and vainly hopes by enduring a probation of works, to establish its own righteousness.

Now the point to which our attention must be given, is the high probability that in the nature of moral government, there must necessarily be a limit to probation—a point of time at which trial ceases and the rewards of virtue or of vice are conferred. For our purposes it is not indispensable to maintain the essential necessity of such limit in order to the full idea of moral government. All that our cause requires is, that such limit must be, in every case, where the universal principles of morals are modified by a special covenant. Where specific terms are prescribed and a reward promised upon the fulfilment, there must be a limit as to time; other-



wise the reward never could be claimed. If the probation is eternal, it never can be completed; and if the reward is conditioned on the completion of the service, the proffer of it is mockery. If, therefore we have been correct in our exposition of those scriptures which teach the doctrine of the covenant of works, there must have been a limit or period of time up to which, if Adam had maintained his integrity, he would have been confirmed and established and secured forever in the enjoyment of life. After the precise period, it is in vain to enquire. The scriptures are silent, because it is not necessary for us to know it; seeing that Adam violated his covenant engagement and put an end to the state of trial. Probation ceases as soon as the person fails who is under trial—the trial is then over; it only remains to let the law do its duty in condemning and executing the offender.

#### SEC. IV.—*Righteousness the grand requisite.*

Hence the general conclusion, that compliance with the terms of the covenant—in other words, obedience to the command of God for the time allotted him—in other words, *righteousness*, was the only requisite to Adam's justification according to the covenant, "for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin." (*Gal. iii. 21, 22.*) Had Adam possessed the righteousness of the law, he would have been justified, and life been awarded to him. But inasmuch as he acted contrary to the law, he and all his are under condemnation; being delivered over by the law, to its just punishment, according to the express terms of the covenant.

Let us treasure up for future use, then, the important truth, that to secure, for himself and his posterity, a sentence of justification by the covenant, it was necessary for Adam only to *obey*: the righteousness that must justify him, includes not in it, but manifestly excludes the idea of suffering. Adam's active obedience to law, for the proper period, would have entailed eternal life upon the entire race.

### CHAPTER VI.

#### *On the breach of the Covenant and the consequent additional requisite to Adam's Justification.*

##### SEC. 1. *God's condescension calculated to secure man's affection.*

Never can we sufficiently admire and adore that condescension, in the Most High, by which he bowed the heavens and came down to familiar equality with man, and made with him a covenant, so admirably calculated to secure his everlasting well-being. No hard terms were prescribed: no complicated and difficult duty, no additional burdens were imposed. A single instance of restriction from an indulgence of sense, is the whole matter. All creation lies before him. Every luxury of new-born nature courts his enjoyment. The virgin blushes of a finished creation attract his eye; and the ambrosial fruits of an enchanting paradise regale his taste. His unclouded

intellectual powers too, fit him for scanning the beauties of surrounding nature, and the still more enchanting glories of the starry firmament. His moral powers, undefaced by lust, fit him for holy intercourse with angelic hosts and with the Lord of all below and all above. Thus made for happiness and replenished with all the means of its present possession and enjoyment—his mind and its desires unstrained in their range, except in the single matter of the fruit forbidden; and even this restraint the easy condition of everlasting security in bliss; it were marvellous indeed, if man's conformity with God's requirement did not give the rivet of eternity to human happiness and transform Eden's bloom into the unfading glories of the heavenly paradise.

Marvellous and unlikely, however, as it must prospectively appear, all this has happened. Man transgressed and by transgression robbed Eden of its beauty, dimmed the lustre of the starry firmament, and shut out the light of heavenly joys from his own benighted soul.

SEC. II.—*The mysterious fact, man's fall occasioned through false views in the mind.*

The fall of man is among the dark rolls of historical record.—The evidence of it quivers in every nerve, and thunders in bursting sighs from every heart of the race. How it was or could be, philosophy cannot tell, and the Bible is silent. I mean that the manner in which the pure spirit of Adam could be induced to believe the devil rather than God—how our first parents could be made to put good for evil and evil for good we know not. Only this is certain, that the mind cannot choose evil *as evil* for its own sake. The law of universal life is, that every living being desires happiness. This law is irreversible even in hell. Devils damned and forever lost, can no more than men on earth, desire pain and anguish for their own sakes. Before evil can be chosen, it must *appear* to be good. A man may choose that which causes pain, as a means of greater and more permanent happiness, as when he takes a sickening portion of medicine; but the act of choice is produced by a balancing in the mind, between present temporary pain and future permanent pleasure. In this process, whenever the mind perceives the happiness of restored and permanent health, and apprehends its reality attainable by means of a temporary sickness and its attendant miseries, the attracting influence of the former overpowers the repulsion of the latter, and choice preponderates in favour of receiving the nauseous medicine. The enterprising mariner *chooses* to brave the perils and to endure the pains of a tempestuous voyage, not for their own sake, but because of the wealth and means of happiness that lie beyond the boisterous ocean. Evil must assume in the mind's apprehension the appearance of good, before it can be deliberately chosen. And this theory corresponds with the historical fact; our first mother "being deceived was in the transgression." (1 Tim. i, 14.) "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eye, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat,

and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat. (*Gen.* iii. 6.) Apprehended good, and that only, can lead the mind to a deliberate choice: and where the thing chosen is really evil, there must previously exist some deception—some false view of it in the mind as the moving cause of the choice. In point, then of veritable fact, sin entered into the world by and through the door of a deluded understanding, a fact this to be carefully treasured up, for it will be found of no small value in our future discussion on the second covenant.

### SEC. III.—*A loss of confidence in God led to the fall.*

Another aspect of this transaction it may be well briefly to notice, *viz*: the withdrawal of confidence from God, and the bestowal of it upon Satan. God had declared that death would follow eating the fruit, Satan affirmed the contrary—"ye shall not surely die."—Here are counter assertions, and the faith of our first parents failed in reference to God's testimony, and passed over to the accredence of the deceiver and tempter. Hence, it is manifest, that *unbelief* is implied in the very nature of sin. The law says, ruin will follow transgression; the subject of law says, no—I cannot believe it—I shall be wiser and happier after transgression. If a man really believes that a certain action will ruin his reputation, disgrace his family, and render him permanently wretched, can he will its performance? Or is it the hope of escaping detection and punishment, that emboldens crime? Unbelief, therefore, in the truths of the testimony borne by the law, is involved in every sin.

### SEC. IV.—*The effects of sin upon the legal relations and liabilities of Adam.*

And here the mere statement must suffice, because an enlargement would anticipate an allotment of another chapter. It is only necessary to say, that the moment sin is committed the perpetrator is condemned by the law. In human administrations of law, indeed, time and formal processes are necessary, before a sentence of condemnation can be regularly pronounced; but the individual mind forms its decision as soon as it becomes acquainted with the fact that the law has been transgressed. And with God, forms of process and examinations of witnesses have no place. His sentence falls as soon as sin is committed, and, as we shall see hereafter, Adam sunk under the power of death the moment he sinned. The penalty of the law then seized him, "thou shalt surely die."

This point, is so obvious, it is so perfectly accordant with the common sense of all men; and so plainly assumed in all the Bible says on the subject, that I am not aware of its having been seriously controverted. Certainly it needs but be stated, to be believed.—All the world believes, that the covenant breaker must abide the penal sanction of his covenant. Adam by sin incurred the punishment of death.

But here a question meets us, of considerable practical importance, because of its bearings upon the grand doctrine of justification, *viz*: does the great moral principle, involved in the covenant continue to bind Adam after his transgression? Is he under obliga-

tions of universal obedience to the will of God made known to him? Has the law a claim upon him still, notwithstanding his rebellion? Can both its penal and preceptive claims bear upon the same person? And at the same time? Can a man be bound both to *do* and to *suffer* the will of God?—See *Owen on Jus.* 240.

It is more than likely your minds are already made up. Your answer is at hand, and that an affirmative. Well, but whilst decision is a virtue, rashness is a vice. Look well; think closely; mark consequences before you commit yourself. Among these, if you affirm, are, the difficulties, because of the penalty, which lie in the way of fulfilling the precept. If a man steal, and be incarcerated for his offence, how *can* he actively labour to make reparation, by fulfilling the laws of honesty. If he murder and be executed, how *can* he fulfil the law of love? If he sin against God and be cast into the prison of despair and die under the curse, how *can* he glorify the law by a holy obedience? Would it not be unjust to demand of the imprisoned thief, or murderer, or rebel against God, a hand and a heart actively employed in the holy duties of love?—How *can* they perform them? If both the precept and penalty may hold a man, is he not bound to impossibilities? And *can* a man be bound by impossibilities?

On the other hand, if you deny that the penal claims of law upon Adam are additional to the pre-existing preceptive claims. In other words, if you maintain that when the penalty seizes him, the precept lets him go—that he cannot be held by both at the same time; then among the troublesome consequences are—

1. There is release from moral obligation by its infraction. Sin itself releases the sinner from the obligation to obey. Consequently

2. The moment transgression cancels the obligation to obey, there can be no farther transgression, because there is no law requiring active obedience, and where there is no law there is no transgression. Sin, after the first sin, there can be none.

3. Therefore no moral being can commit any but one sin. Consequently,

4. There can be no gradation in criminality, except as to the magnitude of the first offence; for there can be no multiplication of offences.

5. Consequently, the devil is no more vile and guilty now than at the first moment of his fall; and his interminable advancement in wretchedness is impossible, for it would be obviously unrighteous to increase the misery of a criminal whose criminality was not increased. Consequently,

6. Satan and all his friends are in a state of sinless perfection—for generations of generations they have existed without violating the law of God; for there is no law over them, requiring their active obedience. For

7. The penalty is mere suffering, inflicted by the law as its expression of hatred against sin, and the suffering soul cannot be willing to suffer, for the obvious reason that it is contrary to the law of its nature; and, moreover, it is a contradiction in terms. Because the very idea of enduring pain implies revulsion of nature; opposition of will. Should Satan yield up his will to the will of God and acquiesce in the torments of hell, is it not manifest that

hell that moment changes its character and becomes a place of happiness?

8. But again, as to civil society, for you will still bear in mind that morality is still morality, whether in the government of God or of man. The religion of the Bible is the morality that must govern man here and hereafter—now and forever. The criminal on whom the hand of penal justice is laid, is lifted above all law, except, simply, the law which makes him to suffer. Whilst suffering for theft he cannot commit theft, because he is not bound *now* by the law's precept which forbids it. And so of all other offences.—And so there is an end of all law and all government, human and divine. There is no difference between virtue and vice. Let us eat and drink and profane and blaspheme God, there's a jubilee in hell and to build a bridge across the impassible gulph is no longer desirable.

Such are some of the troublesome consequences of maintaining that the precept of law ceases to bind a man, at the moment he falls under its penalty—that the moral precept and the penal sanction cannot run parallel with one another. Hence we conclude that moral obligation to holy obedience is eternal. Its cessation would make the sinner independent of God. This doctrine cuts a short way to heaven, right through the shades of hell. It is false, and the truth rises from its ruins. Adam and his tempter are now bound and were at first bound and will forever be bound equally to obey God's will made known to them. Consequently, the penal obligation is additional to Adam. And if he could have been justified by the covenant before its violation, only by its positive fulfilment—by working *righteousness*—he can afterwards be justified only by *working righteousness*, and exhausting the whole curse of the law—satisfying its *penal claim*. Before he can come up to the law in its covenant form and claim the promised life, he must fulfil precept and penalty both. Before God can declare him a just man, that is, justify him, he must be just indeed. These two things are indispensable to Adam's obtaining life by the covenant. He must exhibit a righteousness as long and as broad as the law, and he must endure the wrath of God.

Upon the whole subject, let us remark, in closing,

1. The understanding of man failed him—he was foiled by the tempter, before sin enfeebled his powers; much less now, when the soul is in ruins can man's wisdom adequately direct him the path of duty and qualify him to withstand the wiles of the devil. Therefore

2. He who trusteth to his own heart is a fool, pride of intellect shuts the door of heaven, and a haughty spirit goes before a fall.

3. Sin does not diminish our moral responsibilities. It always increases them.

4. Hence the inevitable necessity of eternal torment to the finally impenitent. The fires of the second death burn upon the lost spirit. It rises, writhes and resists. Its anguish and maddened resistance burst forth in fiercer and still more fierce enmity against God who taketh vengeance. This increase of virulent wickedness, calls down renewed expressions of divine wrath, and thus the breath of blasphemy fans the flames of everlasting death.

[Continued from page 512]

## THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

## No. III.

LII. Origen is the next author to whom we turn. He flourished under Valerian and Galienus, (*Obiit A. D. 261, Indict. 9. aet. 70.*)

In his Homily 16, upon Numbers, he says, "We drink the blood of Jesus Christ not only in the ceremony of the sacraments, but also, when we receive his words." (*Bibere dicimur sanguinem Christi, non solum sacramentorum ritu, sed et cum sermones ejus recipimus.*)

On Math. 15, he says, "This meat, which is sanctified by the word of God, and with prayer, as to its matter, goes into the belly and passes into the draught."\*

Now this cannot be said of accidents without a subject: for they are not matter. Besides the shape, size, taste, colour, &c., which are the accidents, do not take that destination.

In Homily 35, upon Matthew, we have the following, "Jesus taking bread, and giving thanks broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, take eat; for this bread is my body; for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many in remission of sins. This bread which the GOD-WORD confesses to be his body is the word which nourishes souls."†

In Dial 3, of Christ—man speaking against the Marcionites, "If, as they say, Christ was without flesh and without blood, of what flesh then, of what body, of what blood, did he administer the bread and cup as the signs and images, and commanded his disciples by them to renew his memory."‡ On Mat. 15, he says no wicked person can eat the flesh of Jesus Christ.§

LIII. We are aware that Origen is accused by the Catholics of heresy. But those who pique themselves upon following the ancient doctors, must take Origen as orthodox, except in those points, upon which he was condemned by the ancient church. Now he never was condemned for denying the reality or transubstantiation in the supper, nor for having called the bread which we eat, a figure or symbolical body; nor for having said that the matter of the bread passed into the draught and that our Lord administered bread. (For the errors of Origen, See Epiphanius de erroribus Origenis; and Augustine.)

LIV. We now proceed to Cyprian. This father suffered martyrdom A. D. 249. Indict. XII. In his sermon concerning the relapsed we find that it was the custom of the ancient church

\* Ille cibus qui sanctificatur per verbum Dei per que obsecrationem, juxta id quod habet materiale in ventrem abit et in secessum ejicitur.

† Panis iste quem Deus verbum corpus suum esse fatetur, verbum est nutritorium animarum.

‡ Cujus corporis et qualis tandem sanguinis signa imagines, panem et poculum ministravit? Jussit que per illa discipulos memoriam sui renovare?

§ Cibus quem nullus malus edere potest.

27

for the Deacon to go throughout the temple carrying to each the communion in both species. Among others there was a small girl who had been guilty of idolatry. She was forced by the deacon to drink of the cup against her will. She instantly threw it up. Cyprian remarks, "The Eucharist could not continue in a body and in a mouth which had been violated. The cup sanctified in the blood of the Lord came out from the polluted bowels."\* We remark, that if the cup, (*i. e.* the drink) was sanctified in the blood of the Lord it was not the blood of the Lord.

In Epis. 6, of book i., he says, "The Lord calls his body the bread which is composed by the union of many grains."† In this passage he is opposed to the Roman church in two points; *first*, he says the bread is called the body of Christ; *second*, he says that this bread at the time even when Jesus called it his body, was composed of many grains.

LV. In Epis. 3, of book ii., he maintains that it is necessary to mingle water with the wine in the cup, and his expressions are incompatible with the idea of transubstantiation. "He would have the cup," he says, "which is offered in memory of the Lord mingled with wine."‡ Then it was wine, when it was offered. He adds, "that the blood of Jesus Christ is not the water but the wine."§ This is a plain assertion that the cup, being the blood of Christ, does not cease to be wine. He adds, in fact, "that by the wine the blood of Christ is represented to us."||

In the same epistle he says, "The Lord offered bread and the cup mingled with wine."¶ But the Roman Catholic church holds that the priest offers neither bread nor wine. But again; "We find, says he, that the cup which the Lord offered was mingled and that *that* which he called his blood was some wine."\*\* And three lines below he says, "we offer wine;" and a little farther on he blames those who put water only in the cup, not because such an act would prevent transubstantiation, but because "water alone cannot express the blood of Christ."††

To leave no doubt as to his doctrine, he shows what is the use, as he supposes, of the wine and of the water in the cup. "It is," says he, "that by the water we understand the people and by the wine, the blood of Jesus Christ is represented to us. Now when water is mingled with the wine in the cup, the people are joined

\* In corpore atque ore violato Eucharistia permanere non potuit. Sanctificatus in Domini sanguine, calix de pollutis visceribus erupit.

† Dominum corpus suum, panem vocat de multorum granorum adunatione congestum.

‡ Calix qui in commemorationem ejus offertur mixtus vino offeratur.

§ Nam cum dicat Christus ego sum vitis vera, sanguis Christi non aqua est utique sed vinum.

|| Vinum quo Christi sanguis ostenditur.

¶ Dominus panem et calicem mixtum vino obtulit.

\*\* Inveimus calcem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit, et vinum fuisse quod sanguinem suum dixit.

†† Aqua sola Christi sanguinem non potest exprimere.

with Christ."\* This father thus supposing the water to represent the people, and the wine the blood of Christ, pursues the idea by adding "that if any one offers wine only, the blood of Christ begins to be without us, but if water only, the people begin to be without Christ."† Now if this father believed that the wine was converted into the blood of Christ, he must also have believed the water was converted into the people, because he says the people are joined with Christ in the cup, and that by the water we understand the people as by the wine we understand the blood. The union, then, which he intended between the people and Christ was spiritual and sacramental, and the presence of Christ and of the people in the cup must be understood in the same sense.

LVI. In the treatise concerning the supper of our Lord, ascribed to Cyprian, we find this remark; "This, our conjunction with him, does not join the substances, but unites the affections and confederates the wills."‡ And instead of asserting that this bread is converted into the flesh of Jesus Christ, he says on the contrary, "that this bread is converted into our flesh and our blood and serves for the life and increase of our bodies, and therefore the infirmity of our faith being aided by the accustomed effect of things it is taught by a sensible argument that in the visible sacraments there is efficacy to eternal life, and that we are united to Christ, not so much by a corporeal as by a spiritual transition."§

LVII. It is not probable, however, that Cyprian was the author of this treatise. The style of it is barbarous. Augustine admired Cyprian for his eloquence. (*See Treatise on Christian Doctrine, lib. iv. chap. 14 and 21.*) It was written, however, before the origin of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the following passage from the same book (end of the tract upon Unction) is very explicit. "Our Lord at the table at which he made his last feast with his Apostles gave with his own hands bread and wine, but upon the cross he gave his body into the hands of the soldiers to be wounded."|| The author adds, "That the truth was impressed upon the hearts of the apostles, that they might explain to the people how the bread and the wine are the flesh and the blood of Christ;"—and a little below he shows how the bread is the body. "It is," says he, "because different names and species are reduced to the same essence, and because the things significant and the things signified are called by the same names."¶

LVIII. We now proceed to Eusebius, of Cæsaria, who flourished during the reign of Constantine the Great. (*Circ. A. D. 320.*)

\* Videmus in aqua populum intelligi, in vino ostendi sanguinem Christi. Quando autem in calice vino aqua miscetur, Christo populus adunatur.

† Si vinum tantum quis offerat, sanguis Christi incipit esse, sine nobis. Si vero aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse, sine Christo.

‡ Nostra et ipsius conjunctio nec miscet personas nec unit substantias sed affectus consociat et confœderat voluntates.

§ Panis iste communis in carnem et sanguinem mutatus procurat vitam et incrementum corporibus, &c.

|| Dedit Dominus noster in mensâ, &c.

¶ Quomodo diversa nomina vel species ad unam reducerentur essentiam, et significantia et significata eisdem vocabulis conserentur.



In lib. 5, chap. 3, de præparatione Evangelica, he says, "Our Saviour and Lord first, and after him all priests who have followed him in all nations, celebrating the sacred spiritual service, according to the ecclesiastical ordinances, signify to us, by bread and by wine the mysteries of his body and of his blood."\*

The same author. (in book 8, of the same work, chap. 1, near the end,) speaking of the bread and wine of the Eucharist, says, "Moreover, he gave to his disciples the signs of the divine dispensation, commanding to celebrate the figure of his own body; for since he no longer received the sacrifices of blood, nor the slaying of the different animals ordained by Moses, he taught them to make use of bread as the sign of his body."†

Is it credible that Eusebius should so often teach that we receive the sign of the body of Christ, and yet believe that we receive not in sign and figure, but in reality, his flesh at the mouth? It is to be observed too, that he says, we make use of bread as the sign of his body, in lieu of the ancient sacrifices; and of course it is bread at the time when it is used in substitution for the ancient sacrifices.

The same author (in the second chap., near the end of it) says, "The same night on which he was betrayed he gave to his disciples the symbols (τα συμβολα) of the words of the New Testament concealed through him." This proves that by the word *symbol* he understands *sign* or *figure*, because he calls the bread and wine the symbols of the words of the gospel.

LIX. Among the works ascribed to Ambrose, (who flourished in the time of Theodosius, circ. A. D. 380,) are six books *De Sacramentis*. It is not probable that they were written by him. However, this may be—they contain proof (in lib. 4. chap. 5,) that in the time of the author, the prayer used at the celebration of the Eucharist, was thus expressed; "Grant that this oblation may be set to our account, reasonable and acceptable, which is the *figure* of the body and blood of our Lord." In these books the author is careful to inculcate, that the bread is made the body of Christ by the power of God. Yet he holds that, nevertheless, it remains bread; for in (chap 9, of) the book concerning those who are for the first time admitted to the mysteries, when speaking of the miracles of the prophets who changed the nature of things; and comparing with them, that which is done in the Eucharist, as a thing not less, he says, "it is not a less thing to add something new to a thing, than to change natures."‡ Thus admitting, that the bread received something new without changing its nature. And yet more distinctly, (in lib. 4, chap. De Sacramentis) "If there be such efficacy in the word of the Lord Jesus, as to cause that things which were not, shall begin to be, how much more will it be efficacious to cause that things which *are what they were*, should be

\* πρωτος μεν σωτηρ και κυριος ημων, &c.

† τα συμβολα . . . παρεδιδου μαθηταις την εικονα του ιδιου σωματος  
. . . κ. τ. λ.

‡ Non minus est novas res dare quam mutare naturas.

changed in their nature."\* That is, *exempli gratia*, a morsel of wax may become the seal of a king and yet remain wax.

We cite this passage as Lombard (in Dist. 10, of book 4, letter D,) and Thomas (in 3 part, Quest. 76, art 4,) have done, though others have falsified it since. But to show conclusively that the sentiment expressed by the extract was that of the author, we proceed. "How," he asks, "can that which is bread be the body of Christ?" He answers, "By consecration."† Thus the bread is changed into what it was not, namely, the sacrament of the body of Christ, just as the wax is changed into a representation of the seal; which is not done by transubstantiation.

LX. In lib. 4, chap. 4, he says, in the same sense, that the bread is made the body of Christ sacramentally, but without transubstantiation.‡ This, however, is not the language of Ambrose, or of the author, but it is stated in the form of a doubt suggested by another, which the author solves by saying (as in the passage cited from the book) that *that* which is bread is the body of Christ by consecration: and to support the assertion, he mentions several effects of the omnipotence of God, in which there is no transubstantiation—that God created the world—that Jesus Christ was conceived by the Holy spirit—that Moses divided the sea—made bitter waters sweet—that Elisha caused iron to swim. In all these, there was no transubstantiation.

In book 5, of the Sacraments, chap. 4, speaking of our Lord, he says, "Is it not the bread that enters into our bodies, but it is the bread of eternal life which sustains the substance of our souls."§ In this passage he pointedly denies that the body of our Lord is taken into the mouth.

LXI. Again, Ambrose on 1 Cor. chap. xi., says, "because we are delivered by his death, we keeping it in remembrance by eating and drinking, signify his flesh and his blood which were offered for us."||

The Romanists say, we eat the flesh of the Lord. If Ambrose had thought so, he would have said, that in eating *his flesh* we signify his flesh.

In chap. 9, of the book concerning the introduction into the mysteries, we have the following, "Before the benediction . . . one species is named; after the consecration, the body of Christ is signified."¶ And in book 4, of the Sacraments, chap. 4, he says "we drink the similitude of his precious blood." And as if to prevent all doubt as to his meaning how we drink the similitude of

\* Si tanta vis est in sermone Domini, ut incipiant esse, quae non erant, quanto magis operatorius est, ut sint quae erant et in aliud commutentur.

† Quomodo potest, qui panis **EST** esse corpus Christi? Consecratione.

‡ Ubi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit corpus Christi.

§ Non iste panis est qui vadit in corpus sed ille panis vitae aeternae qui animae nostrae substantiam fulcit.

|| In edendo et potando, carnem ejus et sanguinem, quae pro nobis ablata sunt, significamus.

¶ Ante benedictionem . . . alia species nominatur, post consecrationem corpus Christi significatur.

the blood of Christ, he adds, "As you receive the similitude of his death (in baptism) so you drink the similitude of his precious blood, &c.\* Now baptism can be received only sacramentally and by faith in the death of Christ, and therefore we receive the body and blood of our Lord in the same way. This must be the meaning—or the example of Ambrose is inapt.

LXII. Gaudentius (in Tract 2 upon Exodus) says, "The blood of Christ is expressed by the species of wine."† In the 4th century the word *species* was used in the singular number, because, by the *species* was intended the substance; and in fact the same author says "in this bread is received, (by the reason or mind, *i. e.*) rationally, the figure of the body of Christ;"‡ that is, we receive bread, but this bread is the figure of the body of Christ.

LXIII. Gregory of Nazianzum (who flourished under Valentinian and Theodosius, Circ. A. D. 390.) in his second sermon concerning the Passover or Easter, says, "Now we shall participate in the passover, truly, yet still in figure, although a more clear figure than that under the old law; for the passover of the law, I hesitate not to say, was a more obscure figure of a figure."§

Calvinists say that the passover is not a figure properly of the supper, but that both the passover and the supper are figures of our Lord's death, and this author seems to be of the same opinion; for he says in reference to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, "We shall partake in the passover." He adds, "The Son of God will drink it new in the kingdom of his father."|| And again, "What is this drink and this communion which we must learn."¶ It is evident from this, that Gregory was writing of the Sacrament, and that his remarks apply to that, and not to the feast of the passover.

XLIV. Ephrem, whose writings were at one time supposed to be lost, but were afterwards restored from the library of the Pope, has this passage in his treatise concerning the nature of the Son of God, "Consider carefully, how, taking in his hands some bread, he blessed it, and brake it *in figure* of his immaculate body and blessed the cup *in figure* of his precious blood."\*\* He adds, we eat his body, but his meaning is, we eat it sacramentally or spiritually as he had previously explained.

LXV. Jerome is our next witness. (He died A. D. 422.) On 1 Cor. chap. xi. verse 23 and 24, he says, "Jesus Christ taking bread and blessing it, as he was about to suffer, left us a last commemoration or memorial; just as if some one going abroad should leave some pledge to him whom he loves, in remembrance of his benefits

\*Sicut enim mortis similitudinem sumpsisti, ita etiam similitudinem preciosi sanguinis bibis, &c.

† Vini specie sanguis Christi exprimitur.

‡ Rationabiliter in eo figura accipitur corporis Christi.

§ Jam vero paschatis participes erimus, nunc quidem ad huc in figura, licet majis perspicua quam in lege veteri, &c.

|| Novum filius Dei nobis cum in regno patris bibiturus est.

¶ Quæ nam autem sit ista potio atque percepta discere nostrum est?

\*\* Inspice diligentur quomodo sumens in manibus panem benedicit ac frangit in figuram immaculati corporis sui, calicemque in figuram pretiosi sanguinis sui benedicit.

and friendship."\* But a friend in these circumstances does not leave himself, but something else as a token in his absence.

The same Father (upon Leviticus) is cited in the decree (Dist. 2, de Consecratione, Canon *De hac* (76) and the canon runs thus, "It is allowed to eat of this *hostia*, which is wonderfully made in commemoration of Christ. But it is not allowed to any one to eat in itself of the *hostia* which he offered upon the altar of the Cross."† Origen also is cited in the same canon (Hom. 7, in Levit. c. an. 217 in *Egypto*,) in the edition of Pithaeus.—It follows from this, that Jerome believed that the body of Christ, which was offered on the cross, is not eaten in itself and really in the Eucharist. He says nothing about its not being eaten in *one* form, but eaten in *another*; but simply *nulli licet edere*, which may mean *none can eat it* as well as that it is not allowed or permitted to any one to eat it, &c.—Moreover he asserts that the *hostia*, made in the sacrament, is not that *hostia* which was offered on the cross. How can this be reconciled with the doctrine of the Roman church?

In his second book against Jovinian, he says, "Christ did not offer water, but wine, as the figure of his blood."‡ Then Jerome understood that our Lord offered wine. If he meant *water* by the word *water*, he must have meant *wine*, by the word *wine*; that is, wine in substance, and not wine in appearance only. In one word, the wine was a type or figure of his blood, and therefore, the wine was not, in its substance, his blood.

LXVI. Chrysostom (who died A. D. 411, Indict. 9,) in hom. 83, upon Matthew, says, "If Christ did not die, of what is this sacrifice the sign or symbol? You see how careful he was, to cause, that we should always bear it in mind that he died."§ And again, "When the Lord gave this sacrament he gave some wine."|| And in homily 17, on the Ep. to the Heb.—"Do we not offer every day? Indeed we do offer, but in commemorating his death—this sacrifice is an exemplar of him."¶

It would be incongruous to talk of offering Christ in memory of Christ or of his death—of sacrificing Christ in reality and truth, in memory of the sacrifice of Christ.—In hom. 24, on 1 Cor. he asks, "What is this bread?" He answers, "The body of Christ;" and to prevent doubt, he asks again, "What do they become who partake of it?"\*\* He answers, "The body of Christ."

An epistle written to Cesarius, the monk, is ascribed to Chrysostom.

\* Hoc est, benedicens, etiam passurus, ultimam nobis commemorationem sive memoriam dereliquit. Quem admodum si quis, &c.

† De hac quidem hostia, quæ in Christi commemoratione mirabiliter fit, edere licet: de illa vero, quam Christus in arâ crucis obtulit, secundum se, nulli edere licet.

‡ Christus in typo sanguinis sui non obtulit aquam sed vinum.

§ Si mortuus Christus non est, cujus symbolum ac cignum hoc sacrificium est? Vides quantum et studium fuerit ut semper memoria teneamus pro nobis ipsum mortuum fuisse.

|| Quando hoc mysterium tradidit, vinum tradidit.

¶ Nonne per singulos dies offerimus? Offerimus quidem, sed recordationem facientes mortis ejus—hoc sacrificium exemplar est illius.

\*\* Τι γινονται οι μεταλαμβανοντες σωμα χριστου.

It is said to have been written during his exile. In it is the following passage, "Before the bread is sanctified we call it bread, but by the grace of God, through the intervention of the priest, sanctifying it, it is delivered from the appellation of bread, and is esteemed worthy of the appellation of the body of the Lord, although the nature of the bread remains in it."\*

This passage is expurgated from some of the editions; but Gregory, of Valentia (a Jesuit) retains it (in his book concerning Transubstantiation). Yet he, says the author, is not John Chrysostom, but John of Constantinople; forgetting, perhaps, that Chrysostom was the bishop of Constantinople.

LXVII. In an imperfect work on Matthew, (*Hom. 11.*) we have the following; "If, then, it is so dangerous a thing to transfer to private uses, these sanctified vessels in which the true body of Jesus Christ is not, but the mystery of his body, how much more the vessels of our bodies, which God has prepared for himself as a dwelling place."†

This passage too, has been expurgated from some editions, under pretence that these books were corrupted by the Arians. (*See edit. of Paris, 1557, Odet Petit.*) But the Arians certainly could have no motive to interpolate this passage. Others say that Chrysostom alludes to the vessels of the temple of Solomon; but this cannot be so, for he says, these sanctified vessels in which the body of Christ is not contained, in the present tense,—not *was not*, in the *past* tense.

LXVIII. But Chrysostom is remarkable for amplification, verbosity, vivid imagery, &c. Bellarmine remarks this; (*Lib. de Missa 2, cap. 10, § ad illud.*) and his figurative style has been perverted by the Roman church. Yet when not in his extacies of style, we see that he speaks the language of the other fathers. But all of them use figurative language. Jerome says, upon Psalm 147, "The blood of Christ is poured into our ears." Cyprian (*de Coena Domini*) says, "We cling to his cross, we suck his blood, we fix our tongue upon his wounds, we are red within and without." So Chrysostom (*Hom 71, to the people of Antioch*) "the Lord not only makes himself visible to those who desire him, but also to be handled, to be eaten, to have our teeth fixed upon his flesh, and to be pressed with our embraces." Now the Roman church will explain most of these expressions figuratively, and they err in not explaining the whole in that way.

LXIX. Cyril of Alexandria, (who flourished, *Circ. 432, Indict. xv.*) in answer to the objections of Theodoret, says, "Do you declare that our sacrament is the eating of a man? And do you irreligiously urge the minds of those who believe, to such gross

\* Antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus; Divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, &c.

† Si ergo haec vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre sic periculosum est, in quibus non verum corpus Christi sed mysterium corporis Christi continentur quanto magis vasa corporis nostri etc.

thoughts? And do you undertake to treat with your human thoughts that which is taken by an exquisite pure faith alone?"\*

LXX. Macarius, the Egyptian, (*circ.* 350) in Hom. 27, says, "In the church, bread and wine is offered; being the figure of his flesh and blood; and those who partake of this bread which is seen, eat spiritually, the flesh of our Lord."† This author says, it is bread and wine that is offered even after the consecration,—that this bread is the figure of the body of the Lord, and of course, that it is not *really* his flesh,—and that this flesh is eaten spiritually.

LXXI. Vigilus, (against Eutiches, in book 4,) speaking of the flesh of Christ, says "The flesh, when it was on earth, was not in heaven; now, that it is in heaven, it is no longer on the earth."‡ This expression seems formed so as to exclude perversion, by means of a distinction between a visible and an invisible presence. We may add to each clause of this proposition, the words, *neither visibly nor invisibly*; and this must be the sense, or the heretic against whom he was writing, might have replied, that while his flesh was on the earth visibly it was invisibly in heaven.

LXXII. Procopius Gazeus (upon Gen. chap. 49.) has this expression, "He gave the image, or effigies, or type of his body; no longer receiving the bloody sacrifices of the law:"§ using three words to express the same thing.

LXXIII. We have thought it the more important to produce the foregoing extracts from the fathers, because they show that the doctrine of transubstantiation has not always been taught in the Christian church; but doctrines quite opposite to and altogether inconsistent with it. The Roman church insists very much upon the supposed confirmation of their present doctrines by all antiquity, and one of the chief arguments which they bring against the system of doctrines taught by Calvinists, is, that in many parts it is at variance with the writings of the fathers. If it be necessary to agree with the fathers in all things, in order to be the true church, nothing is more easy than it would be to prove, that the present Roman church has apostatized from the faith. The foregoing citations (from Augustine, Justin Martyr, Iraeneus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertulian, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius, Ambrose, Gaudentius, Gregory of Nazianzum, Ephrem, Jerome, Chrysostom, Cyril, Macarius, Vigilus, and Procopius) prove conclusively, that the Roman church has departed from the faith of the ancient church in one important doctrine. Archbishop Tillotson, in his sermon against transubstantiation, has collected some other passages from the

\* Num hominis commestionem nostrum, hoc sacramentum pronuncias? Et irreligiose ad crassas cogitationes urges eorum qui crediderunt mentem? Et attentas humanis cogitationibus tractare quæ sola pura et exquisita fide sumuntur?

† Εν τη εκκλησια προςφερεται αρτος και οινος' αντιτυποι της σαρκος αυτου και του αιματος και οι μεταλαμβωντες εκ του φαινομενου αρτου πνευματικως την σαρκα του κυριου εσθιουσιν.

‡ Caro, quando in terrâ fuit, non erat in coelo, et nunc, quia, in coelo est, non est utique in terrâ.

§ Dedit corporis sui imaginem vel effigiem aut typum, &c.

fathers, upon which his observations are very forcible. Indeed quotations would be swelled to a large volume, if we were to glean all the passages from the fathers which are contrary to or inconsistent with this doctrine. And we might safely promise to become Romanists if they will produce the authority of any father not later than Augustine, for many other doctrines and practices which that church teaches and allows. Such, for example, as the Mass without communicants—the prohibition of the cup to the laity—the limbo of infants—pictures of the Trinity—divine service and prayers in a language not understood by the people and sometimes not by the priest—indulgences—prohibition to read the Scriptures—the delivery of souls from purgatory by bulls and indulgencies—the doctrine that our Lord by his death did not satisfy for the temporal punishment of sins committed after baptism—the power of the popes to give and take away kingdoms—the jubilee—privileged altars—pardons for 6000 years, &c. But these topics are not pertinent to our purpose.

LXXIV. Yet, strange as it may seem, no passage can be produced so directly and plainly opposed to their doctrines that they have not in readiness a gloss, perversion, subterfuge or evasion, by which they hope to escape from it. If the fathers say the wicked do not eat the body of our Lord; the Romanists reply that by the body we must understand the church. If the fathers say we eat not the body of the Lord; they reply that we must understand them to mean that we do not eat it in morcels. If the fathers say that after the consecration the substance of the bread remains; they say we must understand them to mean the accidents. If the fathers say the substance of the bread goes into the draught; they reply that it is only the accidents (which are colour shape or things immaterial.) If the fathers say that the words "This is my body," signify "This is the figure of my body;" they say we must understand these phrases thus, "This bread was formerly the figure of my body." If the fathers say that our Lord gave it to the bread to be the figure of his body; they conjecture without proof that the text of their writings has been corrupted. If the fathers say that the body of our Lord is absent and is not on the earth; they say we must understand the expression to mean that his body is no longer visibly present. If the fathers say that our Lord by the words "This is my body," designated the symbols of his body; they say the symbols lie in connection with the reality, or that Christ himself is the symbol and figure of himself. If the fathers say it is bread that we eat; they reply it is called bread because it was so before the consecration, but is no longer so. If the fathers say that *that* which is offered is the figure of our Lord; they say that by figure we must understand the accidents or species, (*viz*: the exterior form or figure.) When they are pressed to extremities they tell us that Theodoret, Tertullian and Origen were heretics; that the fathers wrote obscurely through fear of revealing the mysteries. But in fact, they are not willing that the fathers should be the interpreters of Scripture, except upon the condition that they may interpret the fathers. But such unfair dealing with the fathers and with us, will not be justified except by those who are firmly resolved to renounce

all liberty of judgment, and to remain in profound ignorance, not only of the Scriptures, but also of the doctrines of Scripture as taught during several centuries, in that very church through which the Romanists profess to trace their pedigree.

[To be continued.]

---

BRITISH CIVILIZATION.

No. I.

It is not perhaps to be wondered at, that the example and opinion of Great Britain should have exerted an undue influence over the public sentiment of this country—when the former relations of the parties are considered. But at present, it seems to us, that the American people owe it to themselves, to truth, and to a decent regard for the opinions of the rest of the world, to disenthral themselves immediately from this unworthy deference, to an influence never deserved, always insolently assumed—and now most ridiculous and insulting in its pretensions.

One of the most sure means of breaking up the remnants of this national deference—so humiliating to us—is to inform the public mind, in regard to the real condition of those who assume such superb airs towards all the rest of the world, and especially towards us, poor republicans. It is true we are so unfortunate as to have no aristocracy to despise us—no King or Queen to tyrannise over us—no established church to corrupt our religion—no intolerable burden of taxation to eat up the earnings of our industry—no immense standing army to drill us into love of country; but possibly they who have and who know how to value these mercies, may be obliged to take along with them other and opposite institutions, which in some degree mitigate these great blessings;—and to escape which, we may perhaps agree not to be so highly favoured as they are in those good things.

Our immediate object at present is to present to our readers a few selections from the periodical press of England, showing their own views of their own condition; and our hope is that our readers will be able to compare candidly and fully, the state of our country and institutions, with these representations,—and thence infer how great our obligations are to those, who being so fully qualified, are also so kindly disposed to enlighten our ignorance and cure our errors.

The papers from which we make the extracts which follow, are the *Record*, the *Patriot*, and the *Examiner*. All three are published in London. The first is the organ of the evangelical part of the established church of England; the second of the orthodox dissenters; and the third of the great radical party in politicks; the two first being *nominally* religious newspapers,—the third only political and literary—unless, indeed, we should add *infidel*—as it is published weekly on the *Sabbath-day*. The file of these papers used by us, covers part of 1836, the whole of 1837, and part of 1838; and may afford us occasional instruction in time to come.



### 1. *Justice and Humanity of British Laws.—Imprisonment for Debt.*

A letter on this subject has been addressed to Lord Denman, as Lord Chief Justice, by the prisoners confined for debt in the Queen's Bench. The following are some of the signatures and the respective duration of each writer's imprisonment:—

J. Gould, B. D., Rector of Beaconsfield, Bucks.

George Conway Montague, formerly of Lackham House, in the County of Wilts, 10 consecutive years in this prison.

J. W. Edwards, late his Majesty's Consul at Nantz, 6 consecutive years.

John Dufrene, merchant, confined 23 consecutive years.

Edward Cazy, confined 5 consecutive years.

Daniel Bliss, late B. Major, 3 and a half consecutive years.

Mary S. Piggott, widow, 14 consecutive years, having been a short time at liberty, again for two years.

B. Walsh, upwards of 10 years.

Cornelius Callahan, 13 years, without any just cause of action.

Joseph Yorke, 21 consecutive years confined.

R. Kenrick, 10 consecutive years confined.

John Bradley, 15 consecutive years confined.

C. Clifford, 17 consecutive years.

Jonathan Wood, 27 consecutive years confined.

The remaining names affixed to this letter are for shorter terms. Among them are men of rank, literature, and science.

### 2. *Election incidents; State of Civilization exhibited thereby.*

**EAST CUMBERLAND.—ATTACK ON SIR JAMES GRAHAM.**—As soon as Sir James and his party descended the hustings, a tremendous rush was made by the mob towards the Right Hon. Baronet, and a scene of uproar and outrage ensued which no language can adequately describe. About a hundred ruffians, armed with bludgeons, and who acted in concert, made the most desperate efforts to reach the person of Sir James, who was, however, surrounded by so firm a body of his friends, that all their attempts to break the phalanx were unavailing. The most furious blows were struck by those miscreants, and many gentlemen were wounded. The yells of the hired mob were absolutely deafening, and missiles of various descriptions were hurled at the Right Hon. Baronet and his party. Upon reaching the Bush, Sir James and his friends immediately barricaded the doors, but the bludgeon-men proceeded up the archway to the back part of the premises and attacked the windows, some of which were smashed to pieces. The scoundrels were well organized. They appeared simultaneously upon the scene, and simultaneously disappeared—not one was to be seen in the streets two minutes after the signal for dispersion had been given. Fortunately they failed in their murderous object, by the firmness with which their intended victim was defended by his friends. It remains to be seen that steps will be taken by the patriotic authorities of Carlisle to bring the miscreants and their prompters and abettors to the bar of outraged justice.

**CARLOW.—INTIMIDATION BY THE PRIESTS.—OUTRAGES OF THE MOB.**—At no period of our history have the Romish priesthood exercised their spiritual authority over their followers with more brutal ferocity than during the present contest for the borough of Carlow; nor could those distant from the scene of action believe that any body of men professing to worship and fear God could so recklessly drive their flocks to the commit-

tal of deeds which would disgrace barbarians. During the week some of those ghostly men were employed running from house to house, threatening with excommunication any man who would vote against Mr. Maule and "their church," telling them, if they dared to exercise the privilege of British subjects according to the dictates of their conscience they should die like beasts; in a word, that they would be cut off from all communication with their fellow-men if they voted for Mr. Bruen. Bands of ruffians, armed with bludgeons, paraded the streets at night, and were employed in demolishing the houses of Roman Catholics—dragging them out of their beds in a state of nudity, and threatening them with immediate death if they voted for Mr. Bruen. In one case a man was dragged out from his family, savagely beaten, and his house threatened to be set on fire if he did not vote for the priests. Thus every law of God and man was violated with impunity, the freedom of election rendered a mere mockery, and every social tie severed by those ambitious but vulgar tyrants, who proclaim themselves the advocates of "Justice to Ireland." And for what? To effect the return of a mercenary speculator, unconnected by birth, property, or connexions with Ireland. The infamous conduct of the rabble, who were maddened to desperation by whiskey and the harrangues of their priests, surpassed anything we ever heard of in a civilized country; and what must men think of the "freedom of election" when some of the unhappy men who possess the franchise were seized upon by force, gagged, and carried off to the colliery pits, to prevent their voting at the election. Men, in some instances, polled out of the same premises, others voted out of houses from which they were long dispossessed, and there were many who voted who were disqualified, not having been in possession of their houses six months subsequent to their registry. We are warranted, then, in the assertion that such a combination of intimidation, outrage, and perjury, was never witnessed in any country possessing any claim to Christianity or civilization. It was no wonder then that Mr. Francis Bruen should say "the electors were hunted like wild beasts, their prospects in life blighted, their trade ruined, their property destroyed, their persons assaulted, and this once happy and peaceable town converted into "a hell upon earth" by the Romish priesthood."

—

WIGTONSHIRE.—Another instance of gross and brutal outrage on the voters on the Conservative side has just reached our ears. That distinguished veteran Sir William Maxwell, of Monteith, whose mutilated frame (he lost his arm on the field of Corunna) should have bespoken their sympathy and protection, became the object of a most shameful and brutal attack. The rabble would have torn him to pieces had not some of his friends come to the rescue, but not till he had received several blows and innumerable indignities; and for what? Because, in the conscientious exercise of his political rights, he voted against the heedless, untaught, and in their present frame of temper, unteachable rabble. His son was also attacked, and had a severe gash on his face inflicted by the rabble. Mr. Murnoch, of Dunrin, was maltreated and severely hurt. Many Conservative voters had their clothes spoiled by filth, and their feelings hurt by every species of vulgar epithet.

—

KILKENNY ELECTION.

—

*To the Editor of the Morning Post.*

"1,000*l.*—say 1,000*l.*"

Sir,—Can you inform your readers what the exact sum is which Mr.

Hume agreed to pay into "Wright's" as his subscription to Mr. O'Connell's *election fund* in return for his return for Kilkenny?

It is said that 1,000*l.*—say 1,000*l.*, was at once named. Hume produced "500*l.*," but the answer of the clerk at the bank in Covent-garden was—"If your thousand pounds is not paid in to-day by *one o'clock*, Mr. Ewart's 1,000*l.*, will be paid in by half-past one." Hume doled it out about one minute before the time.

**MIDDLESEX ELECTION.**—The expense of conducting the late contest on behalf of Messrs. Hume and Byng, is said to exceed 7,000*l.* One individual received upwards of 2,000*l.* for the hire of carriages. Mr. Hume, as we have already stated, was franked for 500*l.* What Mr. Byng's share has been is not known. But there is said to have been a subscription besides what was contributed by the Reform Association.

*All the preceding are Tory Statements, taken from the Record.—We now give a few samples from the Patriot. Both of these, it will be remembered are religious journals.*

Mr. WOOD of Crockford's and Almack's is returned as Member for the county of Middlesex, in the place of Mr. HUME, as the colleague of Mr. BYNG. The Tories have succeeded in bringing this disgrace upon the metropolitan county, to satisfy their vindictive hatred of an uncompromising Reformer, at an expense of about 20*l.* per vote! They have succeeded, by means worthy of the cause, in displacing one of the oldest, most faithful, and most honest representatives of the people, whose greatest crime is, that he is a zealous supporter of the QUEEN'S Government and a friend to religious liberty, in order to place in his room a frivolous nonentity, a red coated puppet of the Hanoverian faction, who presents nothing but the manners and prejudices of the aristocracy and the spite of the parsonocracy, and owes to the accident of birth and wealth his escape from utter insignificance. Well, the choice becomes them.

The people will, however, have learned a fresh lesson. With the ballot, it would have been impossible to throw out Mr. HUME: Intimidation was never more shamefully exerted in order to prevent the Liberal voters from coming forward to exercise their rights. The tory magistracy of Middlesex availed themselves of their influence most nefariously. These things must and will be looked into; and one of the first duties of the new Parliament will be to deal with such parties and such proceedings as they deserve.

In West Norfolk, nothing but gross mismanagement or treachery could have occasioned the loss of both seats; a circumstance which will somewhat tarnish the lustre of the conduct of the lord of HOLKHAM. In East Suffolk, the fox-hunting parsons have thrown out Mr. WILSON, although a very Conservative Liberal. In North Essex, the unopposed return of Sir JOHN TYRRELL and Mr. ROUND strikingly evinces the supineness of the Whig gentry. What is the use of Lord WESTERN'S putting forth a letter in vindication of the QUEEN'S Ministers, when, if he had exerted his legitimate influence, he could effectively have served the Liberal cause? Age and ill health furnish some apology for his Lordship; but we can find none for the proud, jealous, unsocial, selfish spirit of the Essex Whigs, who, unable to produce a man of talent from among their own exclusive class, disdain to give their support to a popular candidate.

There is no county in which the conduct of the Liberal party is more inexplicable than Somersetshire (West); where a mere boy without any pretension to the requisite qualifications, has been suffered to take the lead on the poll, and an old representative has been disgracefully discarded.—

The majority in favour of the Reformers was so decisive at the last election, that the Tories may well talk of a re-action in Somersetshire, although one that is little to the credit of the intelligence and moral principle of the constituency, being produced by the vilest misrepresentations on the part of their ecclesiastical janissaries.

**GOOD OLD TIMES.**—The Leicester election cost Mr. Evans, 19,000*l.*; Mr. Cave, 10,000*l.*; Sir Charles Hastings, 16,000*l.*; and the corporation 16,000*l.*; in all 61,000*l.* Warwick cost 27,000*l.* without bribery; Stafford, 14,000*l.*; where the voters wore the Beaumont cockades, said to be worth 5*l.* each in their hats. The *china* of the Camelford voters was occasionally wrapped, by accident, in one pound bank notes. The Northumberland election cost a very large sum; Mr. Bell probably paid between 60,000*l.* and 70,000*l.* for his seat of two months from February, and his four sessions seat from July, 1826. Mr. Liddell, probably 50,000*l.*; Lord Howick, 12,000*l.*; and Mr. Beaumont was charged upwards of 100,000*l.* though he contrived to pay a much smaller sum. Yorkshire cost Mr. Marshall, 30,000*l.*; and in 1806 the same county, in the great party contest between Earl Fitzwilliam and the Earl of Harewood, cost the former 150,000*l.*; and the latter 160,000*l.*, whose son, the present Earl of Harewood, then Viscount Lascelles, lost the election; 40,000*l.* were raised by subscription to support Mr. Wilberforce, but only 25,000*l.* were expended, the remainder being given by the committee to the various public charities. The contest between Lord Belgrave and Sir J. G. Eger-ton, for Chester, cost Lord Grosvenor, 70,000*l.*, and eventually, it is estimated more than 300,000*l.*

**INTIMIDATION AND CORRUPTION.**—During the present election the victims of the Tories have been victims of the "money power," of influence and intimidation. In all the great towns, where voters would not be purchased, and intimidation could only be exercised to a limited extent, the Tories have been beaten. They have been beaten in all the metropolitan boroughs, in Edinburgh, in Manchester, in Glasgow, Birmingham, Leeds, Sheffield, Leicester, Durham, etc. In cases where they have been successful they owed this result to the venal voters, the growth of the state of things which preceded the Reform Bill. The pauper freemen of Liverpool, Hull, Norwich swamped the respectable electors.

In the counties, with few exceptions, the people are not at liberty to act on their political convictions. The parsons feel that the abuses of the church as well as abuses in the State are threatened by a Liberal Government, and they have every where made common cause with the Tories. A large proportion of the magistracy every where, and in some counties the whole magistracy, are opposed to Reform. The elector finds himself beset whichever way he turns, and finally abandons the very idea of struggling for his principles.

### 3. *How Protestants treat their own Ministers—when they vote against them.*

The reader will see, in the extract which we subjoin from the *Dublin Evening Post*, a specimen of the practical piety that distinguishes the Orange party. So consuming is their zeal for Protestantism that it devours the ordinary respect which even infidels of any breeding pay to places of religious worship. With all the pains that so many of the Irish Parsons have taken to recommend themselves, and indeed their faith, to the hatred of their Roman Catholic countrymen, we have never yet heard that the most obnoxious of them, not even the Ryders and Beresfords, have ever been insulted in their pulpits and driven from their churches.

It is only Orangemen that riot at the communion-table and assault Protestant Ministers at their altars. Several Dublin Clergymen voted for the Liberal candidate at the College Election; and they are attacked the next sabbath in their reading-desks, and frightened from the discharge of their sacred duties with yells of "No Popery," and every demonstration of savage violence. One reverend gentleman, Mr. Bermingham, is assailed with infamous epithets, and only saved from personal outrage by the interference of the Catholics of the neighbourhood, who got information of his danger. This is decent; this is respectable; this is eminently Protestant and truly Christian! Truly the Established church of Ireland is happy in her children.

The following is the account of these profane excesses:—

"On Saturday night a conspiracy was entered into by several hundred fellows, calling themselves Protestants, to disturb the services in the several churches in the city, and to prevent those clergymen from officiating who had the presumption to exercise their judgment in voting, at the College election, for Dr. Stock. Accordingly, at an early hour about 200 persons assembled in St. Bride's Church, to insult the Rev. Mr. Bermingham. When that gentleman appeared, the yelling commenced, and the most infamous names were called out. They then retired, banging the church doors after them, and crying out 'No Popery, no Popery.' From Bride's about a hundred of the *gentlemen* walked up to St. John's, to insult the Rev. Mr. Benn. They took their places regularly in the church, and remained quiet while another person, the Rev. Mr. Bourke (a Renegade Priest!) was officiating; but when Mr. Benn opened his lips, the yelling of 'No Popery, no Popery,' continued, with cries of 'Turn him out,' 'No castle hacks.' 'He shall not officiate in a Protestant place of worship.' The alarm was very great among those people who came peacefully to worship their God. Many females ran away, uproar was kept up in the church with the vociferations of these fellows, saying, that they would not leave the church until Mr. Benn was driven out. We observed some persons going up to him, and telling him, that for his personal safety he ought to retire. Indeed, it might have been expected, from the pointed manner in which Mr. Benn and Mr. Bermingham were held up in the *Warder* to public execration, that they would be assaulted. It was in vain that the Rev. Mr. Fleury went out in his canonicals, and entreated the miscreants to retire quietly, but it was all in vain. Having accomplished their object in this church, a battalion was dispatched to Paul's to insult the Rev. Mr. Tyrrell, while some more returned to Bride's to assail the Rev. Mr. Bermingham, on coming out of the church. Were it not for the determination of the church-warden, Mr. Martin, of George's street, who got a strong body of police, much bloodshed would have taken place, and these ultra-Protestants would have been massacred by the Bull-alley boys, who turned out to defend Mr. Bermingham. We have not yet heard how Mr. Stevelly, in Werburgh's—or Mr. Strong, in Audeon's—or Mr. Franklin, in Mark's—or Mr. Kelly, in Mary's, escaped, who showed themselves to be true Protestants, in exercising the right of private judgment, in voting for the candidate whom they considered best calculated to settle the church question in a full and satisfactory manner."

It is not upon this occasion alone that we have received accounts of a ruffianly system of persecution pursued towards those few Protestant Ministers in Ireland who dare to walk in the ways of the gospel, while all their brethren run after Mammon. We may mention the instance of the Rev. Charles Thomas in Carlow, a clergyman of exemplary worth and character, but who had the hardihood to espouse the national system of education, and who has in consequence been baited by the furious bigots

nd intolerants who compose the Aristocracy of that county, with every description of insult and annoyance.

4. *Lord John Russell's description of the Tory party,—that is, of half the population of Great Britain.*

“ In no very long period of years they increased the debt of this country from 250,000,000*l.* to 850,000,000*l.*—they imposed most burdensome taxes upon the people to pay the interest of that debt—they gave rise to many unnecessary expenses, and kept up many most useless establishments—to facilitate for a time the collection of taxes they depreciated the currency, thereby rendering their imposts in the end much more burdensome and more heavy upon the nation—they administered the poor laws in such a way as to deprive them of the effect intended by the act of Elizabeth—they paid the wages of labour out of a fund that ought only to be distributed in the way of charity, thereby reducing the independent labourers of the country (to use a phrase which I remember my friend Mr. Horner once used to me when speaking upon this subject) to a state of villanage (cheers)—they effected also an union with Ireland, but they did not effect that union upon its only true basis—a union of the interests, of the feelings, and of the affections of the people of England and Ireland. (Cheers.) It was a union bought with money—bought, I believe I am not exaggerating when I say, by 800,000*l.* of British money, besides honours and titles lavished without stint to buy the Irish Parliament, but not to conciliate the people of Ireland. (Cheers.) So much for the acts of Tory ministers. I come now to their omissions. (Hear, hear.) That which they left undone was indeed great, and came in the end to be almost appalling. In the criminal law, for instance, they made little or no alteration in the sanguinary character of the code which then ruled; and as regarded slavery—that unfortunate and sinful blot upon our name (hear, hear)—they did nothing that could be considered as effectually tending to its complete extinction. (Hear, hear.) With respect to other subjects which I will now leave untouched—but untouched only because I wish to spare more time, they left everything to do (hear, hear);—they occupied themselves with maintaining establishments which they then said were necessary—in passing laws from time to time to repress the rising discontent of the people, and with these poor performances they thought the duties of government were ended. (Cheers.) The result was, that when a new Parliament was elected in 1830, after the death of George IV, the state of the country was most calamitous. Happening at that time to be passing through an agricultural district of the country, travelling by night, I saw the fires which everywhere were raised by the incendiary labourers of the time—I witnessed the contempt of law—the degradation of authority. The magistrates felt themselves overpowered—they had no means to resist the evil, and knew not how to arrest it. In the metropolis the state of things was no better, for in London the late King, than whom no king was ever more conspicuous for courageous and amiable qualities—a king whose general character entitled him to the respect of every one of his subjects (cheers)—was advised by the Prime Minister of the day not to venture within the walls of the city, or to appear before his assembled subjects.”

After noticing the affectation of the Tories in calling themselves “Conservatives” the noble secretary proceeded thus:—

“ If that, then, is the name that pleases them—if they say that the distinction of Whig and Tory should no longer be kept up, I am ready, in opposition to their name of Conservative, to take the name of Reformer, and to stand by that opposition. (Great cheering.) And in looking back

to history, taking their sense of the denomination of Conservative, I think one may be as proud of the name of Reformer as they can be of the name of Conservative. (Hear, hear.) What was Luther? (Hear, hear.) Luther was a Reformer. (Cheers.) Leo X. who opposed the Reformation, was a Conservative. (Cheers.) What was Galileo? Galileo, who made great discoveries in science, was a Reformer. (Cheers.) The Inquisition who put him into prison was Conservative. (Great cheering.) So, in the same way, with respect to every part of history, we find that in all times and in all countries there have been Reformers and Conservatives. The Christians who suffered martyrdom in Rome were Reformers. The Emperor who put these Christians to death, Nero, was a Conservative. (Great cheering.) If they choose to change their names—and mock names they certainly are—of Whig and Tory into the Names of Reformer and Conservative, I am ready, from the testimony of all past history, and from all my experience of the present times, to say that I am a Reformer.”

---

THE RESTORATION OF THE BIBLE AS A CLASS BOOK TO COMMON SCHOOLS.

NOTHING which has occurred during our day, has so much surprised us, as the silent, but thorough and universal revolution, which has been operating throughout every portion of society, in regard to the use of the Holy Scriptures; a revolution which absolutely threatens to banish them from the earth as effectually, as when men could only obtain them in manuscript, and then at the price of a life's labour. What boots it to print millions of copies of God's word,—if none of those copies are read? What practical advantage from reducing the price to a sum which we count by pence—if its sacred contents are valued at less than one of those base farthings?

Our experience and observation lead us to believe, that there is scarcely one church in a hundred, in this country—in which the reading of the Word of God forms, *universally*, a part of the stated public worship, on the Lord's day. Ordinarily, a portion is read in the forenoon of the Sabbath day; but even this is very often omitted: and very generally, no portion of it is read, as a part of the stated exercises, in the afternoon or evening services of the Sabbath.

During the week evening services, the reading of the Scriptures, is very generally omitted; and at the meetings for prayer, exhortation, enquiry, &c. &c.—almost universally.

Nay, in the very devotions of the family—and we greatly fear, in a multitude of cases, in the secret devotions of individual Christians—the Scriptures, are often, very often, omitted; especially in the services which close the day.

As to the systematic reading of the word of God in the way of devotional exercise; or its regular study in the way of individual instruction; or its stated exposition, in order, from the pulpit;—the two first are hardly to be looked for, on the part of private Christians, when the last is neglected by their teachers. And does any one believe that one in fifty of the preachers of the gospel in the whole land, laboriously prepares himself, and regularly expounds the Bible, in course, to his charge?

In the church of God, every epoch of signal defection, will be found to have been preceded by an era notable for the shallowness and barrenness of its spiritual expositions. And we in our turn have passed through the dreadful declension, which has in its course brought after it so great an apostacy; and which will speedily be followed by another, and yet another, if we restore not the usages, which by God's grace may keep us in the right way,—as well as purge out the evils which departure from them had so greatly tended to introduce. Hence the profound wisdom of those acts of the two last Assemblies, looking in all directions, to the restoration of the ancient landmarks; and amongst the chief, the urgent, repeated and solemn appeals to the people and the preachers, on the subject of a more thorough and systematic use of the word of God. Hence, too, the indubitable evidence of imminent danger still threatening us, in a general lack of any extended, solemn and deep enthusiasm for the word of life.

Our present object is not, however, to discuss the general subject; but to call attention to one particular branch of it; and especially to the *first* beginnings of an organized effort, to restore the Bible as a reading book to common schools.

It should perhaps, create no astonishment that the word of life should not abide in schools, after it can hardly be said to abide in the sacred desk; nor should parents who let it slip from their fire sides and their closets, marvel to find it glide away from the hands of their children. Nevertheless, as evil increases while it advances—we find that what is only general in regard to the pulpit, is nearly universal in the schools; and that the sin which is not uncommon with parents has become a part of life with their children.

The universal rejection of the Bible from our common schools might have been so effected, as to have been somewhat less intolerable. That is, it might have been done boldly;—and not insidiously and hypocritically, in the name of liberality and catholicity. It might have been done chiefly by men openly profane; and not by men professing to revere goodness and to inculcate virtue. It might have been done out of conviction; and not from motives the most sordid and the most selfish. It might have left us a class of books in place of the sublime and precious one driven out, tolerable as to their influence, and respectable as to their own character; instead of palming on us books as empty of sense as they are of piety, and vile in point of literature, in proportion, as they are extortionately dear in price.

These are the facts. Our school class books in reading, are nearly without exception—books destitute of literary merit—sedulously empty of all sound principles of religion—worse than nonsensical for the most part, as vehicles of knowledge. Or if any information is contained in them—it is as universally local, and of inferior value; confined entirely to New England, where the books are prepared, where their scenes all lie, and whence they have come like an inundation, and washed away the Bible from the schools of the land.



To force these books into the schools, and the Bible out of them—there seems to have been formed a general conspiracy, a tripartite covenant between the authors, publishers, and teachers—to make people pay high in proportion as they were taught nothing. The writings of God, could be had for a few cents; but these new writings, being much “*better to read in,*” and much more *profitable* after being read—are made to enrich those who provide them—teachers as well as authors and publishers—at the double expense of God’s honour and the people’s souls.—And things have come to such a pass, that we have seriously doubted, whether no education at all—is not better than such an one as is often obtained, at our most pretending schools—as the recompense for years of lost time, and hundreds of wasted wealth.

But it is not our purpose to write a lecture against the schools, merely as such; bad as they have become—and dreadful as is the injury they have done and are doing the public. We took up our pen merely to indicate the importance of the restoration of the Bible to the schools—as the best, the wisest, the cheapest, the loveliest of all books; and to do this, more by calling attention to the paper published below than by any remarks of our own.

It is enough to say, farther, that *the Board of Managers of the Maryland State Bible Society*, have taken up this great subject in sincere and earnest purpose to accomplish, if the Lord will, a thorough reform; and that all its conclusions have been cordially and unanimously reached, in large successive meetings of the Board.—In this manner the subject has reached a most important stage amongst us; and our chief object in publishing the report below, which has received the full approval of the Board, is to call the public attention to the subject, and to beseech all who love God or the human race, to do what becomes Christians and patriots, in so noble a cause, at so striking a crisis of it. The citizens of this Commonwealth will, according to the plan proposed in the report and adopted by the Board,—very soon have the opportunity afforded them, of aiding this enterprise, in a direct manner, by signing the petitions and memorials, which are now in a course of preparation. But the reform to be thorough and effectual, must be universal; and we beseech the Lord, to awaken all his people to their duty—and every reflecting man to the danger and the disgrace, attendant on the present state of affairs.

---

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE MARYLAND STATE BIBLE SOCIETY, ON THE IMPORTANCE OF INTRODUCING THE BIBLE INTO OUR COMMON SCHOOLS AS A READING BOOK.

*The Committee to whom was referred the subject of the introduction of the Scriptures as a reading book into our common Schools, submit the following Report as the result of their deliberations:*

THE BIBLE is the only, the all sufficient and the divine rule of the religious faith and obedience of mankind. It alone teaches us what we are to believe concerning God, and what he requires us to do.

No true Christian, ought to hesitate, and no Protestant or Evangelical Christian can hesitate, as to the full admission of these clear and certain truths. Then it follows, that we ought to desire above all things for our fellow-men that as every one of them is immortal, and every one by nature ignorant and sinful,—every one should know the sum of God's revelation to the world; yea that if we love God or our fellow-men, we ought to labour to bring on this result, by every honest and lawful means, and with zeal and diligence commensurate with the greatness of the subject and of the necessities of mankind.

This is the result of any proper view of the religious aspect of the subject. In whatever other light we may consider it, our conclusions are still clear and firm, that the whole world, and every reasonable being in it, ought to know the contents of the Bible; and that we ought to do our utmost to effect that object.

The Bible, even if it were not divine, contains the only solid foundations for true morality, and therefore for individual happiness and public felicity. In it, moreover, are hid the traces of all human knowledge, during four thousand years of the history of man.—And amongst its various writers, are to be found, the most gifted, renowned and glorious of all poets, orators, statesmen, warriors, philosophers, historians, moralists, and lawgivers, that have blessed the earth with their presence and their labours. Nay in every language of all people pretending to civilization, or possessing any thing deserving to be called a literature, this book has been circulated more widely than any other; and in a multitude of cases, has tended more than any other, perhaps more than all others, to give fixation to the language itself, and as the highest classic in it, to direct and control the public taste, as well as to enlighten the public mind and purify the public conscience.

This, therefore, is not only the book of God, but is, also, in a high and solemn sense the book of the human race. So that to be without it, is at the same time, to be ignorant of God, and separated from civilized and enlightened man.

There was a time when the American people felt the force of these sublime truths, and acted answerably to their principles, on some points of this great subject, in regard to which a fearful declension has now occurred. We have distributed, no doubt, more Bibles than our fathers did. But our fathers caused the Bible to be read, where we only scatter copies of it.

While we have been trying to furnish Bibles for the whole world, we have allowed the Bible as a class book to slip out of the hands of our own children. While we have been paying thousands upon thousands to send the Bible to heathen schools, and thousands more to heathen teachers, upon condition of their adopting it as a part of their school instructions; we have permitted the same Bible to be supplanted in our schools at home, and allowed our schoolmasters, under our eyes, and with our patronage, and in obedience to a public taste countenanced, perhaps by ourselves, to reject the same Bible, utterly from their course of instruction.

There was a time when the Bible was found as a reading book in all our schools, of the better sort, both public and private, in

every part of the land ; and when the New Testament, in Greek, was a regular class book, in all our classical schools. Now the latter is almost wholly supplanted ; and as for the former, we are not acquainted with above two or three schools in this commonwealth, in which either the Old or the New Testament, in English, is a class book. And similar facts exist throughout the country.

Such a condition of things cannot but be injurious to the religion, the morality, the education, and indeed, every private and every general interest of the community. We look upon its existence as equally extraordinary, disreputable, and alarming ; and are firmly persuaded that our duty as Christians, as citizens, and as parents demands of all the friends of the Bible and the country, an immediate and united effort to produce a complete reform of the cause of education in this respect.

I. We do, therefore, earnestly recommend, that as the Board of Managers of the Maryland State Bible Society, has done much towards supplying the people with the Word of God, they now endeavour to prevent its final banishment from the very seats of knowledge. And to this end, that the subject of restoring the Bible as a reading book to common schools, be taken up by us as a work peculiarly within our province.

II. And as to the proper action of the Board, we recommend,

1. That a respectful communication in the form of a circular, be prepared and communicated to all the School Commissioners, and to the principal teachers of common schools throughout this commonwealth, known to the board ;—urging the necessity of this restoration. And that a Committee be charged with that duty.

2. That a respectful petition, signed as extensively as may be, by citizens friendly to the object, be presented to the proper authorities in this city ; praying for the introduction of the English Bible as a reading book into the public schools of the city. And that a similar petition, signed in a like manner, be presented to the Legislature of the State, with a like prayer in regard to all schools which receive aid from it, or are subject to its control in the premises. And that a Committee be charged with these duties.

3. That the Board of Managers undertake to furnish Bibles and Testaments for all purposes herein contemplated, at cost.

4. That this subject ought to be brought prominently before the public, and kept steadily in its view, as a great reform indispensably required, by all the interests of society as such, as well as all those of every individual composing it.

Signed by the Committee,

RO: J. BRECKINRIDGE,  
IRA A. EASTER,  
J. HARMAN BROWN.

Baltimore, Sept. 3d, 1838.

---

The foregoing Report, being submitted to a very full meeting of the Board, was discussed, amended, and unanimously adopted ; and all needful steps taken for early and efficient action, on the

Pv. 10. I

119900  
24c  
Lit D

Month

572

*The Restoration of the Bible, &c.*

10

[December,

principles, and in the manner therein set forth. It fills our hearts with joy to add, that all the evidence in our possession conspires to prove, that in this movement we have not gone beyond what the voice of the friends of the Bible, every where, will cordially sustain; and that nothing beyond fidelity and zeal are needful, on their part to ensure early and general success to this important enterprise.

*Program*

