

THE  
BALTIMORE LITERARY  
AND  
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

---

VOL IV.

MARCH 1838.

No. 3.

---

DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE ASSEMBLY OF 1837.

No. VI.

*Distribution of Power.—State of the Representation.*

I. IN a body avowedly representative and republican, as every thing Presbyterial must of necessity always be—the principles which regulate the distribution of power, are of course fundamental in theory, and vital to every practical intent. When controlling power resides in the hands of a minority of the electors—all fair representation is at an end. When the distribution of representatives, is so effected, as to render it impossible, or even very difficult to gather the real sense and mind of the body itself—then every object of the associated existence not only fails, but is absolutely defeated by those pretending to love and to practice the system itself

If we can command the attention of the reader, we will try to demonstrate, that a certain portion of the Presbyterian church, has for a long period held and exercised a power, utterly disproportioned to the extent of that party, and totally subversive of all fair representation. We will endeavour to show that this portion is that which contains in its breast the original germ of all the heresies, troubles, and contentions which have ravaged our church—and that its disproportionate power has been extensively exerted to foster every evil element. We will attempt to make manifest, that this unrighteous power has been retained long and tenaciously against the voice of justice and the constitution, as well as the prayer of the church,—and only at last partially given up—as it could gradually be made to slide into hands, prepared before to receive and exercise it in the same spirit and for the same ends, as those of its prescriptive holders. We will, we are persuaded, be

able to establish, not only the necessity and reasonableness, but the extreme candour and forbearance of the action of the last General Assembly—upon this subject; an action which it must be remembered, has caused more hard speeches to be made against certain members of that body, than all its acts besides.

We will first quote all the material portions of the minutes of the Assembly in relation to our subject.

On page 471 of the printed minutes of the year in question, is the resolution of the CONVENTION, marked eight of its series on church order in the *Act and Memorial* presented by it to the Assembly. It contains so much of the views of the convention, as relates to the matter in hand, and complains of the great evil we have proclaimed above, in the following words, viz.

A progressive change in the system of Presbyterian representation in the General Assembly, which has been persisted in by those holding the ordinary majorities, and carried into detail by those disposed to take undue advantage of existing opportunities, until the actual representation seldom exhibits the true state of the church, and many questions of the deepest interest have been decided contrary to the fairly ascertained wishes of the majority of the churches and people in our communion; thus virtually subverting the essential principles of freedom, justice and equality on which our whole system rests.

It was of course improper for the General Assembly to censure its own past acts, without redressing them at the same time; or rather the former, was not so needful as the latter. In this spirit, while the foregoing item was laid on the table, we find further, in the session (page 480) that a committee was appointed "to prepare an overture to be presented to the next Assembly, in relation to the ratio of representation in the General Assembly."

Before this however, another branch of the same business had been under consideration, and a most important step taken. On pages 446—7 we find the following resolutions offered by DR. ALEXANDER, and passed by a vote of about 115 to 44 (that being the relative strength of parties, on a motion to give them the go-by,) —as additional standing rules of the General Assembly; viz.

1. That no commissioner from a newly formed Presbytery, shall be permitted to take his seat, nor shall such commissioner be reported by the Committee on Commissions, until the Presbytery shall have been duly reported by the Synod, and recognised as such by the Assembly; and that the same rule apply when the name of any Presbytery has been changed.

2. When it shall appear to the satisfaction of the General Assembly that any new Presbytery has been formed for the purpose of unduly increasing the representation; the General Assembly will, by a vote of the majority, refuse to receive the delegates of the Presbytery so formed, and may direct the Synod to which such Presbytery belongs, to re-unite it, to the Presbytery or Presbyteries to which the members were before attached.

II. these resolutions of the Assembly have been a theme of unmeasured abuse, on the part of certain *weak* prints, devoted to peace. And if any thing has exceeded the outrage committed in their passage,—these mild and pre-eminently holy persons being judges,—it was the pledge substantially required,—by the Assem-

bly of its committee on elections, and freely and frankly given by both its members—that they would obey in general, all, but especially this indispensable act—and from the roll of the Assembly of 1838, upon the basis of that of 1837—and so on continually, while these standing rules existed.

We take leave to say, it surprises us exceedingly to find no notice of this latter transaction, in the printed minutes. On page 498, is an order in the usual form, appointing DR. CUYLER, and MR. GRANT, along with the Stated Clerk (DR. JOHN McDOWELL) “a committee to revise the minutes, and prepare them for publication.” Have these gentlemen overlooked, by some extraordinary fatality, the important minute, which contained the notice of Dr. John McDowell’s pledge as Stated Clerk, openly given in the face of the Assembly and the world—(and that too while a resolution offered by one of the most talented and influential layman in the body, and intended to obtain *certainty* on this very head was under discussion)—that he would comply with the acts and expectations of the Assembly? Have they so construed their *revisory* powers, as to erase the minute containing the clear, and manly letter of Mr. JOHN M. KREBBS, the Assembly’s permanent clerk, on this most weighty subject? Those gentlemen are no doubt furnished with sufficient reasons for what they have done; but they ought to be aware that this subject does not bear incautious handling,—and that the church will hold them to an accountability no less deep than its own love of the gospel of God—should any damage befall the truth, either by their action or neglect.

The church and the world know, that these pledges were given, and were of right, as well as in fact *once* a part, and a most important part of the minutes of the Assembly of 1837.—The obligations of plighted faith, as well as those of law, of honour and of ecclesiastical order, are all perfect in the case. And while we have all confidence that every pledge given will be strictly redeemed, and every duty involved, exactly performed according to the expectation of the Assembly, both its clerks, it is nevertheless proper for the case to be broadly stated and clearly understood;—the more especially, since the minutes as published, do not give the facts as they happened. It never should be supposed for a moment, that the Assembly would have left such a matter to the slightest hazard. How could it? How dare it? If it were not well assured, that the mind of the church, truly represented—or at least no worse represented, than its existing organization allowed—could be gathered and repeated,—how could it possibly expect its acts of reform to be sustained, or to remain permanent? And were they passed, only to be juggled off, by some new creation of Presbyteries; or to be wiped out, by some amiable hocus-pocus, under the name of *conservatism*?—The Assembly was in earnest,—it did its work as in the presence of God.

When that body saw its work of reform ready to be accomplished, there were several courses open for it to take, in submitting its great acts, to the decision of the church, and gathering that decision afterwards. Let us for a moment look at this immensely interesting subject.

1. If nothing whatever had been done, in regard to the representation—it would have been perfectly easy for the New School Synods to increase their Presbyteries, to such an extent, as to make the defeat of the evangelical party absolutely certain—and that, even if the latter were greatly the more numerous. To avoid such a result would have been a plain duty; and the most obvious if not the only way to do it, would have been to create new Presbyteries on our side also. But as our present regulations permit a Synod to form a Presbytery out of three ministers—with a few churches (or no churches at all, as our congregationalists say)—the result might have been, and probably would have been, the reduction of the church to its lowest elements;—that is, its dissolution. We suppose no sane man would like to see two thousand commissioners meet in Philadelphia next May, and call themselves a General Assembly. Yet something like this must have happened, if nothing had been done last year, touching the subject.

We will not pause here, to argue about the absurdity in the present state of the church of allowing *three* ministers to constitute a Presbytery—with an elder or two. This was the original ratio, when seven was the limit for the double representation. When the number seven was increased to thirteen, some years ago, as the limit for a double representation—great effort was made to increase the quorum of a Presbytery correspondingly,—but it failed through the long sighted iniquity of the party that has so nearly ruined us. Again, when the number thirteen was lately raised to twenty five, another urgent and most able attempt, to raise the original *three*, was defeated in the same way. And this ridiculous and hurtful anomaly, of allowing three preachers to be represented by *two* commissioners in the Assembly—while thirty six preachers and a hundred churches, can only send *four* commissioners—is not only retained as a blot on our principles and our common sense—but as an engine of our destruction.

2. Another course which might have been taken was, for the Assembly to enter at once on the purgation of the *rotten burroughs*,—and restore the representation to a fair and equal condition; making at the same time efficient regulations for to hold it in that condition. But we are to consider that this was a work of much labour and difficulty; that it required many facts, much patience and deep reflection; and that the Assembly was already wearied and exhausted by a session of unparalleled difficulty, importance, and labour. It must also be remembered, that the subject could not be reached without an appeal to the Presbyteries; and this was not only necessarily a work of time—but in the state of the Presbyteries, would probably require a thorough over-hauling of a great number of them by their respective Synods; all which, could not fail to awaken a thousand new and petty troubles,—and thus turn away the mind and heart of the church, from the great *doctrinal controversy*, (whose end we could nearly see, if the people of God could be kept steadily to it)—and dissipate its scattered energies, to all the corners of the earth, and all the winds of heaven. It was therefore an act of great wisdom, in the body to postpone for the time any general investigation of this part of the evils which trouble us.

3. The only remaining course was, that adopted by the Assembly. Let us take things as we find them—is its language. We know that the state of the representation, is decidedly unequal, and injurious to the orthodox. But let the church be poled as it stands; our confidence in its soundness is such—that if corrupting influences can be removed, or even arrested, and foreign ingredients to some tolerable extent be purged out,—the truth must triumph.—Let then, the case be fairly made and presented to the church as at present organised; and such precisely will be the fact, if the standing orders quoted above, are faithfully executed, and the next Assembly formed, on the roll of the last, at its adjournment. This is the first great feature of those new standing rules. They breathe the very spirit of candour and moderation, towards those who having seized upon power—dread least they have not grasped enough. They contain the essence of a sublime confidence, in our brethren and in God—in the exercise of which, we have chosen rather to contend for the truth on terms of known disadvantage wrongfully forced upon us—than to create a general revolution by demanding an equality of rights and terms,—or to endanger the great cause, by agitating others which derive their chief value from lending security to this. It was a great exercise of Christian fidelity and manly wisdom—and by God's blessing it will discomfit many plans deeply laid in human guile—and long matured in carnal self-seeking.

III. There is a class of persons whose reason is at times so completely under the influence of their passions, that they appear to lose not only all discrimination of what is weak and what is powerful in argument, and all perception of what is right and wrong in the particular case; but they go forward in reckless assertions to support their cause by the show of fact, until the multitude of their errors destroys even what truth they once had on their side;—and the presumption that the moral sense of other men is as dull as their own, leads them into such absurdities, contradictions and improprieties, that even if they gain their end, they have destroyed beforehand, the possibility of profiting by success. Many times have we had occasion to make this reflection, upon the conduct of the New School party and press, within the past year. Who does not remember the tempest of words used in the Assembly—and spread out in protests on its minutes, to prove that the plan of union had been really every thing, and that all the churches of Western New York owed their origin to it? This was when we were discussing the dissolution of that plan. But as soon as this was done—and we come to apply the facts and arguments used to hinder it—and were about to separate ourselves from the Four Synods, as the real progeny of the plan;—*presto change*—the plan had nothing whatever to do, with the case!—Was there ever a more palpable and absurd self-contradiction, in proof or reason. We cite as samples of another sort, the vehement threats of law suits to decide on the validity of spiritual acts of the Assembly,—and the sustained cry, that our agreement with the Connecticut Association was unchangeable and unalterable. As if the common sense, and the ordinary conscience of all men—had not instinctively the perception, that amongst us, threats and pretensions of this sort,

can spring only from desperate ignorance of the rights and obligations of religious parties—or still more desperate contempt of them.—As a different specimen we refer to the false facts ten thousand times asserted, that the plan of union of 1801 with the Connecticut Association, was all of our seeking, as well as all for our good:—whereas, MR. WOOD in his late and most efficient pamphlet has shown by the ancient records, that it was sought and obtained by the opposite party—and that the plan of 1808, was from the beginning a gross fraud; and by the statistical results of thirty seven years' action of the first—that it nearly extinguished our aystem in Four Synods whilst actually in connection with us.—And as a painful specimen of the most unreasonable and inconsiderate folly, we cite the greater part of what has been said against the act of the Assembly now under review.

Why, has not every representative body that ever existed amongst men, been obliged to provide some mode by which a decision could be had, on the qualifications of its own members? If it were not so—is it not obvious that all notion of a representative body is absurd; and that any mob that gathers at a street corner might as well call itself a Congress, as that which had no method by which to ascertain who were really delegated to it, and then to enforce its decisions?—We are sensible that the Congregational churches reject entirely all ideas of representation; because their system being a simple democracy, in which every church is independent of all others,—and the body of the members in each, act directly and personally for themselves—they neither need, nor indeed could employ a representative. Widely different is our system, in which from the church session, to the General Assembly, every tribunal is composed of representatives, either in part, or altogether; and even those members who are permanently attached to any of our church courts, are at first admitted to membership on certain previously ascertained qualifications, and are allowed to continue, only so long as those qualifications last. It is therefore as palpably ridiculous, and is far more seriously hurtful, to deny to any Presbyterian tribunal, the right and power to decide on the qualifications of its own members—as it would be to make a like denial to a congregational church in regard to its private members!

For a considerable period this matter was conducted by the Assembly itself—which caused the commissions of its members, to be opened at its desk—and made up its roll at once, That roll was completed, by ascertaining from the reports of Synods, what new Presbyteries had been added to the former roll of the Assembly; or what old ones taken off. And then the roll of Presbyteries being complete, the fact of election, and the qualification to be elected and to sit, was decided by inspection of the commissions presented at the desk. In case of a disputed election—no matter how arising—it was settled at once, if the case was tolerably plain; if not, it was referred to a committee. When the body became large, a committee of elections was appointed, merely to save time and trouble and prevent confusion. This committee, acted for, by the authority, and on behalf of the Assembly, as well as by its directions; and its decisions were of no weight or validity whatever,

except so far and so long, as they had the sanction, express or implied, of the body which appointed them. When all parties were content with its decisions, they were of course final; but if *any* party were non-content, they could be called in question, reversed or confirmed on the floor of the house. And very often, that committee, found cases, where strict law required one decision, and equity another; in all which they reported the facts—and asked the decision of the house.—Now the new standing rules, leave this latter plan in full and perfect exercise, in every respect except only one. Heretofore this committee has been authorised to act indiscriminately in all cases. Hereafter they shall not act in the first instance, on a Presbytery presented to them for the first time, in fact or in name. *For some time past, the Assembly has received new Presbyteries, upon its roll, by committee; hereafter, it will do this, personally. This is the whole and entire matter,—on this point of the subject which has caused such an uproar, and such volleys of abuse, from the excellent men, whose only object in life, is to do good—and spread error!* “Why do you degrade yourself, by exercising this humble calling”—said an old friend, to one of the generals of the empire after the second abdication of Napoleon. The response was—“Je shave pour de plasare of de ting—and de six-pence.” Alas! the race that compasses sea and land to do evil, under pretext of good, is a race greatly enlarged, in these unhappy times.

It is manifest on the face of the second rule—that the Assembly had full cause to believe the allegation contained in the complaint we quoted early in this article, as taken from the memorial of the convention. The fact is not to be questioned that the representation in the Assembly is, and has long been unequal; and that this inequality has operated entirely in favour of a particular geographical section; and greatly to the advancement of peculiar errors, disorders, and machinations in the church. The circumstances fully warrant the belief that this inequality if not created, was used and enlarged, and obstinately retained, to advance sectional, and party interests, hostile to truth and to the wishes of the majority of the church; and therefore there was every reason to suppose that this would be done again,—and therefore to declare plainly, that it would be resisted. We are aware that some, when it suits their party views—deny to the Assembly the right to look into the case at all—limiting its power merely to an examination (and that by a standing committee it would seem) of the fact, that such and such persons were formed into such and such a Presbytery, and that such and such others, have commissions to represent it. If this be so, the Assembly is a mere gathering of persons, to record the edicts of the Synods—or to whitewash the voluntary societies—or to pass resolutions, that all sorts of agents—abolition, moral reform, non-resistance, anti-sacrament, and all other bodies may send up to it—to “give an impulse” to their machinations. All its functions, great, noble, and august, as the highest earthly tribunal in which the church of God, and the ministers of Jesus Christ, are met to consult, by their representatives, and *to decide*, what is truth and duty—for the guidance of the people, under God,—all, all are in the dust.

But we are not left to conjecture. The fact, the extent, the duration and the effects of this alledged inequality is matter of record and of figures. The motive of it, assumed in the Assembly's rule—is matter of proof, and inference, from undeniable and startling facts. We have examined the whole case, through a series of years—with great labour—and solicit the candid attention of the public to the following expose, of two periods, six years apart.

IV. The General Assembly of 1831, under circumstances of great interest, which are undoubtedly familiar to our readers—invited the churches of the Mississippi Valley to hold a correspondence on the subject of domestic missions—in the Valley—which resulted in a convention of delegates at Cincinnati during the fall of that year. The Ruling Elders who were members of that convention with some others then in that city, met, drew up and presented to the Assembly of 1832, a memorial on the subject of representation, the first draft of which we find amongst our papers—and publish its substance, so far as the point in hand is concerned.

Our church consists of 104 constituent bodies, represented in the General Assembly by about 400 delegates, if all were present.

There are 1584 ordained ministers, and 2253 churches embraced in the 104 Presbyteries, and represented by the said 400 delegates, one half of whom were designed to be ministers, and the other half, Ruling Elders.

Our church may be considered as divided into three great sections, namely, *First*, the valley of the Mississippi; *Second*, the southern Atlantic slope, on that portion which lies south of the Chesapeak Bay, and east of the Alleghany mountain; *Third*, the northern Atlantic slope, or that portion lying north of the Chesapeak Bay, and east of the Alleghanies.

In the *1st sec.* are 575 ministers, 967 churches, 47 Presbyteries, 10 Synods.

“ “ *2d* “ “ 213 “ 246 “ 13 “ 3 “

“ “ *3d* “ “ 696 “ 1040 “ 44 “ 7 “

The *two first sections* united have a majority of 92 ministers, 173 churches, 16 Presbyteries, and 6 Synods. They should have a clear majority in the General Assembly of about 30 votes, if that body were full.

On a mature examination of the facts it will be found however, that the *third section*, although a decided minority of the whole, has an actual majority of about 10 votes, in the Assembly, if every delegate of the whole church were present.

Besides this, that *third section* has very decided advantages resulting from its relative position to the place where the Assembly meets, and the superior advantages for personal intercourse existing in that section. This advantage of position, upon an average of one year with another, is equal to more than 40 votes. In the last Assembly (*that of 1831, in which Mr. Barnes was first whitewashed.* EDTRS.) it was equal to 31 votes. That alone, in an Assembly of 230 members was equal to nearly 15 per cent. or about 60 in 400.

Now adding together these various errors, of 10 votes in favour of an actual minority, of 30 votes that the majority would have if the present system were properly carried into practice, and of 15 per cent., equal to 60 votes in 400 thrown in favour of the *third*, and against the *first and second sections* from the circumstances of position, and we have an aggregate error equal in practice to one fourth of the whole representation of the church; and that so operating as to place the power of the church for good or ill, in the hands of a decided, and that a geographical minority.

This is alike contrary to common sense, to Christian principle, and to the settled theory of our church government.



The remainder of the memorial is taken up, with other points of the subject, intensely interesting indeed, but not directly pertinent to the present business.

The Assembly to which that memorial was addressed, changed the ratio of representation—adhering to the Presbyterial instead of resorting to the Synodical basis, as urged by the convention of elders; and refusing to change the number *three*, as the quorum, thus leaving room for new Presbyteries without number, of the smallest class. Let us now look once more at the statistics, after six years' trial of the changed ratio. We take the printed minutes of 1837 as our guide, and we preserve the same sectional classification adopted in the preceding extract. There are

In the 1st sec.	829	ministers,	1324	churches,	68	Presbyteries,	13	Synods.
“ “ 2d “	313	“	427	“	18	“	3	“
“ “ 3d “	998	“	1084	“	49	“	7	“
ALL THREE.	2140	“	2865	“	135	“	23	“

1. According to the present ratio and principles of representation, the General Assembly, if it were full—would contain 334 members. Of these, by that ratio and on those principles the *first section* would send 146 members, the *second* 44, and the *third* 144. So that the *first and second* united would overbalance the *third*, in a full house, by 46 votes.

2. But if the representation were strictly and only Presbyterial, each Presbytery sending one minister and one elder, then *section one* having 68 Presbyteries would send 136 members,—*section two* having 18 Presbyteries, would send 36 members—and *section three*, having 49 Presbyteries would send 98 members. And *one and two*, unitedly would have 172, to 98 sent by *three*; that is a clear majority of 74 votes, instead of 46, as at present; the present arrangement being unduly favourably, to the *third* section by 28 votes out of 334.

3. Again; if the representation were arranged upon churches only, supposing the Assembly to consist of the present number of delegates, the result would be as follows. *Section one*, with its 1324 churches would have 155 members; *section two*, with its 457 churches would have 53 members; and *section three* with its 1084 churches would have 126 members. So that *one and two* ought on this plan to have a majority in the Assembly of 72 members instead of 46, and thus suffers by the actual state of things, an evil and error of 26 votes out of 334.

4. Suppose, however, that ministers only were made the basis of representation. Then in an Assembly of 334 members the *first section* with its 829 ministers would have 127 representatives; the *second* with its 313 ministers would have 50 representatives; and the *third* with its 998 ministers would have 157 representatives. In that case, the *first and second* sections, would have only a majority of 20 votes—instead of 46, their present majority; and thus, *three* would gain by the change 26 voices in a house of 334.

5. Finally, let us suppose a system of representation established upon all these combined bases. Then in an Assembly of 334

members—the *first section* would have 141 representatives, the *second* 46, and the *third* 131. In this case *sections one and two* would have a majority of 56 votes, over *section three*, instead of their present majority of 46, and would thus gain 10 additional voices.

In these calculations nothing is said in regard to the influence of position—which is so clearly set forth in the extract quoted from the memorial of the convention of elders—and which must forever operate, whilst the General Assembly, continues to hold its sessions, either wholly within, or barely without the limits of the *third section*. As long as Philadelphia and Pittsburgh are the only points at which the body can be induced to meet, it will be impossible for the distant south, and the great west to be fairly represented. And why might not Baltimore, and Richmond, and Charleston, as well as Cincinnati, Louisville, Lexington, Nashville and St. Louis—be in turn the places of its meeting? The reason usually given, is, that the Assembly would thereby forfeit its charter. But the truth is, the Assembly is not, and never was, and never should be a corporate body. It has indeed a board of trustees who are incorporated. But so far is the fact from being as alledged, that this charter might be forfeited by the Assembly's meeting out of the State of Pennsylvania, which gave it—that the act itself contemplates the probability of such an event, and makes express provision for the doing of certain things, only when it should meet in this state.

It cannot fail to strike the reader, that out of the five cases presented in the foregoing statements—and which cover the whole ground—three of the four differing from the present arrangement would operate against *section three* by equalising the representation upon any basis but one. That one, is the basis of ministers only. And here a very curious result is exhibited. Thus it appears that from 1831 to 1837, *section one* had increased in ministers 254, and in churches 357; that in the same period *section two* had increased in ministers 100, and churches 211; and that *section three*—while its increase in ministers was 302—increased in churches only 44! That is, the *two first sections* added nearly two churches for each minister added within the six years; while the third added nearly seven ministers for every church added! This is most astonishing. And while it very plainly shows, how it comes, that a ratio based on ministers only, would be of superior advantage to that section, it also reveals to us in some degree the secret cause of the troubles produced in it, by evangelists, agents, editors, professors, and other secularised clergymen, who for lack of better employment, have created such a ferment in large portions of that unhappy section.

V. On the comparison of the whole case as exhibited in 1831 with that presented in 1837, it might at first sight be supposed that every thing was at least tending towards improvement. But a closer inspection will show, that although from 1831 to 1837, there was a slight approximation in the aggregate, towards equality between *sections one and two* on the one hand, and *section three* on the other; yet this was far more than counterpoised, by throwing all this augmentation, and more, into affiliated hands, in the two first sections. A few figures will make this very plain; and

abundantly show that the geographical minority so used its power, as to fasten a doctrinal minority in supremacy over the church.

1. The Synod of the Western Reserve with 105 ministers, and 141 churches, were entitled to 20 representatives—by its peculiar arrangements of Presbyteries:—while Virginia with its 114 ministers and 142 churches—had only 14 representatives. What rendered this iniquity most glaring and outrageous was that one Presbytery in Virginia contained more Presbyterian churches than the whole Synod of the Western Reserve. Only consider that about 30 churches—should send 20 representatives to a General Assembly, in which 2865 churches had unitedly but 334 members! Yea and threaten to sue us, for complaining of it!!!

2. Again: The Synod of Michigan with 34 ministers and 74 churches, had a right to 6 representatives: while the Synod of North Carolina with 75 ministers and 138 churches had only 10. One church in the former Synod weighs down two in the latter; though the latter be, *or rather because they are*, thoroughly Presbyterian, while the former are “neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring.”—One minister in Michigan is equal to nearly two in North Carolina—the latter being orthodox—and the former the proteges of Dr. Peters, and the disciples of Dr. Taylor.

3. Let us take one sample more. The Synod of Illinois with 67 ministers, and 86 churches, managed to get 16 representatives; while the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, with 115 ministers and 167 churches—was content with precisely the same number. And the Synod of Kentucky and Tennessee had each 10 representatives; although the former had 68 ministers and 117 churches, and the latter but 49 ministers and 74 churches.

But we will cut short these sickening details. We have pondered this subject long, we have examined it to the bottom, we have sifted it repeatedly; and we now boldly assert, that there never existed a more flagrant case of deliberate and long continued injustice, in the conduct of such affairs, than the evangelical portions of the Presbyterian church in the South and West, have sustained from their professed brethren. Well might the General Assembly pass new standing rules to prevent the augmentation of deliberate wrong already too tamely endured. Well might it put on record, its serious condemnation of long sustained attempts to get power by fraud, and then wield it deceitfully, in the name of our church, for the ruin of its order, and the subversion of its doctrines. Attempts for which there was no decent pretext in the condition of the respective regions of the church and the country—but directly the reverse; and which were made deliberately—and obstinately pushed to the very verge of perfect success—after full exposure above six years ago.

If the Presbyterian church would save itself, it has still a great work to perform. The facts contained in this article may teach her the nature and extent of the difficulties already surmounted before the last Assembly could do what it did; and rouse her to a due sense of the vast and dangerous means thus accumulated in the hands of the New School party, and still remaining in them by fraudulent arrangement of Presbyteries, to undo all that has been done—and

drive the orthodox forth from the church. It has been systematically organised in such a way as to lodge—as far as possible, the paramount power, in the hands of the actual minority. Systematic efforts have been made, through not a few of the agents, of most of the voluntary societies, to throw in aid on suitable points, and organise the whole. And now the great contest remains to be decided. This battle will be won—if we be faithful, in defiance of all these difficulties. But if we waver or pause—all is lost.

We owe it to mankind to command success. For the action of the last Assembly, when fully sustained, will convey an invaluable lesson to all those who in contempt of plighted faith, and the sacred obligation of an oath, first engross power unjustly and then wield it injuriously;—teaching them that at length, not only detection and exposure, but retribution will overtake them.

---

#### OUR ABOLITIONISM.

THE following letter has surprised us beyond expression. We presume it will occasion hardly less astonishment in the minds of our readers.

For the apparent good feelings of the writer, we are duly grateful—and regret the necessity of bringing his name before the public. His conduct we look upon as merely *official*; while that of *Mr. Hutchinson* has been voluntary and self-directed. We consider the letter essentially that of the latter gentleman, except the name;—written on his business, by his direction, and under his instructions. So that most that is offensive in the case is not only his,—but made so, by his deliberate choice. But let us have the letter—and then the comments.

P. O., Petersburg, 11th Jan'y, 1838.

GENTLEMEN:

I am requested by the Rev'd. Mr. Hutchinson, to have his Magazine stopt. He objects to the abolition feature, which stands out with so much prominence.

He cannot consent, as a Christian minister, to aid you in the circulation of any publication, intended to interfere with our domestic relations. As for myself, I am bound by the laws of my state, to suppress the circulation of all papers, containing such inflammatory appeals, as are to be found in your three last numbers under the signature of Presbyterian.

You are not aware perhaps of the existence of the laws of our state, upon this subject. I would respectfully beseech you either to exclude from your publication, all articles in favour of abolitionism, or to decline sending any more of your Magazines to this office.—

Very respectfully yours, &c.

THOMAS SHORE, P. M.

Mr. Hutchinson's paper has been stopped. We say this in the beginning, lest he should not survive the anxiety of uncertainty, on

that head—for the period necessary to read this article. We forgive him also any small matter,—which might possibly be coming to us, for whatever past numbers he may have received; and send him this *as a present*—that he may read this article. All matters of business are thus settled, and we proceed to the moral of the story.

“*He objects to the abolition feature which stands out with so much prominence.*” Our attacks on abolition have indeed been frequent, and pretty plain. But we did not suppose they would be likely to grieve any gentleman in Petersburg. We saw Mr. Hutchinson in Scotland, immediately after the discussion at Glasgow, between GEORGE THOMSON, and the Senior Editor of this work. But he did not then inform us, that he was pained at the prominence given to our denunciation of Abolition, in that discussion. We afterwards informed Mr. H. in Paris, of the fact, and a portion of the contents of a certain letter written from that city to DR. WARDLAW of Glasgow. But even then, he did not declare himself hurt by the very prominent place then given to abolition. This gentleman may well imagine the surprise with which, for these and other still more personal reasons, which for his sake, we forbear to mention—we read the first paragraph of the preceding letter.—Well thought we after all—the man is an abolitionist! This is really too bad! Poor fellow: poor fellow!

But softly good reader; there is more of this letter back. It is we who are abolitionists!!—A better cause for mirth could not readily be suggested—if it were not that pity and sorrow were too much demanded, for him who furnishes it.

We then are abolitionists. We who, perhaps the very earliest of the friends of the black race, of the peace of the country, of the quiet of the churches, and of the integrity of the American union—denounced modern abolitionism, so called;—we are, after all, abolitionists! We who have, written, argued, spoken and preached against their doctrines, since their origin;—who went to Boston to denounce GARRISON; who went to Glasgow, and exposed THOMSON; who from Paris, silenced WARDLAW; who in both hemispheres, with the knowledge of more men, then know the existence of our reckless accuser, have ceaselessly opposed this fanaticism—we are after all, abolitionists ourselves!—We repeat our first exclamation, but with other feelings; “poor fellow; poor fellow! This is too bad!”

But softly once more. When Mr. H. causes the post master of Petersburg to write to us that our publication was “*intended*” to be abolitionist, he may not possibly have meant all his words import. This is the more possible, as in the same paragraph, a singular error of fact occurs. The letter is dated January 11th,—and he specifies certain articles signed *Presbyterian*, and which he says “*are to be found in your (our) three last numbers.*” With your favour Mr. Hutchinson, this statement of yours is untrue, in two particulars out of three. For the three numbers you cite, contain between them, but one article, “under the signature of *Presbyterian.*”—Pardon us,—but, a gentleman who sets out to bring accusations meant to be offensive, and known to be unfounded—ought to be scrupulously exact, as to the truth of the details of his case.

But let us suppose, the charge was meant against our work, and not against ourselves. That he meant to say our work was abolitionist, even if its authors were not. We excuse any incivility that such a construction might imply, or such a charge involve. But is any thing more absurdly false, than such a charge?—For the last three years, next to opposition to popery, our great aim has been to expose and resist the fanatical and outrageous spirit which has manifested itself at the north, in relation to so many great subjects, and especially in regard to sound doctrine, religious revivals, and the coloured race. We take it for granted, as the most charitable inference the case admits of—that Mr. Hutchinson has not looked even at the contents of the numbers of our work, which he may have received—and that for the rest he knows nothing. If he has perused our pages, he cannot escape the painful charge of accusing our work falsely with deliberate knowledge. And if he speaks of our support of abolition being exceedingly prominent, and of our work as being intended to interfere with slavery, upon abolition principles, to such a degree, as to make it his Christian and ministerial duty, to decline aiding in its circulation;—if he does this without a knowledge of the work itself—he has done that, which we should blush to catch our worst enemy doing.

But he may say, these charges are made specifically against three articles by name; and although they are alledged to be in numbers, in which they were not, yet they were in some numbers.—Thus far, it is true—that three articles “under the signature of Presbyterian” —had been published by us. But it is untrue, that those articles or either of them “contained inflammatory appeals;” it is untrue, that they expressed the general purpose of this work; it is untrue, that they stood prominently out as indicative, of a purpose to favour them, or their doctrine; it is untrue, that they expressed the opinions of the conductors of the work on the subject of abolition,—and the last matter was not possible for Mr. H. to mistake, because an editorial note accompanied the distasteful article, in the very number returned by his order.

Mr. H. has the undoubted right for reason or without reason to refuse to patronise our unpretending work;—though according to our poor judgement, he might do a far worse thing than help us along. He has also, the undisputed right, to refuse us his patronage, because we choose, so far to respect the liberty of the press, the right of free discussion, the claims of ancient friendship and Christian fellowship, as to publish, against our own opinions—even a single line which his sensitive nostrils snuff at. But under his favour—he is bound to do this, truly and decently, if he even did it to Garrison himself; and when he does it, under circumstances like the present—those obligations are fortified, by many others—uniting to command an utterly different course.

Mr. H. is an eastern man—a few years ago, come down into Virginia. We are glad to believe, he has been fully as well received as he deserved, and hope he will be both useful and respectable in his adopted country.—For ourselves we might imitate the device of the inhabitants of Attica, and as touching the slave states, adopt the same ensign with them. They took the grasshopper as

their armorial bearing, because they were like it absolutely indigenuous to the soil of Greece. Our honoured ancestors have been *from the beginning*—as multitudes of our beloved kindred are till this hour, faithful and trusted children, of the ancient commonwealth of Virginia; while our own lot, and that of the great mass of those connected with us, by the nearest ties, are indissolubly bound up, for good or ill, with the destiny of the various slave holding communities. We are bound by blood, by birth, by hallowed recollections, by sacred and enduring ties, cemented by ages, and by inestimable obligations—to those communities, which this absolutely *novus homo*, come—from whence?—and to abide how long? loves so much better than we, that he rebukes us for disregarding,—and understands their true interest so much clearer than we, that he insults us for disturbing their peace!—Beware good Mr. H.—least men suspect a loyalty so premature and so mal-apropos, in making manifest its fervour. They cry thief, who would blind pursuit; they are boisterous, who are most thoroughly alarmed. Take care, Sir, that you do not raise a suspicion of our cause by your reluctance to have us show how strong it is; or of your own sentiments by your excessive sensibility, on wrong occasions.

We are deeply grieved to be obliged, by a decent regard for our good name before the public, as well as a love for truth—and a proper self-respect—to pen these lines. We hope the lesson they would inculcate will neither be lost on the individual whose exceedingly improper conduct has rendered them necessary; nor on that somewhat numerous class of persons, who seem almost to consider editors and printers, out of the pale of civilized society—and their feelings and reputation, fair game.

The post master at Petersburg, will act as his own views of duty shall dictate. If he knew us, or our Magazine, he would be aware that abolition, properly so called, has no more decided enemies; and that according to our ability he could not do that cause a greater favour, nor his own, so far as he would oppose the other, a more decided injury, than by suppressing our work altogether.—If, however, he thinks himself called on to suppress every thing that will not argue for the excellence of slavery in itself considered—and its full accordance with republican liberty, and bible religion—we apprehend he will be obliged to suppress bodily nine tenths of the slave-holders throughout the southern country. It is one thing to resist the principles, spirit and aims of abolitionism; it is quite another to contend that slavery is a Christian grace.—We solicit both his, and Mr. H's attention to this marked distinction, so perfectly recognised throughout Virginia.

## AN UPROAR IN MISTAKE,

OR

*Bishop Purcell's first Kentucky Consecration.*

ABOUT the beginning of December last, there occurred at Lexington in Kentucky, one of those indescribable scenes, which a sudden and causeless panic, sometimes produces; and by which the long projected and carefully got up show, of consecrating a papal chapel—was turned into a most uproarious affair. Nobody was seriously injured, as we have reason to believe; multitudes had hearty laughs afterwards at what befel them there; and this good resulted, from the threatened evil, that the whole affair became a subject of ridicule, instead of an engine for promoting papal influence in that delightful town. We will recount the matter—out of lack of capacity for more weighty business—during an hour of bodily and mental lassitude.

Lexington, is a delightful spot, seated in the midst of the finest district of America, enjoying a climate not surpassed in beauty and sweetness—and inhabited by a population, worthy, if any could be, of the blessings they enjoy. It is, moreover, so to speak, a sort of *west end*, not only to Kentucky, but also to the southern country below it: and from year to year, persons of refinement and wealth, as well as persons seeking knowledge, and those in pursuit of health—not only resort to it temporarily on account of its many advantages,—but become permanent residents. It is, however, and has been from the first settlement, a protestant place, inhabited by protestant people. In an out lot of the town, there did indeed stand a small chapel, where a few *Romans*, as the people called them, met in shy privacy, once in a year or two—and there went through, certain queer facings and wheelings, which made the boys wonder. And there were a few, but very few people—decent, but only a handful,—old Mr. Tibbats the baker, old Jerry Murphy, the constable, old Mr. Hickey the white-smith—and a few others—who privately professed this uncooth faith.

Thus matters stood, for a long, long time. At length, about six years ago, the papists seem to have made a simultaneous movement all over the country; and the city of Lexington, was one of the selected fields of their labours, for converting back the American people to king-craft, priest-craft, and we know not what besides. Suddenly there appeared there, priests and nuns, in any desirable quantity. How strange it is, these priests and nuns should forswear each other's society and yet constantly stick together,—renounce each other's company and yet never be found apart!—But no matter. They came to Lexington merely to do good. Were so anxious to nurse the sick; so devoted to orphans; so eager to teach schools;—that is, however,—and it is very odd, only to care for *protestant* sick, feed *protestant* orphans, and teach *protestant* schools.—In the twinkling of an eye—all things were changed. Those



who were secret *Romans* before, came openly forth; those who were luke-warm, became bold; those who were careless, became excessively pious, particularly after grog-time of day. Property which was supposed to belong to Mr. Such-a-one, was found to have always been the heritage of the church; accommodations for the *sisters*, and possibly for a few others not so certainly sisters, were at once erected; and arrangements made to erect a new church in the town.

This is all the common course of things. Only at Lexington, after all the raking and scraping, not half enough *Romans* could be got to fill the little old house in the back lots as you went the back way to Fowler's garden; and therefore a big chapel, erected in the city, and holding itself forth with much pretension, could be of course, only an engine for proselyting, of rather more than ordinary boldness. However, so the affair was. And what with contributions coaxed out of *liberal* protestants on false pretences, and taxes levied on the faithful throughout that diocese, and alms contributed by the Leopold foundation, and other foreign associations,—the chapel at last approached its completion; and in the autumn of 1837, the grand event of its consecration was to occur.

This whole matter of religious juggling is to us, a great barbarianism; doubtless we are great barbarians to it. But the idea of baptising a bell, sanctifying a house, or a grave-yard,—blessing cups and plates, pow-wowing over bits of wax, or mettle, and such nonsense—is too silly to amuse grown children with,—and worse than ridiculous, when used as a means of pleasing God, and obtaining his favour. The *Romans* at Lexington thought otherwise, and we are clear for their right to think as they please; only give us also our right to think of their thoughts with the same freedom.

In due time all their arrangements were made. The chapel was fixed off, all just so. The doll babies all dressed up. The long white sticks, with wax ends, all set about the altar, to give light in the day-time. The little boys and their bells to jingle, and their crimped white over-shirts, as nice as could be.—Every thing—prim and snug;—and all the *sisters* dying with anxiety, and all the *fathers* chuckling at their coming glorification. The music, and the machinery to praise God withal, tried and retried; all right.—Every part practised; all perfect.—Alas! that even the consecration of a chapel should be subject to chance and fate! Alas! that the best concerted schemes, should be liable to derangement—yea to sad and signal failure!!

Time and tide pause not on their ceaseless course. The eventful day at last arrived. The musicians were at their posts. The *fathers* were in their best array of white and red, and scarlet and violet, cut into all sorts of fantastic shapes. The people streamed into the chapel—and filled it full, jam—cram full. In came the gang of operators,—boys, lads, men; white, parti-coloured-red; deacons, priests, and the Bishop John of Cincinnati, at their head;—in they came all bowing and scraping towards the long white sticks with the wax ends—and all dodging and capering like ducks in a thunderstorm. All looked their prettiest; and at their head Bishop PURCELL, as we have said, demure and prim, as his "priance-

ly grace" himself of Vienna, who about that very time got his cis-Atlantic brother "*successor*" of the apostles—into so sad a scrape, about those naughty Ohio free schools. By the bye—speaking of "*successors*"—we incline to think, Bishop Purcell has exhibited better evidence of being *Peter's successor*, than most of the popes of Rome ever did. We mean not his successor as apostle, nor as preacher, nor as Christian; but as to the fact, of being caught in a tremendous *say-one-thing-to-day—and-another-tomorrow!* Few popish bishops show much remembrance to *converted Peter*; Bishop Purcell, seems very like Peter, when denying with oaths, his own words and deeds!

But we wander. The house is full—and the scenes are begun. The censers are lighted; the doll babies are getting smoked; the incense is rising in clouds as they pass up and down the crowded aisles. A chap in the gallery seeing the smoke, shouts fire!—A centinal fixed aloft to sound the bell at the proper period, in hastening up or down broke a round in a ladder at the very moment—and fell heavily against a stove pipe in the gallery. The gallery is falling! Fire! The gallery is falling! Fire! Fire!!

The scene that followed beggars all description. We will only attempt to give an impression of some portions of it.

The crowd rushed down the aisles—down the gallery steps—towards the outer doors—over each other—upon each other—pell mell—man, woman and child,—white, black and yellow,—gentle and simple—rush, rush, rush.—Fire! The gallery is falling!

Bonnets are twisted awry—down shoulder pads and mutton-leg-sleeves are mashed up—sattin slippers are bad protectors for toes under other peoples' heels—fine fabricks that *were* dresses, are hardly to be called so now.—"Skin, for skin," saith Job "all that a man hath" (yea, and the ladies too, even their finery) "will he give for his life."

Mr. J. ran and jumped through a window. Miss W. mounted the window sill, and in the ecstasy of terror patted juber. Mrs. B. was thrown down and walked over, in defiance both of prayers and other somewhat different remonstrances. Mrs. V. standing on the back of a pew was knocked head foremost over two, into the third. The Misses. S. were shocked into stupor, by the want of calmness of others. And Jake Hostutter declared, that when he was squeezed through the front door—a pile of women five feet high, was laying before it.

But the reverend fathers; where were they? Their instant and universal impression, seems to have been, that it was all a premeditated affair—and that a protestant mob was about to lynch the whole brotherhood. A guilty conscience needs no accuser.

In this idea, the head shepherd, played the hireling and put off. "Holy Virgin Mary"—cried Bishop Purcell "pity and save us;" and suiting the action to the word—he made himself scarce, through a side door—and was seen no more.

One priest still more alarmed, it was said, escaped from the house, and was caught half deranged with fright, and half dead with the *unusual labour*—puffing and running, in full canonicals, in the suburbs of the city; and with great difficulty was soothed, and brought back.

A third, perhaps the incumbent of the place, more resolute began a harangue to the *protestant* spectators, who composed at least nineteen twentieths of the audience—the purport of which was, to remind them, that *they* at least, were in no danger—as dogs never eat dogs—and therefore protestants would not mob protestants. We grieve to say, the inference did not commend itself to the affrighted multitude. But Colonel S—, taking the idea, possibly from the priests' attempt,—came forward into the chancel—and would have mounted the pulpit—in order to speak to the people—and restore order. Sacrilegious attempt! Vain thought! It was a consecrated pulpit; that far the work was completed; and better let the whole parish, than permit a heretick to set foot in that holy place. And boldly and successfully did the *father*, resist the unbelieving protestant; and onward raged the storm.

Impelled by a similar idea, a German musician in the gallery—leaned over the rail and began to shout in a lingo, which nobody comprehended—that there was nothing to be feared; but his looks, gestures, and tones, betokened that *every thing* was to be feared. Whereupon the fright only the more increased. And when as a final and desperate resort, the orchestra struck up, its various and discordant tones—to sooth and quiet, or at least disenchant the crowd of its terrible panic; the uncertain sounds, frightful and unlooked for, augmented a confusion, now thrily unfounded.

At length however the terrible scene passed off. One by one, through doors and windows—the gaily dressed crowd, sallied forth rumped, agitated, and fatigued.—And when the last had escaped, it was found, but apparently not before, that the house was not burned—and that the gallery had not fallen!

First came the hour of enquiries. And like the formal report of a Colonel when the army lay at Norfolk during the last war—this contest, like his, resulted in their being, killed—none; wounded—none; missing—none!—Frightened to death; and befooled out of their wits—almost all!

The next hour—was one of convulsive laughter!—How wonderfully is man created?—What a show was this—what people these to so be at it—what a scene—what a result.—

But the *poor priests* after all their terror and mortification, had this serious difficulty left. The consecration of the house was only, half finished! What questions for the casuists spring therefrom! Is it a half consecration of the whole house; or is it a whole consecration of half the house? If the former, is the last half of the whole ceremony to be performed; or must the whole be half performed? If the latter, must the remaining half of the house, until it is also consecrated—be considered sanctified by the part already finished, or only in expectancy and capacity of consecration—or as being still the abode of the evil spirits who were so laboriously exorcised out of the other half?—These are serious and weighty, as well as difficult questions. We shall therefore tranquilly await their solution; hoping that Bishop PURCELL, will soon disembarass himself of the *mistakes*, about the quotation from LAGORI, and the free schools of Ciaccinnati, and turn his great and enlightened faculties to them. Our articles on the *Mystery of Jesuitism*, published and yet to be

published, may aid him in his laudable endeavours, to prove that he is not bound by the ordinary laws of morality; nor indeed, to heretics, by any laws at all. And after reading his various epistles, we should do him great injustice to suppose he has not fully arrived at this salutary conclusion.

---

(For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.)

JUNKIN ON THE MORAL GOVERNMENT OF GOD.

Chapter II.

ON THE PARTICULAR MODIFICATION OF MORAL GOVERNMENT, AS IT WAS EXTENDED OVER MAN IN HIS PRIMITIVE CONDITION; OR, THE COVENANT OF WORKS.

Sec. 1. *The primeval state of man, anterior to the formation of the covenant, considered intellectually, morally and legally.*

IT is not intended by the title of this section, to intimate that man existed any considerable time, before God entered into covenant with him. The object is simply to present a view of his qualities, character and condition, in the particular respects referred to, apart from the peculiar moral constitution, under which he was placed. This seems necessary in order to a right understanding of that constitution.

Ist. *Intellectually.* He was endowed with a knowledge of things around him. He was not thrown into being, and into the midst of a countless number of fellow creatures, utterly ignorant of himself and of them; of his own capacities and powers, and of theirs; as the schemes of theorising philosophers, would seem to have it. In their speculations, men have been fond to account for the formation of language, spoken and written—of the manner in which man acquired a knowledge of his own soul, and of the creator's being and perfections; of the relations that exist between man and his maker, and also between him and the creatures around him. Especially have volumes been laboriously written about the origin and progress of language—how, from the rude sounds in nature, names would be given to things, and these transferred to similar things, &c.

All such speculations are based on the false and misguided assumption, that man was formed capable of acquiring knowledge, but was not created "in knowledge."

The Bible presents a more rational account, and one which casts no such reproach upon the wisdom and goodness of the creator. It assures us that "God created man after his own image," and that this consisted partly in knowledge—"Renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him;" which shows conclusively, that the image after which man was created, consisted partly in knowledge. And the manner in which God represents himself as conversing with man immediately after his creation, implies his possession of the faculty of speech, and of the art of reasoning, and of a language which formed the vehicle of thought. "The Lord God commanded the man." Will it here be pretended, that this does

not necessarily imply a spoken language; it may only have been an impression produced upon the mind without speech? But of this there is no evidence, and we have indubitable evidence, a little after, that the man did speak of the woman, and to the woman, and to God; and there is the same certainty that the woman spake to the serpent and to her husband. Equally baseless is the hypothesis, that man was left to gather his knowledge of the creatures around him, from experience alone—that he was not indued with knowledge by the Creator. God told him much concerning them. He prescribed to Adam the limit of his authority over them, and the uses to which they might be applied.

Equally without foundation is the assumption, that man was left to decypher the Creator's being, attributes, and requirements from the creation around him. On the contrary, God gave him a law, and in this, communicated to him, a knowledge of his own will, as in the command to be fruitful, to use the creatures, under certain restrictions, to dress and keep the garden. And after the creation of the woman, a knowledge of her relation to himself was given to him, and of the obligations it involved. Indeed the idea of Adam's utter ignorance, his being left to grope his way to knowledge, is so gross an absurdity, that I am aware the reader will not tolerate much delay in the disproof. He feels that it is a mere waste of time. But then, let him please to remember that on this very assumption, gross as it is, the enemies of revelation, and some of its misguided friends, have built their respective systems, the one to corrupt, the other to destroy all confidence in the Bible. If you concede, that man originally had no revelation from his creator, but was left to discover the divine being and perfections, by reason, you exalt reason at the expense of truth, and give her a power which she never possessed. Hence the infidel gains his most plausible advantages against revelation. But, on the contrary, if you hold to the facts, as *inferable by reason*, and as taught in the Bible, you have the *necessity* of revelation established, prior to the fall of man. He never existed without revelation. God revealed himself to man—made known his own being and perfections, to a certain extent—man's own qualities, relations, and duties, at his creation, and before the fall.

If again, you concede this degree of ignorance—if you grant that Adam knew nothing at all, then the corrupter of Bible doctrine infers, that there could be no covenant of works, no representative relation of Adam to his posterity—no moral headship; and by good and necessary consequence, there can be no covenant of grace, no headship of a second Adam—no imputation of his righteousness, &c. Thus by this one rash admission, you put it beyond your power to defend the citadel of truth; you virtually abandon the Bible to its foes, and sport away the hopes of a ruined world.

But; whilst the truth is to be maintained, that man had communicated to him, directly from God, much valuable information before his fall, and establish the necessity of a revelation even then, and hence its superior necessity now; it is not to be affirmed that Adam possessed the knowledge of all nature, and of all art, and of all divine perfections. This absurdity, for sinister purposes, is attempt-

ed to be forced upon us, that by representing the doctrine of primal revelation in a ludicrous point of view, the true doctrine may be brought into contempt. We have not said that God revealed all things to Adam. But we do say that he communicated to him much knowledge, and furnished him with reasoning faculties, by the right use of which, he might indefinitely extend the range of his intellect and the sphere of his knowledge.

2. *Morally*—We have seen, that a moral sense is essentially necessary to a moral being. Man possessed this. He had a heart, as well as a head, to know good and evil, to judge of right and wrong. To this his Creator addressed himself, when he prescribed duty, and prohibited sin. But it is more important to remark, that these moral powers were in an attitude for right action. In other words, man was created in a state of moral rectitude.

This may be viewed in a two-fold aspect. He was, on the one hand, free from every corrupt principle, feeling, inclination, or disposition. This is what the old divines would call negative holiness. He was also positively inclined to right action—having the will and affections turned toward holy things. Both are included in the language of Solomon, "God hath made man upright." This moral rectitude may be most satisfactorily proved, by reference to the doctrine of sanctification, which is spoken of, as a changing of his people "from glory to glory" into the same image. The image of God, after which man was created, consisted in holiness, or moral rectitude, "be ye holy, for I am holy" "as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." "Sanctify them in thy truth."

3. But the *legal* primitive condition of man is chiefly important to a right understanding of the covenant of works. He was under a law, bound to act agreeably to the will of God, so far as made known to him. To no truth does the human mind assent, more readily, than to the affirmation, that the rational creature is bound to obey the creator. If the human mind can have no distinct perception of a rational, immortal creature, under no obligation of obedience to him, who sustains its existence; at least I think it impossible to believe in the reality of such a state. If there is no necessary obligation, there can be no dependence, and we have the anomaly of an independent creature! On the contrary, if the notion of an independent creature be entirely unreasonable, then we must admit the existence of moral obligation lying upon man by a necessity of his condition. Anterior to all covenant transaction and relation, man was bound to perfect obedience to the divine will. In other words, he was under a moral government. For, as Witsius observes, "Adam sustained a two-fold relation. 1st. *As man.* 2d. *As the head and representative of mankind.* In the former relation he was a rational creature, *under the law*, to God, upright, created after the image of God, and furnished with sufficient power to fulfil all righteousness." B. 1st. ch. 2d. sec. 3d. Adam stood alone and was individually accountable to God. Should he act contrary to the divine will made known to him, he must abide the just consequences of his action—he must be punished as God might think suitable to his government to inflict

Should he obey, he must be rewarded accordingly. But in the results of his actions himself alone would be necessarily, or indeed justly involved. Such is supposed to be, and to have been the condition of the angels. It is not known to us that they have ever been on probation in any other respect than as individuals; each standing or falling for himself, each receiving the reward or punishment, allotted by the Creator to his obedience or sin, as the case might be. Had man been left to multiply and replenish the earth, whilst in this his strictly primitive estate, it may be conceived that some would have fallen, whilst others would have remained steadfast in their obedience, as it has actually proved with the angels. The fall of one might have affected the condition and standing of another, by way of example and through the force of natural connexions; still those maintaining their integrity, would have been retained in their state of blessedness. But I cannot see how and on what principle they could be *confirmed*, at any given period in that state, so as to be henceforth incapable of falling into sin. In other words, I cannot see how there could arise any claim on the part of man, to any thing but present enjoyment, except from a special act of condescension and love on the part of God. Some gratuitous pledge or promise of God, must be necessary to produce and justify in man's mind, the faith of an endless life and blessedness. Until such pledge or promise should be given, he could not conceivably have a claim of right in perpetuity of bliss. His continuance for a long time in a state of obedience, could create no obligation upon the Creator prospectively, so that God should be bound to secure him forever. But if at any period, no matter how far removed from his origin, he sinned, he must die. Or as Dr. Bates in his *Harmony of the Divine Attributes*, expresses the thought, (vol. 1st. 189.) "Thus holy and blessed was Adam in his primitive state, and that he might continue so, he was obliged forever to obey the will of God, who bestowed upon him life and happiness. By the first neglect of this duty, he would most justly and inevitably incur the loss of both." Again, "And from hence it follows that man only was in a state of moral dependence, and capable of a law."—"And as it is impossible that man should be exempt from a law"—(190) Such was the strictly primitive condition of man—a state of moral dependence, a state of trial or probation, *individually* only, not *socially*—a state as far as we know, not necessarily limited, but capable of perhaps, interminable duration, in every stage of whose progress there was a possibility of falling and being lost—a state whose change for the better, must be a matter of pure benevolent gratuitousness on the part of the supreme governor.

## THE MYSTERY OF JESUITISM.

## No. II.

*A Jesuistical Creed, gathered out of the works of Johannes Baptista Posa, a Spanish Jesuit by Franciscus Roates, Doctor at Salamanca, and Chaplain to his Catholic Majesty of Spain. It is to be found in Latin, in the Appendix to the Relations of de Vargas, page 333, printed in the year MDCXLI, digested into XII articles.*

## I.

I believe in two Gods, whereof one is Son, Father and Mother, metaphorically, according to an eternal generation; the other, metaphorically Mother and Father, according to a temporal generation: and what is consequent thereto, that the common term, Mother-Father, may be equally attributed to God and the B. Virgin, as if they were both Hermaphrodites.

## II.

I believe in Jesus Christ the only metaphorical Son of both, according to an eternal and temporal generation.

## III.

I believe that Jesus Christ as Man, was conceived and born of the Virgin Mary, metaphorically, as of Father and Mother, by a paternal and maternal virtue.

## IV.

I believe that he suffered, and was dead, not truly and really, because it was impossible he should die.

## V.

I believe that he was buried, though not truly and really dead.

## VI.

I believe his Soul descended into Hell metaphorically, whereas it was never separated from the Body.

## VII.

I believe that he rose from the dead, by a metaphor suitable to that whereby I believed him dead.

## VIII.

I believe he ascended into Heaven, that he sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, and that he will come to judge some alive, and some already dead.

## IX.

I believe in the Holy Ghost, who spoke by the Prophets, though those were sometimes mistaken and deceived.

## X.

I believe the church to be, as to the better part of it, holy; and the communion of Saints.

## XI.

I believe the remission of sins, effected by a sudden collation of the Holy Ghost upon the wicked.

## XII.

I believe the Resurrection of the body, as to the better part of it, and Life everlasting, not without some fear of the contrary.



[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE church, as by law established in England, exhibits a singular and most melancholy spectacle,—no discipline can be exercised upon the unworthy and the church, from the communicants in the same parish up to the highest order of ministers, having no power to choose who shall be “over them in the Lord.” We select, therefore, the following facts, in relation to its defects and the proposed reform, from the London and Westminster Review, for April 1837;—not doubting that it will be highly interesting to the reader.

“The Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel of London, a man deservedly revered, has published a pamphlet entitled “Fundamental Reform of the Church establishment,” which breathes a spirit of the most fervent piety, and the sincerest desire to make the establishment a fit instrument for great and holy purposes. The first great defect noted by him in the present system is, *that it is too despotic*. While the people have been acquiring political power ever since the reformation, no corresponding change has taken place to any extent in the church. The Bishops are chosen by the government without the consent of the clergy,—the clergy are ordained by the Bishop without any examination by clergymen unconnected with both parties; clergymen are appointed to parishes without the consent of the parishioners, and communicants are to be admitted or excluded from the sacraments without the consent of the church.

The next class of defects are those of leaving each order in the church to act too much alone, and by thus stretching the responsibility of each ecclesiastical functionary too far, in fact weakening the discipline of the church. The system is thus calculated “to perpetuate a succession of clergymen who will be gentleman-like, upright and well educated, but undevout and negligent; to separate the bishops from their clergy, the clergy from the flock, and to render the laity indifferent to the welfare of the church.”

To remedy this defect, Mr Noel proposes a great change in the form of church government,—modelled partly on the constitution proposed by Archbishop Usher and partly on that of the American Episcopal church, but differing in some respects from both. He proposes, that the church shall be governed by five ecclesiastical courts. Of these, the primary body is *the church*, consisting of all communicants with the clergyman as president, and invested with the power of regulating the internal spiritual matters of the parish, and of exercising discipline. The second is *the congregation*, also a parochial body, consisting of all persons above twenty-one years of age who have held sittings in the church for two years. This body is only to be called into action on the death or removal of a minister, in which case it is not to elect a successor, but to exercise a final veto on the nomination of the patron. The third is *the Synod* of the diocese, a body of about fifteen persons to be elected by the clergy and laity of the diocese, in the ratio of one represen-

tative of the former, to six of the latter, and presided over by the bishop. This body is to elect the bishop, subject to the veto of the crown, to punish offending clergymen and to regulate the diocese. The next is the *Committee of the Synod*, which is to examine candidates for orders, nullify appointments of ministers and make them in certain exceptionable cases. The fifth, and highest governing body of the church is *the Assembly*, consisting of two houses, one composed of the bishops, the other, of 108 clergymen and as many laymen, chosen by the Synods, to meet annually and whenever convoked by the Archbishop of Canterbury. This body is to be an ecclesiastical legislature to superintend the inferior courts, and punish bishops. None of these courts are to entertain questions of church property.

The second great defect is *the secularity of spirit* in the establishment, which Mr. Noel conceives to arise in a great measure from **THE GRANDEUR OF ITS DIGNITARIES**. This he proposes to cure by cutting off the bishops from the House of Lords, and giving each an income of 2500*l* a year.

The third defect is *its intolerance*. He remarks that "our church most inconsistently acknowledges the orders of no Christian church, save of that whose doctrines and practices she affects to hold in the greatest abhorrence, while it denies the spiritual authority of the ministers of every protestant denomination except itself." Mr. Noel calls on the church of England to acknowledge the ordination of every regular minister, not only of foreign protestant churches, but of every body of protestant dissenters,—and to allow them to preach from the pulpits of the established church.

Besides these changes, Mr. Noel insists on the necessity of building more churches, and endowing more ministers; the fund from which this deficiency should be supplied, is the surplus of the income of the bishops and chapters after the proper retrenchments be made.

"On the whole," says the reviewer, "we take leave of this pious, wise and honest clergyman, with feelings of the most unfeigned respect. Disagreeing with him on many points, we cannot but wonder at the straight forward simplicity of purpose with which he proposes plans far exceeding in boldness, those advocated by the most liberal politicians; far superior in wisdom to those of the timid or stationary bigots, to whose deadly hatred his fearless sincerity will expose him. If the church of England is to be saved, it must owe its safety under God to clergymen who will reform it as boldly as Mr. Noel."

The Rev. Sydney Smith, long known as a celebrated writer for the *Edinburgh Review*, commonly styled *its joke-master*, and deservedly despised for his miserable latitudinarianism, and his abuse of Newton, and Scott, and of the doctrines they loved and preached; this gentleman for his political services has been rewarded by the ministry with a rich prebend. The new ecclesiastical commission, however, has reduced the privileges of the prebends and he has lately published an exceedingly witty letter in defence of his own life-interest. In the following passage, he offers a reason why the revenues of the clergy should not be reduced, which puts *the benefits of an established church* in rather a novel light. He says:

"Not only will this measure bring into the church a lower and worse educated sort of men, but it will have a tendency to make the clergy fanatical. You will have a set of ranting, raving pastors, who will wage war against all the innocent pleasures of life, vie with each other in extravagance of zeal, and plague your heart out with nonsense and absurdity; CRIBBAGE MUST BE PLAYED IN CAVERNS, AND SIX-PENNY WHIST TAKE REFUGE IN THE HOWLING WILDERNESS. In this way, low men doomed to hopeless poverty and galled by contempt will endeavour to force themselves into station and significance."

"Here," says the reviewer, "the establishment in its present form is recommended to the British people as the bulwark of whist; and the terrible horoscope is drawn of a period when low persons will stretch out their hands against lovers of amusement. Then will the members of Graham's (gambling club) retire into the moors and mountains to play whist according to their conscience, and Brooke Greville, and other martyrs and confessors of that faith, will play on the hill-side, while their scouts are watching the dragoons, who shall be out hunting their lives. Does not this view of the matter explain a proceeding of the commission which sorely puzzles Mr. Smith,—namely, the reducing and raising the number of residentiaries in every cathedral to four? *Is not four, the number needful for whist?* Have not the commissioners done this that every cathedral may make up its own rubber and no more, instead of leaving things in their present unequal state wherein a canon of Durham or Wells can hardly cut in once in the evening and St. Paul's and Lincoln are reduced to *dummy*."

---

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

POPERY SUBSERVIENT TO THE DESIGNS OF DESPOTS.

WE find in the Zodiac, a literary periodical formerly published at Albany, the following important facts. They are related by Gen. Ducoudray Holstein, who was engaged in the unsuccessful endeavours to liberate Lafayette from the Austrian prison of Olmutz.

"In Austria, under the administration of Metternich, the universities, colleges and schools are under the closest inspection; the courses, books, &c. are prescribed, and the professors and teachers watched and arrested if they show any liberal opinions in their writings and doctrine. The inspection is confined to Archbishops, bishops, curates, monks and nuns. To the universities are attached *councillors* with large salaries, who have their secret instructions to watch over the actions of the rector, professors and students, every liberal idea is crushed and severely punished, and thus Austria is at least a century behind Prussia and the northern states of Germany, in regard to education and light.

As soon as Metternich became prime minister, he called Gentz from Berlin to Vienna,—Gentz, one of the greatest statesmen of our time, was born at Breslau in 1764, and he attracted the eyes

of the cabinets of Europe by his excellent memoir addressed to Frederick William 3d, on his accession to the throne of Prussia, in 1797. It made the greatest sensation, as it gave excellent advice on the internal administration of the country. He was a Professor at Berlin, when he received the invitation to be employed as Councillor of State, with a large salary. Not having been as well treated as he expected at Berlin, he went to Austria, *became a Catholic*, and the intimate friend and confidant of Metternich, who procured him the title of Councillor of State and patents of nobility, with many other pecuniary advantages. Gentz was by the influence of Metternich, named Secretary of the Congress of Vienna, and his secret pernicious advices, contributed greatly to the system of oppression which rests so heavily on Germany. Gentz also advised Metternich to surround himself with men of talent, not only favourable like himself to absolute power, but *particularly those who like himself had abjured Protestantism and become Catholics*. Thus Frederic Schlegel and his accomplished wife became Catholics in 1802, and in 1808 passed from Cologne to Vienna. There, upon the suggestion of Metternich, he wrote his well known "*Letters upon the Modern History and Literature of all Nations*." This work was published at Vienna in 1811—12, and is truly masterly, but on examining it closely, the reader will find its secret tendency greatly in favour of arbitrary power and the principles of the patron, Metternich. Frederic Schlegel died at Vienna, August 9, 1829. He must not be confounded with August. William Schlegel, his brother, the translator of Shakspeare, and the intimate friend of Mad. de Stael. By the advice of Gentz and Schlegel, Metternich called around him *men of talent* who had changed their religion, and were ready to employ their powerful pens in favour of despotism. Thus arrived successively Werner, Kollin, Adam Muller, Haller, and various others, who have received patents of nobility, large pensions, &c. Vienna is thus the distinguished capital of eminent artists, particularly musicians, and at the same time, the head quarters of despotism.

Metternich on his return from the Congress of Vienna, remarked: "The Abbe de Pradt, has said that mankind is going *ahead*, and that nothing can stop them; very well, we work at "*least to stop them*." In these words lie the key of a profoundly arranged scheme, between the three northern autocrats of Russia, Austria and Prussia,—the dark and secret influence of Metternich, is but too conspicuously visible in Holland as well as in Germany, Italy and elsewhere; and his favourite plan *to try to stop the progress of mankind* has every-where been put in practice. *Not satisfied with what he has done in Europe, which is, generally speaking, subdued, where liberty and the rights of man are poor empty words, he has sought a MORE POWERFUL INSTRUMENT than bayonets, dungeons and scaffolds to employ upon the political institutions of the new world; HE HAS FOUND IT IN THE MORAL INFLUENCE OF CATHOLICISM, and with this in conjunction with the Pope, and the Archbishops of Vienna, Olmutz and Milan, he tries to stop the march of intellect, even in our free and happy country.*

## ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH ABROAD.

## No. VI.

## THE REIGNING POPE'S BULL TO THE POLES.

A BRIEF of Pope Gregory xvi. was addressed, in the month of July 1832, to the Polish Bishops. It might be asked whether there had been any schism in Poland, or some heresy working its mischief there at the foundation of the Catholic Church? No such thing! There was merely a contest between a despotic power and an oppressed people, who did all that patriotism and heroic efforts could achieve to shake off the oppressor's yoke. But, thanks to the apathy of nations, and still greater thanks to the tenfold greater power of despotism, that wronged people was crushed; and the Holy Father comes behind to give it the last blow, with the view, as it appears, of proving what has often been written in defence of Popes' Encyclical Letters, that the head of the Church of Rome confines himself *exclusively* to the spiritual affairs, but that he never meddles with the political condition of any nation. Let us first read and explore that document.

"To the Venerable Brethren, greeting, with our Apostolical Benediction.

"We have received information of the dreadful misery which the flourishing kingdom sustained in the course of the past year, and at the same time have learned that the only cause of it was, the wickedness and perfidy of the evil-minded, who, in that unhappy time, under the pretext of religion, *rose against the lawful authority of the Sovereign, and by tearing asunder all the bonds of lawful submission, plunged their country into an abyss of misery.* Prostrate before the altars of the Most High, We, his unworthy representative upon earth, *have shed abundant tears* over the dreadful distress with which that part of the flock, committed by Divine Providence to our weak but earnest care, was visited. In humility of heart, we sought by prayers and sighs to appease the wrath of the most merciful Father, imploring to send down to us consolation by the pacification of your country, which suffered by dreadful civil wars, as it had *revolted against his beneficent lawful authority.* At that time, venerable brethren, *we sent you a Brief,* to inform you that your distress bound down our hearts also; we desired thereby to comfort and strengthen you with spiritual care, in order that you might, with new and indefatigable zeal, defend the true doctrine, and call on the Clergy and the faithful intrusted to you to abide by it. We have learned however that in consequence of the *obstacles* that occurred, that letter never reached you. Now that, *with the help of God peace and tranquillity are happily restored,* we again, venerable brethren, open our heart to you, exhorting you with still greater earnestness to exert all your efforts to keep away from the flock intrusted to you the causes of the late misfortunes. Your duty obliges you to watch with the greatest vigilance, that artful men, propagators of false doctrines, may not scatter among your flock the seeds of lying and fatal doctrines. These men, under the cloak of zeal for the general good, use for bad ends the credulity of the simple, who, in their blindness and ignorance, serve them as instruments to disturb the tranquillity of the kingdom and to overturn the existing order of things.

"It is fitting that, for the advantage and instruction of the faithful, or followers of Christ, the malevolence or perfidy of such lying prophets should be placed in such a light; it is fitting on every occasion, and without fear, to refute their deceitful principles by the immutable words of Holy Writ, and the authentic monuments of the traditions of the Church; from these pure

sources, from which the Catholic Clergy must derive the principles of their conduct, and the doctrines to be inculcated on the people committed to them, we clearly see that *submission to powers appointed of God, is an invariable principle*, and that no one can refrain from fulfilling it, except in the case that, by observing it, he would violate the laws of God and the Church. 'Let every one,' says the Apostle, 'be subject unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; wherefore ye must need be subject not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake.—(St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.)

"In the same manner St. Peter teaches, 'Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the Emperor (King), as supreme, or to the Prince (unto Governors) as sent by him. For so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.'—(1st Epistle of St. Peter, chap. ii.) The Christians of the Primitive Church were faithful to these principles to such an extent, that even in the midst of persecution they served the Roman Emperors, and so promoted the glory of the empire. Like Jesus, they acknowledged no ruler but Him in Heaven; they knew how to distinguish between the eternal and the temporal ruler, and out of love for the Lord of Heaven they were subject to the Sovereign on earth. The Holy Fathers, as you venerable brethren well know, always preached this doctrine, thus the Catholic Church always wrote and still writes. By such principles the early Christians were guided in their conduct, and their legions never sullied themselves with treachery, which was so common among the heathen troops. Let us hear what Tertullian says, 'We are calumniated to the Emperor; yet the Christians never were partisans of Albinian or Nigrin, or Cassian traitors; never seen only among those who the day before had sworn fidelity before the heathen idols, and made sacrifices to them instead of prayers for the prosperity of the Emperor. Those very persons who often blamed the Christians were convicted of hostile projects against the Emperor. The Christian can never be an enemy; we are not only not enemies to the Emperor, but we know that we are bound to love him, to honour him, and to wish for his prosperity.'

"In mentioning these principles recorded in the traditions, we do not suppose venerable brethren, that they are unknown to you, nor do we feel that you will be wanting in zeal to advocate and to propagate the doctrine of the submission which subjects one to their lawful Sovereign; but we wish that this our Brief may serve you as a proof of the sentiments with which we are filled towards you, and of our ardent wish that all the ecclesiastics of the kingdom may be distinguished by purity of doctrine, by prudent conduct, and by pious lives; that they may be blameless in the sight of all men. In this manner we hope that affairs will be restored to order for the general good. *Your magnanimous Emperor will show you his clemency, and listen to our representations and requests, to the manifest advantage of the Catholic religion in the kingdom; which he promises at all times to protect.* Sensible people will surely praise you, and your enemies hold their peace, as they have no ground to blame you.

"In this expectation lifting our hands to Heaven, we beseech Almighty God to enrich each of you more and more with heavenly favours, and we, who always have you in our heart, expect you to perfect our joy, by being filled with one sentiment, one spirit, and brotherly concord. May one true doctrine proceed from your mouths! May your words be blameless! Preserve the deposit entrusted to you, and labour with united strength in the works of evangelic faith. In conclusion, pray to God for us, without ceasing. From the bottom of our heart, and as a pledge of our paternal affection, we bestow on you, and on the flock committed to your charge, our apostolic benediction.

"Given at Rome in the church of St. Peter, on the        day of July,  
in the year of our Lord 1832, and of our Pontificate the 2d."

Bishops of Poland! you are called upon again to preach inviolable submission to your "magnanimous Emperor," who, by his misgovernment, has provoked your sacred struggle, and after having killed your fathers, and driven their children into slavery or exile, has blotted even the name of your country from the map of nations. Is this the consolation Rome, from her apostolic see, has to bestow on the prostrate Poles—a nation which at an early period of its history, ranked among the converters of the heathens of the North to Christianity; and which subsequently, at different epochs, stood a dauntless champion in defence both of Christendom and European liberty, against the Asiatic hordes of the wild Tartars and the dreaded Crescent of the Osmanlis! Verily, if the head of the Catholic Church has nothing better to offer, but to pass a sentence of condemnation on those of his spiritual children whose watchword is known to have been "*God and Liberty!*" we must think that either he is labouring under a gross error, or mankind is to follow another watchword, that of "*Slavery without God!*"

The Holy Father deplores the misfortunes of Poland, but instead of taking steps to alleviate their load, he anathematizes the patriots, whom he calls the "evil minded," and charges them with having "*plunged the country into an abyss of misery by tearing asunder all the bonds of lawful submission.*" But that the Polish insurrection was provoked by Russian despotism, and by the violations of the Charter and of the Imperial oath, does not concern in the least his Holiness. In the whole Brief, not a word is said on that subject. It is the wronged and the oppressed that are guilty in the eyes of the pontiff: they alone are charged with the violation of "*lawful submission.*" But the sovereign who was to reign constitutionally, and who has violated the compact between him and the nation, is reminded of no law that was binding on him, and from that omission it appears as if he were allowed to do any thing he pleases with *impunity*. This is a specimen of the justice of the Apostolic See!

The Pope "*has shed abundant tears,*" we read in the Brief, over the "disasters" that the Polish nation must suffer for having "*revolted against a BENEFICENT lawful authority.*" But now he finds that he has reason to console himself that "*with the help of God tranquillity and order are restored.*" The phrase is neither new nor felicitous and only shows to the world that the chancery of the Vatican is very apt to commit plagiarisms on such speeches as General Sebastiani's, who announcing the fall of Warsaw in the French Chambers, said—"Order and quiet reign in Warsaw." Yes, it was the quiet of the grave! Truly, it is a splendored triumph for the Roman Catholic Church to look on the disasters of Warsaw; and the fate of Poland, delivered up to all the atrocities and the vindictive spirit of savage autocracy. It never was better known than it is at present what kind of order is reigning in Poland: confiscations, exiles of parents and infants, decimation, rooting-out of all nationality, all physical and moral cruelties,—these are the order and the tranquillity on which the Pope is congratulating Poland—these the titles by which he is calling on the Poles to obey Nicholas, and to hurl their "*false and fatal doctrines into hell.*" Still these doctrines, reprimanded in the Poles, as it is well known, have gained them

the suffrages of all the noble minds in Europe: imbued with their principles, every Pole willingly made sacrifice of all he held dearest to him; heroes gladly sunk into their graves to confirm their truth; and, after all, their doctrines are even now held purer than any that Rome and St. Petersburg might teach the world.

The Pope quotes the words of the Apostles, and the examples of the primitive Christian Church, with the view of showing that "*submission to powers appointed of God is an invariable principle,*" and that no one can disobey them, except in case they should "*violate the laws of God and the Church.*" Now, according to this doctrine of the Pope it would appear that a nation is authorised to revolt against a power which would do away with the rule of abstinence from flesh on Fridays, because the people would then rise in defence of a species of *divine* law—a law adopted by the Roman Catholic and the Greek Church; if however laws, human, civil or political, are violated, the people are commanded patiently to submit. But are the latter rights not equally divine? Where are we to look for their origin? To whom else are we to refer this proud inherency in our human nature, if not to the Maker himself, who is the only source of justice and virtue?

Let his Holiness consider, that the kingdom of Poland was erected by the Congress of Vienna, "*in the name of the Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;*" that in that name the kingdom was to have its *Constitution*, by which only it was to belong to Russia; that the remainder of the Polish provinces under Russia, Prussia, and Austria were to have their *nationality* preserved to them; and further, that Nicholas, on his coronation-day, as King of Poland, at Warsaw, took an oath on the Gospel, to maintain and keep inviolate that Constitution, which he nevertheless has violated, and whose very name he has entirely abolished. Was this to be the faith of treaties concluded in the name of the Holy Trinity? Was this to be the result of the oath taken in the cathedral of the Polish capital by a crowned head? Who is it now that ought to be charged with perjury, blasphemy, and violation of the most essential acts of religion? Therefore, had there been no other reasons but these, the insurrection of the Poles is legitimate and *justifiable*, if taken even in a religious point of view. And if there is any charge that might be brought against the Poles, it is only this—that from an excess of submission, they had suffered, during sixteen years of violations of their rights, "the name of God to be taken in vain" by two Russian emperors; and that, at the very first act of perjury and blasphemy of these rulers, they did not revolt.

"*Your magnanimous Emperor,*" continues the Pope, "*will show you his clemency, and listen to our representations and our request, to the manifest advantage of the Catholic religion, which he promises at all times to protect.*" In this passage appears the whole mystery of the Pope's concession to temporal sovereigns. Let the latter only protect religion, in the Pope's sense, and he delivers up the people to oppression and slavery. The tyrants may then decimate the nations by thousands, and he will extol their "clemency." They may commit all kinds of enormities their vindictive spirits suggest,



and he will call them "magnanimous." It is melancholy to see him who calls himself the Vicegerent of Christ make the Christian religion—that religion of love and charity—subservient to the most abominable designs of oppression. It is shocking to witness religion, which should be the shield of the rights of man against tyrannic power, or, at least, a solace to the weak and oppressed, degraded to be the standard-bearer before despotism, and the sanctifier of its infernal acts. But if obedience is to be a duty on the part of the people, justice ought to be that of sovereigns: the one duty is no less sacred than the other; and if the Pope ventures to remind the people of their oaths, he ought, before all, to have reminded sovereigns of theirs.

The Pope, in his dotage, says that the "*Emperor promises to protect the Catholic religion.*" And so did he promise to keep the Polish Constitution! So did other Russian Czars and Czarinas promise before him! And Nicholas swearing fidelity to the Charter, has even taken an oath "*to make the Catholic religion an object of his special care, it being professed by the majority of the inhabitants.*" But, after all, did he or his predecessors keep their solemn promises. No! history shows it. Under the reign of Catherine, Russian generals went from province to province, with Greek priests, at the head of their armed cohorts, converting, with bayonets in their hands, whole villages and districts in Volhynia and Podolia from the Roman Catholic to the Greek Church. Catholic clergy were expelled their parishes, and their churches and revenues were given to Greek Priests. The Vatican cannot be ignorant that there is a Ukase severely forbidding, in Russia, proselytes being made to any other religious persuasion than the Greek Church, the conversions to which are ever encouraged. Jesuits, at Petersburg who acted contrary to this Ukase, were expelled that capital, and at last from Russia. There is another Ukase, which orders that all the children born by a Catholic mother with a Russian, or by a Russian woman with a Catholic father, shall be of no other than the Greek religion. These regulations must have had, as it may be supposed, the effect of considerably thinning the Catholic population, in spite of the Emperor Alexander's known professions of cosmopolitism in religion. To this "Greek of the North," as Napoleon used to call him, when abroad, any religious persuasion or sect was good—even excellent, provided he took a fancy to it. When in England, he told the Quakers that, in his opinion, their religion was the best: when in Germany, he became the most zealous votary of the mystic ranting of Madame de Krudener; so much so, as to have followed her inspirations in establishing the Holy Alliance of Kings. In his own Empire of all the Russias, however, he was a rank Greek, who increased the privileges of the Greek clergy to the prejudice of the Catholics, sought by all means to augment the followers of the Greek ritual, and did not allow even the Jews to be converted to other persuasions. In the kingdom of Poland alone English missionaries were permitted to convert the Jews to the Protestant church, because the national religion was there Catholic. Now, when compared with his predecessors, the Emperor Nicholas may be said to be a Greek patriarch, who is himself fanat-

ically Greek, and will see nothing but the Greek Church around him, which he is led likewise, from political motives, to protect; being the only monarchy of the Greek religion in Europe, to whom all the Slavonic tribes of that ritual, in case their religion should suffer, would look up for protection. His policy is (and the policy is indeed prudent) to strengthen the political position of Russia by the hierarchy of the Greek Church, which may be considered as the only moral strength that unenlightened Russia can possess. From these reasons, he can never protect Catholicism, or any other church which he considers to be diametrically opposed to his policy. No sooner did he ascend the throne, than he gave orders to deprive the Polish Catholic clergy of their schools at Witebs, Polock, and other places, and to introduce there Greek clergy, and Russian professors, who might teach in the Russian language. There exist Ukases of his, issued in 1828 and 1829, forbidding the construction of new Catholic churches or chapels in the governments of Mohilew and Podolia. But the late Polish revolution, by freeing him, in his opinion, of all obligation towards the Poles, has furnished him with the best opportunity of carrying his Greek zealotism to the highest pitch; and if Catholic worship and churches are not abolished, it is only owing to the lack of sufficient autocratic power to reduce so soon the Catholics, and all Christian persuasions, to the uniformity of a single Greek ritual. The early Christians were not more cruelly persecuted under the reign of the heathen emperors, than the Roman Catholic Church is at present by this despot.

We do not much pry into the reasons why the Poles should be so extremely prepossessed in behalf of Catholicism; nor shall we enquire whether Protestantism, that which, in the sixteenth century, was the promoter of the literary glory of Poland, was not more fit to further the political affairs of that country and, perhaps, to rescue it from ruin. Catholicism was, indeed, productive of many national reverses, in which the ambition of the Popes played no insignificant part; still, it was not devoid of good. It would have incurred less censure had it proved more constant to its devoted people, the Poles, and had it not betrayed them, as it did, at the very hour, when trampled upon by their common foe, they most wanted its support. Yet, although the head of Roman Catholicism, the Pope, abandoned the Polish people, the Catholic religion (which we separate from Catholicism) afforded them that solace which every Christian creed cannot fail to bestow on the unfortunate in the hour of his tribulation. The Catholic religion, as a ground of belief, and as a firm conviction of the mind, claims respect from every one—claims respect from Nicholas—and ought to have found in the Pope, as the head of the Roman Catholic Church, a more strenuous defender.

The Poles are known for laying great stress on every thing that is national, and so they do on their national religion. On that very account it has a peculiar charm for them. It was the religion of their families, their faithful companion through life, and comforter at the grave. It was, besides, the religion which at an early period, they had transplanted among the heathen Prussians and Lith-

uanians; which, for many centuries, they defended against the Tartars and the Turks; for which their ancestors had bled and died; and which was associated with all the heroic achievements that impart an exceedingly romantic charm to the annals of Poland. After the dismemberment of their country, that religion acquired an additional value, as a source of consolation in their patriotic grief. The Poles were robbed of all they possessed; their religion alone was left to them. They fondly cherished it: it kept them distinct and at a distance from their despoilers, who were of a different religion; and to it they are chiefly indebted for the preservation of their nationality. In a twofold view it was dear to them, as a salutary craving of the mind, and as the safeguard of their existence as a nation: both are sacred and were guaranteed to them by treaties—if birthrights require to be guaranteed.

That Russia has renewed religious persecutions in the nineteenth century, need not be wondered at; she is a barbarous and temporal power. But that a spiritual power like that of Rome should have abandoned her spiritual children, would be one of the most inexplicable anomalies in conduct, did we not know that at the bottom of the whole policy self-interest or ambition is lurking. Such was for ages the policy of Rome with respect to Poland, to gratify which, the country had to pay the *Petri grossus* to Rome, to conquer and convert heathens to Christianity, and defend it against other barbarians; to nourish sects at her bosom, and to oppress them—to be in turn tolerant and persecuting; all this to please the ambition of Rome. But now, when Poland lies prostrate and powerless, she is spurned and forsaken, and the Holy Father makes alliance with her mortal foe against the most vital interests of that country. Not Poland alone, but the whole of Europe is concerned in the present dealings of the Pope with the bear of Muscovy. Any accession of adherents to the Greek Church, adds a greater strength to Russia, which is even now overwhelming the liberties and civilization of Europe. Poles as Catholics, Poles as Poles, will never cease, even under Russian bears, to be a barrier of civilised Europe against the Eastern barbarians; but this barrier is destroyed as soon as the Poles will become Russianised, exchange their Catholic religion for that of the Greek Church, and lose their nationality by an amalgamation with the population of Muscovy. By publishing his Brief, the Pope, in deference to the will of the Czar, has not only acted against Poland, but also against the safety of other nations. His Bull is a curse to Poland, and therefore a malediction to Europe! We hope that no *Te Deums* will be sung at the accomplishment of either.

It has been observed by De la Mennais, that "Rome is double; the one spiritual, which is immortal—the other temporal; and that the former has nothing to do with the principles adopted by the latter." If it be so, it is deplorable that delusions of the kind should be practiced on the human understanding, and thus all its powers be put to the test in unravelling whether any act of Rome be a sanctity to be revered, or an earthly trickery to be cursed. The whole of the Catholic world was hitherto accustomed to see in the person of the Pope the head of their church, and to apply to him

as children do to their spiritual Father, in the dearest and the most secret concerns of their life. But how sadly these devout applicants must be disenchanted in finding that in their spiritual councillor is a Sovereign Pontiff, a brother of Don Miguel and of the Czar Nicholas, who shares in the prejudices and vices of his fellow-sovereigns, adopts the same doctrines with them, and makes their interests his own. By this, his second nature, the Pope is not a whit above the level of the rest of despots. Like them, he urges the right of absolutely directing the intellect and the conscience of the people, and anathematises the liberty of the press; and again, as the proprietor of territorial dominion, he condemns the mode of levying taxes by votes of the people, as they operate as a check on arbitrary power. He oppresses his subjects, and resists their just claims. Foreign armies, as of late, must be sent to force them to obedience; "the memorandums" must be written by all Powers to suggest to him political improvements, none of which he executes, although he promises them. Like other despotic rulers, Gregory XVI. descends so low as to borrow, in his reasoning, the logic of the Diet of Frankfort, and in his writings the style and language of Field-martial Paskewitch. He moreover contracts loans of Jewish usurers, allows them to kiss his feet, and keeps a mercenary guard of Swiss soldiers to overawe his Catholic subjects.

It is humiliating, that by this duality of nature in the Pope, a spiritual power like the apostolic should have become so much a tool, as to exhort and dictate in favour of so wordly, and almost so infernal an affair, as that of Nicholas with respect to Poland. Poland having for ages stood connected with Rome by no other than the spiritual bond of Christianity, expected in her hour of trial, and, we fully agree, deserved a Christian treatment. In her cause, which is acknowledged as just and sacred by all noble minds, she required no admonitions nor absolutions, but a due share of spiritual justification and of comfort; and Rome ought to have shrunk from dragging the noble victim before a tribunal polluted by Russia. The carnal part of Rome cannot constitute itself a competent judge in matters that belong to its spiritual province; and it is only a presumption that it passed a sentence of condemnation in a cause the justice of which it could not comprehend, because of the film of carnal illusions. But every day advances are making towards removing falsehood and deceptions, and towards establishing the reign of truth and justice. *God wills it so!* The affairs of the world being created for progress, cannot be rendered stationary; and despite the manifold impediments that are put to obstruct their way, they must, nevertheless, as if under the spell of Galileo's words, "proceed in their march." The social question once well understood, and once founded on a firm basis, will cease to be a question at all. Princes and kings, who now, supported by brute force, seek to oppose this march, will at last be left alone, and will then disappear altogether. Truth and justice, liberty and humanity, will then occupy their thrones. Woe to the Pope, if he do not bethink himself betimes to throw off his carnal *tiara*, and if he like his earthly associates, remain behind in the progressive movement. The Cabinet of the Vatican might then become not more respected than the Cabinets

of Berlin, Vienna, and St. Petersburg, by regenerated nations. Then, but then alone, can the arrival of a political "New Jerusalem" be expected; or, if the words of the Abbé de la Mennais may be used, "Spiritual Rome will appear beautiful in its whole moral power, and shall issue a voice to the nations, who will be prepared to understand it, calling loud upon them to gather round the sublime standard of "God and Liberty." At the arrival of that happy era, the approach of which is thus anticipated by the mind of one of the noblest servants of the Catholic Church, we trust to the justice of Heaven, that Poland, whose sons were known to have ever ranked among the foremost in defence of "*God and Freedom!*" shall be the first to be resuscitated bright from her ashes, in her glorious crown of Martyrdom. POLONIA, No. 5,—Dec., 1832.

---

### LENT.

*Is it such a fact that I have chosen?* ISAIAH, lviii—5.

OUR present number appears in the midst of this *joyous fast*—which like every thing else papal in modern times, says one thing, and means another. The subject is worthy of a moment's consideration—if it were only because such multitudes of our fellow beings deem it so. We have therefore taken the pains to examine THOMASSIN'S *Traitez Hist. et Dogmat des Jeunes de l'Eglise*—Baillet, *Fates Mobiles*, and the *Grand Dictionaire* of the Priest Moreri—in relation to the matter. The result of our investigation follows.—

*Lent*, was originally a protracted fast immediately preceding EASTER—which the reader is aware, answers to the feast of the Passover amongst the Jews. At first the fast was voluntary, and rigid; but for no certain period; ordinarily for a few days only.—There is no trace that any obligation to keep a stated fast was supposed to exist, in any part of the church, before the middle of the third century. And even after such an observance was supposed to be obligatory—it was for a long time unsettled what number of days should be kept as a fast. When a fixed time was first introduced, it was the period of *thirty-six* days; but even then there was no regularity in its observance. For while the Latin church kept a fast of six weeks before Easter, the Greek church observed one of seven weeks. And both pretended to keep the same number of days—as the Greeks did not fast either on Saturdays or Sundays of Lent, except holy Saturday; while the Latins fasted every Saturday—and thus equalised the number of days. The number of days seems to have been fixed at 36, upon the idea of *tything the year*, and consecrating a tenth of time to God, by mortification and penance. The views of the Greek church on the whole matter, and their reasons for adhering to a practice different from that of the Latins, were fully set forth, in the council of *Trullo* in 642. During that century (the seventh) the number of days was increased to 40,

in the Greek church in imitation of our Lord's fast; and the same change took place amongst the Latins two centuries later. But still the Greeks took nine weeks to obtain their complement of days and the Latins but seven weeks for theirs, on the principles already stated. But many particular churches long held to their more ancient customs, of various kinds; as in Milan, for example, where as late as 1563, it required all the authority of *St. Charles Baronio*, backed by the power of the Roman See, to enforce the uniform observance of the Latin system.

The manner of keeping Lent was at first, and for some centuries, strict. In the western churches, meat, eggs, milk and all preparations from it, and wine, were forbidden entirely; and but a single meal of any thing, and that towards night, was allowed each day. Fish were not forbidden; though many voluntarily abstained from every thing but fruits and vegetables. As to fowls—it was pretty early contended, that they were created on the same day as fish and like them, *out of the water*; and that therefore they were admissible like them during lent. But this notion of the flesh, was not at first well received.

In the eastern church lent was always more rigorously kept—and the people generally confined themselves to bread and water with vegetables. Many of the Monks, however, (jolly fellows!)—revolted at this thin diet; and those especially of Pontus and Capadocia—insisted on the *duty* of cooking a little salt meat with their vegetables. We condemn them not. But as the proverb says it is not just, to make fish of one, and flesh of another,—it had been well perhaps, if they had stuck to salt fish instead of salt meat. At least the proverb contains as much reason, as they had, who insisted on eating fish, *as a fast*, because Peter was a fisherman. And for the same reason why not eat men? For Christ told Peter he should be a *fisher of men*. The council of *Ancyra*, in substance allowed the meat. But *St. Basil*, in his Constitutions denounces the monks as Eustathians. We rather guess his saintly eyes would open wide, if he could attend one of Archbishop Eccleston's fast suppers.

In the progress of time the rigor of fasting insensibly diminished; and as early as the beginning of the ninth century—wine, eggs, milk, butter and cheese—were permitted freely, first to the *unwell*,—then to all who had not other *proper* food to support them under their *necessary* labours. Give a priest *one* unknown quantity in an equation, and he will bring out any desired result. But with *three* such in one proposition, and his own bowels the umpire,—“good night to Marmion.” Still, however, the fast was thus far kept—that only one meal a day, and that towards night—was allowed. Though this were a fasting—better than the feasting of half mankind; who during the whole period of the earth's duration have probably not enjoyed one hearty meal a day, of nutritious and palatable food.

By and by another device was fallen on to mitigate still farther—this pretended starvation of forty days. The Pope of Rome, made money from every thing else; why not from a man's stomach? Why should his abdomen be more sacred than his brains or his heart? The power of dispensation had just as good a fulcrum in the du-

odenum as in the jaws; and liberty to eat may be better granted, than that to forswear one's-self. What was begun, as an exception, soon became the rule. In 1475, the Pope's Legate gave a dispensation, to Germany, Hungary and Bohemia, to eat eggs, milk, butter and cheese, for five years, during lent. At length even the Bishops in their Synods accorded such dispensations; and at present it is an outrage never once thought of, that a papist can keep such a fast as lent—for forty whole days—without eggs, milk, butter, cream and cheese! It is well for them, that none of them are dispeptics, for such fasts as these would kill them.

But as to the single meal per diem. Is there no remedy for such a serious affair as that? Let us see. Till about the year 1200, the Latin church enforced the necessity of eating only once—and that after vespers—in other words, towards night. As to the Greeks, from the sixth century, they had dined at mid-day, and taken a collation of fruits and herbs at night. In the thirteenth century the Latins began to indulge themselves in a few conserves to strengthen the stomach during the day—and to take a *collation* also at night. This word is borrowed from the life of the cloister—where the deceitful heart, above all places, seems to learn the art of calling “evil, good—and good, evil.” After supper the religious professed—had in many instances a rule to gather themselves together, for the reading together in public of such things, as their superiors prescribed; and especially the *Conferences* of the holy fathers, called in Latin *Collationes*. After the reading—came the drinking, on fast days, of a little wine—a very little;—and this was the real *collation*! So far, so good. One meal per day—and that very late—nominally stood, as the rule. But that from being scant and coarse, had long become, as we have shown, generous and immense. And now we find, how it became gradually flanked before with *conserves* and behind with *collations*. Sweet-meats and wine, are not generally considered a very meagre diet.

The next step, was if possible a still more cunning, and complete alleviation of all the horrors which habitual self-indulgence would experience under a forty days period of temperance;—fasting being any longer out of the question. This was a contrivance to put things forward—so that the chief meal of the day, should not be so near the close of it, and therefore so many previous hours of the morning not be lost on mere *conserves*. Yet the thing was difficult, because it was established like the immovable hills, that the meal must be *after vespers*—and *vespers after nones*—which from time immemorial, were respectively at sun-set, and three hours after mid-day. The matter came about thus; they who could not attend the celebration of the “divine office”—nor observe the canonical hours, could hear the bells as they sounded for them, and could regulate their meals during lent thereby. And if men cannot fast with the church—it is nearly as good to feast by its rule. Thus the hour of afternoon service became the signal for eating; and the practice became universal—not to eat dinner—that were horrible—but to advance supper three hours! That is, to sound for the “divine office” at three o'clock in the afternoon—being the regular hour for *nones*; to celebrate mass immediately afterwards; and *vespers* directly

after mass; and *supper* directly after *vespers*. This process brought the *supper* on at four o'clock in the afternoon, instead of at seven or eight.

This idea once struck out, smoothed all before it. The Emperor Charlemagne was a quick witted as well as a strong-fisted chap, and in his religious sentiments full half a protestant. He preferred three o'clock for his dining hour; and therefore mass was said at two, and *vespers* and *supper*, came immediately after—still eating after sunset, but advancing the hour of sunset! The monkish historians excuse the Emperor for this trespass on the sun—by saying that as he was served at table by the sovereigns whom he had subdued,—who afterwards sat down and were served in their turn by counts and earls—and they by inferior dignitaries—through a long series; if the Emperor had not eaten till after the regular sunset—the last of his serving-men could not have eaten before midnight. It was most reasonable that the sun should set a few hours sooner than usual, during lent, rather than the Emperor's household change either their hours or their habits.

If the matter had stopped here, the sun would probably have put up with the arrangement;—and all things considered, would have got off on better terms than any other entity that ever had to do with her of Babylon. But things did not stop here, and requirements were made and continue to be made of the sun, which are hardly to be considered reasonable by any candid person. In the tenth century the custom of eating *after sun-down*, at the hour of three P. M. (*nones*)—was universal throughout Italy; where they commenced the “office of none” during lent, about noon, following it with mass, *vespers* and *gluttony*. It was not before the twelfth century that this practice was fully established in France. Before the year 1500—the hour of *supper* had been insensibly advanced to *mid-day*! And then *nones*, or three P. M. came about nine o'clock in the forenoon, and *vespers*, or sunset, at least an hour before the sun reached the meridian!! Thus stands the matter to the present hour: and the world will be so good as to remember, that during lent, the sun sets at eleven o'clock in the morning. There can be no doubt of it, for the acts, reasonings, and declarations of the infallible church, are express to the point. Nor is the proposition, though rather startling at first, at all harder to receive, than fifty others, put forth on the very same authority. As for example—that the soul, body, blood and divinity of Christ, whole and entire, is contained in every particle of the consecrated bread and wine. That is, that there are a thousand millions of Gods, in an inch square of cake: that a priest by saying “*hoc est corpus*”—can create Gods, *ad libitum*; and that every communicant, eats them by myriads.—Down with the sun, for us; it is far more credible than most of the capital doctrines of popery.

Now all things considered, lent, is not so formidable an affair. Here are, *conserves* to strengthen the stomach—just at will: here are eggs, butter, cheese, milk, cream, all kinds of fruits, all sorts of vegetables:—all kinds of fish, embracing oysters, lobsters, terrapins, green turtles, and the innumerable tribes of things that live, wholly or chiefly in the water. These are the undisputed property, of the



most rigid and abstemious papist during all lent, at least once every day, in quantities to be decided by his personal capacity. Then there is a multitude of other things, about which the church is not quite certain—and which may be eaten or let alone; and then other immense classes which are *maigre* or not, and so admitted or not according to circumstances—such for example, as the time it takes the gravy to get cold—&c. &c., which also, the operator must settle, or get his confessor to settle for him, as the cases occur. Then to finish the day—(as the main meal can be taken any time after vespers, and vespers can be said at any time)—it is to be remembered—that the *collation*, as to length, breadth, and thickness, is entirely an open question. This is the state of the case for those who pretend to keep lent regularly. But there are many alleviations even to this abundant provision. The *infirm* are not expected to keep lent. Nurses and pregnant women are not required to do it. No one under 21 years of age, nor above 60, is bound to keep lent; nor are any of any age who live by their daily work. To all this add, the annual and now stated dispensations of the Pope allowing to all the faithful, the privilege of meat (which seems to be the only forbidden thing) two or three days in the week; and the standing power to *sell* dispensations from all parts of the fast, to all who will pay for them; and the idea of the *eating department*—of a papal fast, will be fully before the mind.

We know not whether it would be most appropriate to mock or to weep over this exhibition of hypocritical sensuality, and childish self-delusion. Why, this fast, is absolute luxury, compared with the habitual state of nine-tenths of the human race, from the foundation of the world; and yet, it is held up before the world as a period of deep mortification, and before God as a ground of justification and acceptance, on account of its extreme severity. We verily believe, that any man of temperate habits, who would faithfully keep one lent, as the Papal Monarch would not only allow, but commend him for keeping it—would encounter serious risk of a surfeit, if not of radical derangement of his health, by the excesses of the table. And this is precisely the way, in which most papists who can afford it, keep lent. It is with them a period of excessive indulgence, far more frequently than of any, the least real abstinence;—and fasting, as applied to their lent, is mere mockery.

*Formerly*, says the father THOMASSIN, continence, abstinence from gaming, from public amusements, and from litigation, were enjoined during lent. As the injunction had no effect, and they who gave it never thought of obeying it—it was, perhaps as well to omit the repetition of it. But what a religion is that, in which conformity to the world, mutual contentions, gambling, and incontinence, were always allowed, except for forty days of each year; and latterly are hardly prohibited, even during lent!

It is extremely remarkable, that the Bible should have designated with the most exact and unerring precision—the apostate church of Rome,—by every one of its characteristics, down to the most minute. As in this case, by the singular characteristic of its pretended fasts. These are the marks of the apostacy of the “latter times,” recorded in *1st Tim.* iv. 1—6: A departure from the faith;

giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; (oh! how illustrated in the subject we have been treating!) having consciences seared; forbidding to marry; AND COMMANDING TO ABSTAIN FROM MEATS!—*Now we search in vain for any thing absolutely forbidden to be eaten during lent, but meat!*—Fish is permitted; fowl is disputed about; *flesh alone is forbidden*:—it can be eaten only by dispensation! And upon this minute but fatal mark, the Eternal Spirit fixes its ineffaceable malediction!—Yea, he makes the putting of our “brethren in remembrance” thereof, one evidence that we ourselves, are “good ministers of Jesus Christ!” Beloved Christian brethren, we have in this, discharged our conscience and our duty:—Will you credit our report—and help our labours?—Unhappy, deluded fellow-men—we lay before you this necessary, though it may be unpalatable evidence—that your hopes are founded on nothing better than sand!—Will you receive the admonition—cast your idols to the moles and bats—and live by faith in the Son of God?

---

THE LITERARY SUPREMACY OF THE NORTH.

*How got? How used?*

The popularity of a book, is as much a matter of trade, perhaps more—than gauze for ladies' caps or checks for dandy pantaloons. Either of several methods will *trade* a book through as many editions as a man's conscience is divisible, by tens, by fifties, or by hundreds. We remember to have seen a copy of MATTHEW CAREY'S *Olive Branch*, marked 27th edition: yet, though we are not very grey, we have lived to see the whole twenty-seven editions, not only disappear but be almost forgotten.

The methods of which we speak, are *first*, that some extensive publisher take a book in hand, publish it as a matter of business—and by previous engagements with his customers throughout the country, absorb several editions of a few hundred copies each. If the Harpers have a hundred booksellers to whom they give credit for books bought of them, on condition of their taking a dozen copies each, on an average, of every book they publish, this at once disposes as to the publisher, of twelve hundred copies—equal according, to a man's fancy, to two, to ten, or to twenty editions. After this all is easy—or all is immaterial. The book is able to live on its own strength;—or it dies on so many hands, and they purchasers—that no one feels it much, and the publishers not at all. But this operation puts the authors of books absolutely into the power of the large publishers; and gives to those publishers, the predominating weight in regulating the current literature of the nation. How far they are safe depositories of either of these important functions—namely the control of writers and readers both,—we suppose may be fairly inferred from the utterly contemptible, jejune, wishey-washey stuff, which deluges their counters, under the name of “recent publications.”

There is a class of publishers not strong enough to force the public taste, and which is therefore obliged to content itself with seducing it. The title of a book is got up; it may be new,—it may be only *renewed*,—or it may be a mere re-publication.—Agents are provided, who enter on the adventure, just as our northern brethren combine to kill sperm whales, each for such a portion of the oil. Then specimen copies are given to Doctors of Theology, and Doctors of Law, and Professors in Colleges, and Pastors in the large churches, and multitudes of other gentlemen, who really are, or are supposed to be, or at least suppose themselves to be, very extensively and favourably known; and for these, recommendations are given, printed and classified,—by which the throat of the public is widened, greased, and crammed, to any extent, and with any compound.—The giving of these recommendations is considered so much a matter of course that agents who solicit them are hardly civil if they are refused,—sometimes even *forge* them, as we shall presently show; and the persons who give them, are sometimes not only ignorant of what they affirm, but forget and deny afterwards that they ever affirmed it.

We will illustrate by an example or two:

In the General Assembly of 1836, the *Rev. Dr. Skinner*, sometime of Andover, but now of the city of New York, was charged in debate, with favouring certain doctrines, upon the very rational ground that he had decidedly recommended a book of one ABEL PEARSON of Tennessee, thereanent. Hereupon the doctor, pointedly and vehemently denied that he had ever recommended, or that he knew any thing about said *Abel*, his book, or doctrines. But it being past doubt that the doctor's name, was at large appended, in good capitals, to a recommendation, bound up in the book itself; that worthy gentleman came slowly and doubtingly, to a feeble, and then a tolerably distinct impression, that he did recollect having incautiously recommended a book about which he knew nothing.—

We were very politely called on and very much out of measure pressed, a few years ago—to introduce into use, and recommend in writing, that edition of the Assembly's Psalms and Hymns, got up at *Carlisle*, and improved in certain important respects, by the *Rev. George Duffield*, while once of that ilk.—After a very civil, then a very firm, then a pretty positive, and then an absolute refusal to do either of the things required of us; the agent closed his proposals, and let out on us, such a volley—that we were obliged, the only time in our lives,—we who from infancy had been taught the supreme force of every duty of hospitality—were forced in mere self-defence, to intimate that the gentleman need not consider himself obliged by courtesy to bear our painful presence, longer than his sense of duty absolutely required.

It appears to us a public duty to relate the following case.—During the latter part of the past summer a man, whose name we believe to be LYON, and who lately resided for a short time, in or near Abingdon, Va.—acting as he said, as agent for L. H. YOUNG ——— of New Haven, Conn. left for us, and for recommendation by us, a volume entitled “THE LIVES OF THE APOSTLES OF JESUS CHRIST,”

and as the advertisement of the copy-right sets forth, written by DAVID FRANCIS BACON. Being very much occupied at the time, and therefore unable to give the work a proper examination—and being no ways disposed to give currency to a work on such a subject, coming from such a quarter, without thoroughly examining its contents, we caused the volume to be returned to the agent. Not to be thus put off—he called on us—once—twice—perhaps three times. We took the pains of explaining to him fully, why we could not recommend his book. Yet after all this, he forged a recommendation from the senior editor of this magazine—forged his name to it—and on the force of that forged paper, obtained in his congregation, a pretty large circulation for his volume. Of course many persons in that congregation would know the hand-writing of their pastor; but Mr. Lyon had only to say to all such—this is only a *copy* of the recommendation; the original is at my lodgings; I will bring it to you. Of course too, the pastor would soon hear of such proceedings; but Mr. *Lyon*, more cunning than a *fox*, learned of him a few days before a temporary absence from the city—that five or six weeks would elapse before his return; and thereupon he diligently plied his work, and finished it before that return. This occurred during part of November and December last.—We once knew a female who stole candles to light a place of worship. Here is New Light heresy, propagated by forgery!

We do not pretend to charge the publisher, far less the author, even—with knowing, or conniving at these proceedings of this agent for the distribution of their work. It is our purpose to send a copy of this article to all the parties interested; and we shall patiently wait, to see what steps will be taken, to redress the evil done, and to satisfy the public mind that such acts will not be repeated. *Afterwards*, we shall know our own duty.

But there is too much reason to know that most unjustifiable means have been for many years used, and are still resorted to, in order to poison and unsettle, as well as direct and control the public mind, in the southern, central and western states—by agents and adventurers from the north in other modes, as well as through the dissemination of books forced into circulation.—A systematic attempt has been made for generations, to place eastern men at the head of all the colleges, academies, and schools, of the entire remaining portion of the union: and by a hocus-pocus somewhat similar to that used about their literature, the country has been made to swallow presidents and professors as numerous, as they were too generally worthless. At the same time the newspaper press, especially that *called* religious, had been subsidised and engrossed for the same ends, by the same persons, through kindred means—to an extent so great—that it spoke over Ashdod—and Ashdod,—only,—the very lisp of Canaan, being unheard in our captivity. Dr. ELY and the *Philadelphian*, through all its changes of name and principle, constant only to its original worthlessness and vulgarity, and faithful in nothing else, except that, in all its phases, it was always wrong: Mr. CONVERSE, and the *Telegraph*,—valuable as a living proof, that the sycophancy and timidity by which certain reptiles crawl upwards, are not in reptiles only, invariably united with duplicity, disloyalty and malignity;—these

are but specimens of a class so ample—as to threaten the country with disunion, and the church with lasting corruption.

Now, as the times require more hidden means of attack and annoyance, we find them actively in use. Is the body of a large city, where the church is happily sound and united, to be corrupted in detail and secretly? A vagabond addressing himself to some generous or benevolent feeling—perhaps selling tracts for his support, appears; and for months together disseminates in every family, a subtle poison, in the name of religion. For nearly a year past, this very process has been going on—and is still going on in Baltimore; and pamphlets of the most vile and dangerous description, have been placed in every Presbyterian family—by a reprobate calling himself a Presbyterian student of divinity.

Is a great scheme of benevolence to be defeated? Spies are sent in secret, through the length and breadth of the land, disseminating an invisible but powerful influence against it. The Managers of the *Maryland State Colonization Society* have declared explicitly in their last annual report, that this has been the case in regard to their scheme of operations—which they have found counteracted continually, by some secret agency diffused over the whole state.

Or is some prominent supporter of evangelical truth, to be undermined—and some powerful and united congregation—to be divided and shaken, in these trying times? Behold—a New Haven book—and a felon for its distributor—ready to disseminate Pelagianism in the name of the Apostles of the Lord!—

These things may not be borne. A decent self-respect, a proper nationality of feeling, a true independence of character, a just regard for the cause of truth and the public good, and an enlightened zeal for the advancement of true religion alike forbid us, to permit the continuance of this systematic dictation, annoyance and deception. If our eastern brethren choose to come amongst us,—let them do so, as our equals—and no more. They have no superiority; let them cease to claim it. If they desire to reside with us, let them no longer consider all the states as provinces, subject to "*the universal yankee nation*;" but amalgamate with us, and be really one with us.—The retirement of Dr. PATTON, and Dr. PETERS, especially that of the latter, we consider a clear and noble testimony to the force of an increasing sentiment in the church and the country, that the limit of endurance is passed. We sincerely trust that the eastern churches and people will see it in this light; and that Andover especially will remember, in all time to come, who it was that gave honourable refuge, and a new means of injuring us, to the most dangerous enemy of the Presbyterian church.

## TESTIMONY FROM NEW ENGLAND.

As every thing good comes from "down east"—we suppose a little *testimony*, as to the home workings of those patent spirituals which have physicked the Presbyterian church so terribly—may not be the worse—for being fresh from the same quarter. We give it in the form of copious extracts from a fast-day sermon, preached on the 1st of last September, in the *Edwards Church, at Northampton, Mass.*—by the Rev'd JOHN MITCHELL—pastor thereof. We ought also, in all fairness to inform our readers, that Mr. M. is the successor of THAT *Mr. Todd*, now of Philadelphia; not to know whom, is to be considered not possible.

It is hardly possible however to find two people who write more unlike each other, than *this* Mr. Mitchell, and THAT Mr. Todd. This however must be confessed, that if the former has most ideas—the latter as far excels him in the *images* of ideas; and what the *Edwards Church*, might be in danger of losing by the directness and lack of pretension of its present pastor's efforts, is well compensated in the inflated self-complacency of those of his illustrious predecessor.

There are many accounts on which this testimony ought to command serious attention. It is from an eye witness; it professes to be given after personal observation and experience; it is uncontradicted; it is illustrative of most important subjects; and it corroborates and corresponds with all that all other sober persons, of sound views have already uttered in various places on the same subjects. Besides this, it unwittingly develops the action of the *Congregational system of church order*, in trying times, and shows its tendency to generate and promote trouble,—and its utter incompetency to furnish any adequate check to any evil prevailing within the church—or even to free itself from it.—And what is to the full as interesting, it shows, by the simple exhibition of the facts of the case—what has been repeatedly asserted, and as often denied as calumnious, that the *great operators*, throughout the whole land, have been essentially of one stamp—guided by the same plans, operating on the same principles, and seeking the same results.

The truth is, and here is ample testimony to it, that the Presbyterian church in her controversy against the errors and disorders of the times, is fighting the battles of every evangelical denomination—yea is contending for all that is vital to the whole body of Christ. It is a noble and glorious testimony of her Lord and Master on her behalf, that he has placed on her, the chief stress of this trial of the Church's faith. May he give her grace, worthy of the great occasion,—and equal to the mighty trial!

In the promotion of *revivals* within a few years past, we have introduced various '*new measures*,' of a very exciting and some at least of a very questionable character. What these measures are you know, and the results you know, or rather *begin* to know. They have in many instances added large numbers to the churches; but have added nothing to their strength, nothing to their beauty. The introducers of them have aimed at *immediate* and *great* results (unmindful of remote ones) whether

*genuine* or not, and have proclaimed them in the newspapers. Our former sort of revivals, continuing for many months, perhaps for years, and producing daily their individual, thoughtful, *personal* conversions, have been deemed too slow a work for us: we have converted people *in masses*, in the *gross* by *carriage-loads*; and have filled the churches with them: we have cast our net into the sea and have gathered *of every kind!* Or rather *they* have done so, of whom these things are true; for we cannot say them of this and many other sections of the land.

How far the things in question, where they have occurred, have done violence to the habits of the people, and to the order of the churches; desecrated the pulpit: vitiated the popular taste; emboldened infidels; unsettled ministers; multiplied itinerants; caused divisions; and brought death or languor and consumption, on the churches, the most of you are, I suppose, aware. They have brought discredit on revivals. I almost fear they have put a period to them,—at least for some melancholy years. For while some churches have run out of their wits in one direction, others, alarmed, have retired to the opposite cold extreme; and from both, as we have reason to fear, the Spirit has departed—grieved by the distrust and coldness of the one and *scandalized* by the extravagancies of the other.

It has been one of the effects of these measures, that they have brought the *ordinary* means of grace into disesteem. Christians have reserved all their zeal, and sinners, all their purposes and hopes, for some extraordinary occasion which is to be attended with extraordinary results, while the weekly sabbath and the stated pastors, have been regarded with indifference. One of the leading religious newspapers lately proclaimed the opinion that revivals are not to be looked for, except in connection with protracted meetings, and that these meetings are not successful except under the management of evangelists, or of clergymen from abroad, whose labors are, for the time being equivalent to those of evangelists; and that therefore souls are not to be converted, in any considerable numbers, except by means of protracted meetings and evangelists. It is probable that thousands of readers received the opinion for truth. They were *prepared* to receive it, having acted on it already. But what then becomes of the wisdom of God in the appointment of the *ordinary* means of grace? Of what peculiar importance is the Sabbath, with its stated ministrations and ordinances? They must be *new* paths that lead to such conclusions as these.

In the business of reform, generally, we have a great deal of what is called *machinery* and *agitation*. Combination is the power; vehement discussion, invective, and agitation, are the manner; and 'going ahead,' the supposed result.

The *gospel*, in its appropriate institutions and modes of operating, has been deemed an inefficient system;—superannuated; inapplicable to the times: 'it decayeth and waxeth old, and is ready to vanish away.' It is too *general* in its aims; and we have therefore formed and multiplied societies of a more *specific* character, in reference to almost every particular immorality,—Seventh Command Societies; Fourth Command Societies; (Sabbath Unions, as they are called;) Retrenchment Societies; Plain Dress Societies; Total Abstinence Societies; Anti-Slavery, and, as some will say *Pro Slavery* Societies; and I know not how many. There is room for a hundred more; for there is no end to the sins that require correction.

The *gospel* is too slow in its operations; too calm in its temper; it is not *hot* enough, for the times; it has no arrows sharp enough for the heart of the king's enemies,—such monstrous ones as we now have to deal with; it is too sparing of epithets; it is not bold, and vehement, and sweeping enough, in its denunciations: it asks no fire from heaven to come down and consume the adversaries! Oh for 'a voice like a VOLCANO; and for words that shall SCORCH and BURN like drops of MELTED LA-

VA,' upon the sinner! This is the way we pray in these days. And we talk of 'scourging the guilty men into obedience to the commands of God, with a whip of scorpions.'

As one of the consequences of the multiplication of societies, the land is filled with their *lecturers* and *agents*. It is scarcely extravagant to say, the public conveyances are loaded with them. We are endeavouring to raise up young men for the ministry; but while we do this, a large number of ministers are leaving the appropriate work of the ministry to go up and down as lecturers. I do not question their motives: they are my beloved brethren, and I speak of them with respect. Nor is it modest, perhaps, to question their wisdom. If they think they are engaged in a work which is more important than preaching the gospel, more becoming, more agreeable, more consistent with those solemn obligations which they are supposed to have taken on them at their ordination, it is not for me to question their right of judging for themselves. But for myself, such are my views of the comparative importance of the work they have left and the work they have assumed, that, as a lover of my country, and the world, I would rather have seventy faithful ministers, in seventy vacant parishes, in seventy destitute places at the west, or at seventy missionary stations, than to have three times seventy lecturers on any, the most important, of the topics which occupy them.

It is the wisdom of one class of our reformers to enlighten the world in regard to its iniquities. When our Saviour sent forth *his* reformers, how did he instruct them? Did he bid them go into all the retirements of sin, into the sinks and dens, and chambers of wickedness, especially of lewdness, and bring out what they found, in the most minute and graphic descriptions to the public? Go, tell the ignorant, the curious, the simple, the young, the wanton and the chaste, what things are done of them in secret, and *how* they are done? Make collections of obscene pictures and publicly exhibit them; or distribute them about the country! He bid them no such thing. Such was not the *light* which he would have them shed on men. But, assuming that the world was wicked, everywhere wicked,—that all men *knew* this, they showed unto them that they should repent and 'turn to God, and do works meet for repentance.'

The *immodest pretensions* of some of our reformers. They go in advance of the gospel. How often have I heard it used as an argument and a remonstrance with us, when we have hesitated to admit their lecturers to our pulpits, that the gospel never can prevail till their societies have cleared its way. 'Is not this sin, and that sin, (say they) its greatest obstacle? How can the gospel prevail so long as there is so much lewdness; so much war; so much slavery, &c.? Must not we do away these things before it can advance?' But what then? Are your societies to precede 'the church of the living God,' and achieve the victory, and claim the triumph? And is the gospel to follow you as an humble *gleaner*? We must tell you, as our conviction, on the contrary, that your societies can do nothing without the gospel. The sins you seek to remove will never be done away till they fall by those weapons which are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds. Those weapons are the doctrines, spirit, and institutions, of Christianity. So far as these prevail, the objects you have in view are gained; and no farther.



