

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV.

SEPTEMBER 1838.

No. 9.

STATISTICS OF CRIME AND PUNISHMENT.

Condition of things in Pennsylvania.

WE have again and again urged the importance of exact statistical information, upon every subject to which that great and neglected science pertains. In all practical affairs, it is the science of sciences; the rectifier of error, the revealer of truth, the corrector of mistakes, the test of all theories, the proof of all laws, the master key to the well being of society.—And yet of all knowledge, statistical knowledge, is the most rare. On which account it is, that so few people, are really of any use, morally considered, in the economy of society.

There are under our eyes, at the present moment, two documents from the two principal cities in Pennsylvania, of high importance in regard to the subject embraced in the caption of these remarks. One is the "*Ninth Annual Report of the Inspectors of the Eastern State Penitentiary of Pennsylvania; read in the Senate and House of Representatives—February 8, 1838:*" the other is the presentation of the "*Grand Inquest in and for the City of Pittsburgh,*" to the judges of the Mayor's Court, in regard to the common jail; and is dated June 16, 1838. The "*Eastern State Penitentiary*"—as our readers are probably aware,—is the new prison in Philadelphia, in which are confined, all persons convicted of felonies, and condemned to two years or more imprisonment, from the city and county of Philadelphia;—and also, all other felons, from the whole of the counties lying east of the mountains—no matter to what length of confinement condemned. It is also known that this prison, has been constructed without regard to expense, and on the most approved and matured principles,—expressly as a model prison. A report therefore, which gives a general summary, of eight years' ex-

perience, and a particular account of the last year of the eight, in such an institution, ought to be received with great attention by all who take an interest in the solution of the great and difficult problems, involved in the subjects of the prevention and punishment of crime.

The principal facts in the report on the jail at Pittsburgh seem to be ;—that the house itself, is dark, sombre, ill ventilated, confined, and ill arranged ; that as to its condition, it is dirty, its atmosphere damp, heavy, chilly, confined, and offensive ; the accommodations of the prisoners are more than insinuated to be bad as to food, and dreadful as to lodging ; their beds consisting only of a little straw in a bunk, covered over with a loose covering of coarse muslin, and the very decencies of life outraged by the extreme filth, and unavoidable exposure of maniacs and insane persons, kept in the same tier of cells with the convicts ; as to this mixing of insane persons with the prisoners, the court add a note, expressive of their ignorance of any authority, by which this manifest injury to the health and convenience of persons put there by law, should be perpetrated ; and as to health, the grand inquest, are convinced, that the effluvia of the place must be decidedly injurious to its inmates ; that the mode of lodging, in reference to health requires immediate attention, and that the health of those confined must be surely enervated, their physical condition brought to decay, &c. &c. This report is signed by *George Darsie*, Foreman, and fourteen other persons : and it is certified by *J. S. McMillan*, as Clerk, to have been read, approved, and ordered to be printed by the court.

We forbear to make any comment on such a state of case as this. We take it for granted that every man in Pittsburgh would blush to read the report, or this synopsis of it ; and for ourselves we are unspeakably astonished to learn that such a state of things could exist any where, in the United States—but especially in Pennsylvania—and that in the second city in the commonwealth. What renders these revelations the more dreadful is, that the fate here portrayed, is that of *innocent* as well as guilty men ; if not indeed of innocent men chiefly of persons confined before trial ; of persons arrested on mesne process ; of persons not even accused, but merely put in for safe keeping ; as witnesses, for example, unable to find sufficient bail in recognizances ; of the unfortunate, as debtors, &c. &c. Truly Pennsylvania, must look into these matters—or she will not only lose her good name, but become a hissing, instead of an honourable proverb in the nation.

The prison at Philadelphia,—as our previous remarks show, is intended only for convicted felons. And the report before us, shows how much better it may be, in a multitude of respects, for a man to be guilty in one part of Pennsylvania rather than be unfortunate in another : how much better to steal in Philadelphia—than to go in debt in Pittsburgh : to kill, to burn, to rob, to ravish, on this side the Alleghanies—than to endorse for a friend, to be mistaken in the value of pig iron, or to be poor and a witness, on the other !—These are horrible anomalies ;—and although, beyond

doubt, the prison and its directors, are clear of all blame—while the jail and its, are worthy of all, in the premises, the case penetrates to the vitals of the subject, and of society. It is in vain to talk about reform of men *convicted*, by means of *prison* discipline; while men *suspected*, or men not even suspected, but *only unfortunate*, are demoralized by *jail* discipline. For let it be remembered, that while every convict that enters a prison comes into it through the jail; thousands who are confined in jail, return thence to society.

We will now turn our attention to the mass of interesting matter contained in the general summary of the eight years' experience which this prison furnishes; and of which a pretty full abstract is annexed to the excellent report before us; as well as to the details and principles of the report itself, for the single year.

1. The number, and nativity of the criminals—give us 858 individuals admitted into the prison during the eight years of its existence, from 1830 to 1837, both inclusive;—and they are reported to have been born in thirty-eight different states and kingdoms—embracing in that number no less than twenty of our own commonwealths.—Nothing could more clearly reveal two important facts, in regard to the social condition of this whole nation, namely: (1.) the original heterogenousness of our population, and (2.)—the hereditary strength of the migratory principle within us.

Of the whole number 139, being one-fifth of the whole,—were born in foreign countries; and out of that number 65 were Irishmen—being one-thirteenth of the whole number of convicts. In a population of which not one in twenty is a foreigner—and not one in fifty an Irishman, these facts speak rather hardly of all the foreign, and very decidedly so, of the Irish population.—We commend them to the country, as a matter for meditation in connexion with the naturalization laws—and the privileges of citizenship;—and to the calm inquirer into the merits of the Papal religion, which teaches these warm tempered and unruly men, idle forms and degrading ceremonies, instead of principles of virtue, and habits of order.

The average of the eight years is below the item for the last year of the eight. During it, every fourth convict was a foreigner; and every ninth one an Irishman. The evil therefore is constantly increasing.

2. In regard to the ages of the convicts; there were under twenty years of age 104; between twenty and forty 659; and above forty 125.

From this it appears that the great bulk of crimes are committed during the prime of life; and therefore at the very period, where there ought to be most average restraint, and least average temptation; and during which, if any reliance could be placed on the excellence of human nature, it ought to be most pure, being then at its perfect development.—The inference is obvious enough.

But it still further appears, that far more crime is committed in the last period of life, than in the first; that is, after forty, than before twenty. And if we call to remembrance the fact, that the

number of persons that reaches 20 is vastly greater than that which reaches 40—we shall be struck, with the force of the proof now exhibited—that the concluding years of man, are far more prone to crime than his commencing ones.—From hence, as from every other view of the subject, it is manifest, that *young* convicts, are ordinarily persons of peculiarly depraved characters; and that they require in all respects and from all considerations, a peculiar mode of treatment, in order to reclaim them.

The item on this subject, like most if not all others in the report for the single year which it covers, fully bears out the general average: viz, for that single year—under 20 years of age, there were 13 convicts; between 20 and 40 there were 128; and above 40, there were 20.

3. Of the 858 crimes for which the same number of persons have been convicted, there were against the person and personal rights of others 78; against property 770; besides 10, not falling certainly under either class (6 for example, being *perjury*, might fall under both classes, or neither, as the case might be.) That is, about nine-tenths of the whole, are crimes against property. Of the 78 against the person—59 may be said to have originated in anger, and 20 in lust: of the former 41 were cases of killing,—and of the latter 16 were rapes or attempts to commit them. That is, out of the personal offences 57, in 78, were of the very highest grade.

It is to be regretted, that nothing in the report gives us any clue to the period of life, at which particular offences were committed. And yet this point, is not only a most curious subject of enquiry; but must when it is investigated, shed much light on the moral progression of the human soul,—as well as on the practical effects of given states of society, as compared with each other.

This exhibit, presents in a very clear light, the facts that in Pennsylvania, the personal security of individuals is much greater, than the security of property, and that the former is either not violated, or its violations not punished except in cases peculiarly outrageous; and that the character of the criminals, and therefore of the period, is the reverse of sanguinary. We observe that the report for the last year exhibits some confirmation of the general averages, on both these points;—showing a progressive amelioration. Out of 161 convictions for that year, 15 only were for offences against the person,—being about one-eleventh of the whole; and of these, the proportion of aggravated cases, is on the whole diminished.

There can be no higher evidence of an exalted state of mere civilization, than that the persons of men are esteemed by all, to be sacred, and in all private respects inviolable. There can be no higher evidence on the other hand, of the prevalence of an imperfect morality, a defective religious instruction—and an unenlightened condition of the public conscience, than an extensive commission of petty offences against property. Not presuming to judge absolutely, we are obliged to conclude, relatively, that in eastern Pennsylvania, civilization simply considered, is in a more advanced state, than pure religion or even sound morality. We apprehend this to be very remarkably the fact, at the present moment,

throughout the greatest portion of this nation—and the world. Will the people of God, never comprehend the vastness and glory of their dispensation?—

4. We pass next to the moral and educational condition of the prisoners.—Out of 858, there were 415 who could both read and write; 217 who could read but not write; and only 226 who could neither read nor write. Above one-half being unable to obtain other than manual employment; for in this country a man who can't write—indeed who is not tolerably educated, is deprived of nine-tenths of the higher stimuli to exertion—which operate on his fellows.—The state is more bound to see that its citizens are educated, than to see that the poor are fed; for with us, knowledge is a more imperative necessity than bread.

Out of 858, as many as 622 were drunkards: 39 were drinkers, though not drunkards; 10 were not classified; and 187 called themselves sober. It is highly probable however, that even these, were the children of drunken parents, and hence their victims; or were in some other way cursed by this all pervading iniquity.—But take the best that can be said, and it appears that only about one in five of all the convicts through eight years experience in an extensive prison could call themselves sober. With the vast experience now existing on this subject, we may say that tipping leads as naturally to ruin, as the most aggravated diseases do to death. Can any man prove that any particular disease kills four out of five, of all the dead, in any particular city, or country, or graveyard? But here are four out of five in this prison, who were tipplers! Then a man who tips is more likely to be led to prison as its fruit, than he who has cholera, small pox, or yellow fever is to be conveyed to his grave by it!—What have our makers and venders,—or law-givers and law expounders to say to these things? *Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord; I will repay!*—

So again of these 858, there were 514 who were never bound, to any master, to learn any trade, art or calling; there were 185, who being bound, left their masters; and 159 who were bound and served till 21 years of age.—We cannot gather from these facts how many were raised to any regular calling, or had been trained, and were competent to conduct any sort of regular business. This is the great point, on which information is needed, on this branch of the subject. The strong probability however seems to be that the great majority had no regular business. Add this to the fact stated above, that a like majority had no competent education; and it will no longer appear surprising, that they should become convicts. A man without education, and without a competent knowledge of some employment by which to live by labour, and besides this, a tippler; it were strange if such a one escaped both prison and poor house. But, what folly is it to talk about prison discipline, when the state itself, makes its own criminals?—Until the state provides for the education of all its people—and sees that every one is obliged to be brought up to some sure and competent livelihood, and then takes away all public temptation; until the state does this, at least, the true place to settle the subject of prison discipline, is

in the Legislature, and in the statute book.—It is mournful to reflect, on the immense proportion of these convicts, who were once apprentices; 344 out of 858, were once apprentices.—The masters of these boys, will have a heavy debt to answer for before God. And for what but ruin, do the great mass of our apprentices appear to be training?—These boys might be the glory of our country; instead of that—they are made too often a curse, by the very force of training.—Let any man examine this subject, as it relates to our good city of Baltimore, and if he has a heart, it will be wrung with anguish. The masters seldom take the apprentices into their families; rarely provide for their religious instruction; expect only so much work,—and leave them afterwards to themselves. There are a few honourable exceptions; but this is an accurate general description. Indeed many refuse to have boys bound to them; lest they should incur obligations, which they do not wish to fulfil; and only take boys, by a sort of broom-stick engagement with them, their parents or friends: the public and the courts meantime conniving at the destruction of the boy.—Nay the public sentiment, is itself absolutely dead on the subject.—There is no public advantage of any sort, that we know of, enjoyed by the apprentices of Baltimore—such as are common elsewhere, and might easily be provided here. No libraries, nor reading rooms for their use: no lyceum, nor institute for their instruction; no bond of union amongst themselves, but common wickedness; nor any common effort to do them good. See the frightful result.—If this report is to be trusted,—nearly one-half of the convicts of their generation, will be furnished out of this small and most interesting class. Well may they say, no man careth for our souls!—

Here follows, an important fact, for the papists. Their priests and doctrines, inculcate that marriage, is in some sort, a hindrance to the practice of virtue. We refer our readers, for the full discussion of this, and other parts of the question of marriage, to the able series of articles which we are publishing, in relation to *Celibacy in the Papal Church*. Meantime, this report informs us that of 858 felons, 541 had never been married; 55 were widows, and widowers; 1 a divorced person; and 261 only were married. By turning to a previous page, it will be seen, that the great mass of these persons, perhaps every one of them, were of marriageable years. If we will reflect also, we will perceive that the great bulk of society of suitable years, is made up of married persons.—Then we shall be more capable of weighing the vast importance of this testimony, in favour of the virtuous influences of marriage, and in proof of the criminal tendencies of celibacy. Small as the proportion of unmarried persons, of mature age, is in this country, it appears to contain more than three times as much aggregate corruption as the immense mass of the married: in other words, as nearly as we can conjecture, the chances of crime if a man be single (for nearly all these convicts were men,) are above twenty times, perhaps above fifty times as great as they would be, if the men were married. What say you to that Mr. Eccleston? And you Mr. Gildea! Nepotism, (or *Nephewism*; as they have no

sons,) is a word coined, to express by the priests and prelates—the correlative of the idea revealed by these statistics.

5. We have said nearly the whole number of convicts were males. Here as on the other points, there is a statement, for the whole period; and another for the eighth year. Of 161 persons convicted the last year, 3 only were females—and of these only *one* was a white woman. This is exceedingly delightful. For if the mothers, and wives of the land be pure, the first grand step, is taken towards making the husbands and fathers and sons of it, pure also.—Cursed and abhorred of God, and ripe for perdition is that land, where women are corrupt.

For our own parts, we incline to think that the true principles of female punishment, are but illy understood. For example, nothing is more clear than that they ought to be confined, if at all, in prisons, wholly separate and apart, from those of men. So too, certain punishments apparently equal,—are really far more severe upon females than males. And again, from the actual state of society, the encouragements to reform, are much fewer in their case, than in that of the robuster sex; and therefore the *fact* of punishment is a much more serious obstacle to future virtue and usefulness. To which, add that punishment so far as it is remedial, and intended for example, is in no sort of proportion, less needed, in the actual state of crime, for the female, than the male sex.—We are convinced, that no public influence, by the punishment of this solitary white woman, can be a thousandth part as valuable, as it would have been to record that not one had been convicted. It is often a help to trembling virtue, to avert the face from its weakness; and crime is sometimes the most happily rebuked, by forgiveness. Besides this—the open exposure of the persons, the offences, or even the names of females, is decidedly hurtful to public morals, as well as fatal to the taste, the sensibility, and the exalted sentiment, of a people. It were better for the law to presume that females cannot commit the more odious offences, and so overlook as far as possible, all such cases; or presume madness, and treat them accordingly; or by some humane and wise device, evade the evils of their exposure and punishment, in a multitude of cases, rather than incur the risk of more terrible ills, than any which their inadequate punishment could produce.

6. There is a portion in these statistics, for many, if not for all—one for the abolitionists follows. Of the 858 convicts, 544 were white; and 314 coloured. Of the white persons 12, or one in more than forty-five were females; of the blacks 24, or one in thirteen were females. That is, coloured males are thirteen times worse than coloured females; but white males are forty-five times worse than white females.—But comparing the two colours, it would result, that if there were just the same number of white and black females, the latter would be, by the facts, just twice as bad as the former. But when the actual proportion of these to each other is considered, it seems that the black females are out of comparison the most corrupt. Thus it is stated, on p. 10, of the report, that for the eighth year, for example, the black convicts are

$\frac{1}{100}$ of that population; and as we have shown above, that every thirteenth of these convicts is a female, it follows, that the female convictions were $\frac{1}{100}$ of the black population, for a single year. That is, out of every hundred negroes, twelve men, and one woman, are annually put into this single prison. But of the whites, it is stated, on p. 11, that the proportion for the same year is $\frac{1}{7515}$ of that population; and we have shown above that the white female convictions are to the white male, as one to forty-five, not quite. That is, that one white man is yearly sent to this prison for every 167 of the white population; and one white woman for every 7515. In other words the black men are 22 times more corrupt than the white; and the black women 75 times more so than the white; and still further, that the most corrupt classes of the whites, are better, in the proportion of 22 to 13, than the best classes of the blacks.

These are hard conclusions, by force of which to persuade men to the *duty* of amalgamation; as based amongst other foundations, on that of equal purity of the races. They are doubly difficult to digest, as being revealed, in the very region where most has been done for the black race;—and where they have, for the longest period, and to the greatest height of pretension, by themselves and by their advocates, claimed equality with the whites. This population has lately been disfranchised in Pennsylvania; and that equally, whether the old constitution stand, or the new be adopted; in the former case, by a judicial construction of the law,—in the latter, by a positive provision of the constitution.—If *any qualification*, of any sort, be salutary in a republic, as the basis of the supremest rights, then it is hard to conjecture how a more imperious necessity could be laid on a commonwealth, than obviously existed here—to take from the corrupt, the ignorant, and the incompetent, a function useless to them, if not hurtful, in their actual condition,—derogatory to liberty, and dangerous to the state.

7. In all this subject, nothing is of more importance, than its *moral* influences. We consider those theories perfectly absurd which regard the benefit of the individual punished, as the only, or even the chief end of punishment. The security, and the benefit of society, are justly to be consulted, at whatever cost to the guilty; and the duty, nay the permission to regard the guilty is subordinate to other and higher considerations. It is true, that society has no right to punish cruelly or illimitably; and signally true, that it has no right to punish those, whom it has itself made criminal, by bad, or by imperfect laws. Hence, the double duty to be merciful, in punishment, and to adjust it, as far as its prime object will allow, to the benefit of the guilty. In this way, a recompense may sometimes be made for human errors; and as it may often occur, that the guilty are victims of society itself, this remuneration may mitigate that evil, that its punishments may frequently be unspeakable blessings.—There are great errors also, abroad in the world as to the necessarily reformatory character of punishment, in itself considered; and from hence, unreasonable and exaggerated expectations are too often formed, of the influence of certain systems in

this respect. The highly respectable Inspectors tell us in their report, in general terms, that they have reason to be gratified at the general working of the system of this prison; and add instances, in which, within their own knowledge the most admirable effects have followed confinement in it. To these they add benevolent suggestions, such as their experience has culled, for the more effectual and humane execution of their plan of discipline.

We observe however that the facts they furnish on the subject of reconvictions, have a mournful emphasis. Of the 858 convictions, 590 were the first; 167 the second; 65 the third; 23 the fourth; 6 the sixth; 6 the seventh; and 1 the ninth time. Nearly one third of all—old offenders.—And this is more than borne out, by the report for the eighth year; during which 59, of 161 convictions were old offenders; some of them convicted for the fifth and sixth times. Of 471 who have served out their full time and been discharged from this prison, 47 have been reconvicted and sent back to it. And of the 161 received during the eighth year, 19—or one in eight nearly,—had been in this prison before. The directors say, they “have never had a female prisoner reconvicted.” And the warden in his report adds this solemn testimony: “drunkenness, is the principal cause of these reconvictions, as it is also of a large proportion of the first convictions.”

8. The last subject to which we will call attention, is the influence of confinement, and especially *solitary* confinement (which is exclusively adopted in this prison)—upon the health of the prisoners.—The report is full, and we will add, most satisfactory on this subject. The Inspectors say “the experience of another year enables us to state that no instance of insanity has occurred in this institution, which has been produced by solitary or separate confinement, operating injuriously on the mind.”—They add, that persons, who have been confined six, seven, and eight years, are not only in perfect health, but “amongst the healthiest persons, are those who have been the longest time in prison.”

There is annexed to the report of the Inspectors, one from Dr. Darrach, the physician to the prison; which is full of interest. There is very little information in possession of the public, which goes to illustrate the mutual influence of crime and disease upon each other. This report of Dr. Darrach, contains a statement of the health of the convicts, when admitted, as well as when discharged; and therefore sheds some light on the subject just indicated, as well as on the important one of the influence of imprisonment on health.—The first important fact drawn from his report, is, that on the whole, the influences of the confinement have been obviously and decidedly beneficial, in regard to health; the aggregate of persons in sound health, being greater, in a given number of those dismissed from the prison, than of those received into it. The second and not less interesting fact, is that a majority of the criminals, when admitted, are in imperfect health. Thus for the eighth year, of 101 whites admitted, 59 were in imperfect health; and of the 60 blacks, 35 were so. Now shall we conclude, that disease, especially when it is chronic in its character is favourable to crime; or that previous crimes had produced these diseases; or that these

unhappy prisoners had lost their health in the confinement on mesne process, before their trial, in such prisons as that at Pittsburgh, of which we have spoken in the fore part of this article? Most of these diseases are, apparently chronic; many of them it is true are such as indicate a state of vice at some period of life; but, some, also are congenital. It would be rash to express a decided opinion, on grounds so slender as exist here; nor would we venture one even after some reflection and investigation. But we incline to think, it will turn out, whenever the subject is examined—that while crime is decidedly hurtful to health—on the other hand, disease is itself a high occasion, and often a direct cause of many kinds of crime.—We observe, that the solitary confinement, and general system of the prison, bears harder on the blacks than on the whites. A new proof, of their inferior condition, both as to habits of labour, and mental improvement.

We have been seduced much farther than we intended into this, to us, deeply interesting subject.—It is one of the highest praises of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, that she was the earliest in modern times to take up the subject of punishment by confinement; and that she has been amongst the most steadfast and successful, in developing its humane and sufficient character. It is indubitably and long ago, proved to be ample, to satisfy all demands, of the state, in all ordinary cases. Now let it be made effectual, as it relates to the convicts themselves; not only to preserve them in safety, but, if possible, in health, and without expense, beyond their own earnings,—and with moral and intellectual improvement, suitable either for a return to society, or an endless departure from it.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE INSTITUTION OF CELIBACY IN THE PAPAL CHURCH.

No. VI.

LXXI. ABOUT the year 763, one Saint Chrodegang, bishop of Metz; or as others say, one St. Baudin, arch-bishop of Tours, conceived the idea of subjecting all the clerks belonging to his cathedral to one rule. The rule was borrowed from the monasteries with some variation for the sake of novelty. Hence arose the canons of aftertimes, who in their origin were monks under a new name. The bishops were always aided by a council, by whose advice they regulated the affairs of their churches. During the first three centuries all the believers, lay as well as clerical, composed this council, as appears by Cyprian and others of the fathers. But as the church became numerous, the laity were by degrees excluded, and the clergy of the diocese only admitted. The next step was to exclude all the clergy except those of the episcopal city. But even this soon appeared to be too burthensome, and the bishops chose a small number of the clergy of the episcopal city, and shared with them only the responsibilities of government. This was the senate or council of the bishop.

LXXII. By the institution of St. Chrodegang, this senate was converted into a monastery, and the clerical senators into monks, who thus became doubly subject to their bishop, in as much as in the character of Abbe, he had the right to chastise and imprison them. For the purpose of secluding them from intercourse with the world, and especially with females, they were obliged to *remain within a circle* formed around the cathedral, which in many cities was called *the cloister*. They took their repasts in common. They received their clothing and the necessaries of life from the bishop, and their senatorial functions being reduced to almost nothing, it was necessary to devise for them, some means of occupation. The psalmody of the churches was for this purpose committed to them, and as the ability to read was not common in those times, this new employment of the canons was highly meritorious, and the means of procuring many donations.

LXXIII. The bishops then left to their canons the office of chanting, while they took to themselves the uncontrolled authority of government. The change was popular with the prelates, and was eagerly adopted in each cathedral, as a useful reform. But the rules of monastic obedience were then relaxed, though the bishops retained the authority which they had acquired by the original institution. Fleury (*Hist. Eccl. ann. 811.*) mentions another expedient of the clergy, to acquire power over the other ecclesiastics; which was to select their clergy from the serfs of the church, who, through fear of being chastised, or sent back to servitude, would not dare to complain. (See Hallam's *Mid. Ages*, ch. 7, p. 294, et seq. Harper's Ed. 1837. Introduction of Capitular Elections.)

LXXIV. There was more difficulty in subjecting the multitude of curates, priests, and deacons or clerks, scattered through the rural parts of the diocese, than the clergy of the cathedrals. It was more seldom that episcopal authority reached the former. They could therefore adhere to ancient customs with less disturbance. If they were compelled occasionally by force to change them, they had more opportunity for resuming them, or at least for devising some means of indemnity against episcopal invasion. The history of the church in different nations will show this.

LXXV. Mezeray remarks that the celibacy of the priests began to decline in France, about the end of the Merovingian race. (*Vie de Philippe I.*) He ascribes the fact to the morals of the barbarians, who upon taking orders, would not submit to the restraint, and they thought it more virtuous to have wives than mistresses. He adds, that the usage extended very soon to Germany, Britain, Illyricum and the neighbouring provinces. But this author is mistaken in some of his statements; at least as it respects Britain and Germany: for the ecclesiastics of those countries married long before this epoch. He errs also in saying that the celibacy of the priests was practiced in the primitive church, as has been proven. But Mezeray does prove that when the French clergy were forbidden to have wives, they supplied their places by concubines, and that about the beginning of the 5th century, they resumed the practice of marriage, which had been interrupted after the time of pope Siricius.

LXXVI. We are told that the Angel Gabriel, announced in England the law of celibacy, (*Polydore Vergil*, lib. vi.) in aid of the cause of the Benedictine monks against the ancient priests and monks of the Britons. It has often been said, that Great Britain was converted by the monk Augustin, who was sent thither by Gregory. But Christianity was taught in that island long before that time, and traces of it remained notwithstanding the devastations of the Anglo Saxons and Danes. There were at least two or three bishopricks remaining at that time, and several monasteries, among which, was that of Bangor, which contained near two thousand monks. Buchanan (*Rerum Scotticarum Hist. lib. v. ch. 36.*) says of the monk Augustine, *venit in Britanniam a Gregorio Romano pontifice missus Augustinus quidam monachus; qui sua ambitione dum novam religionem docet veterem vehementer turbavit: nam non tam Christianam disciplinam quam calimonias Romanas docebat.* He adds, the former Britons were taught Christianity by the disciples of St. John the Evangelist. The monks which Augustin found there were very different from those of the order of St. Benedict. So says Buchanan, and also Hume, who has given an account of them from Osborne, a contemporary author. (See Hume Hist. House of the Plantagenets.) These different orders of monks became violent enemies. A war was carried on between them nearly five-hundred years, according to Rapin, Thayer, before the ancient clergy were subdued. The kings often took part in their quarrels. If the reader will refer to the account given by Hume of the part taken by Edwy, Edgar—by Odo and Dunstan, and the melancholy fate of Elgiva, whom king Edwy espoused, he will be able to judge of the benefits which England derived from the mission of the monk Augustin. Still, foreign influence had not been able to subject entirely the native ecclesiastics so late as the year 1001: for in that year the council of Hengham reproached them with having several wives, at one time, and this council promised the privileges of nobility to those priests, who would abstain from their wives, or would not marry in future. But this remedy was not successful. Hence, perhaps the title "Sir," which the clergy bore instead of "Reverend" before the reformation. (See Offer's life of Tyndale, chap. ii. Hallam's Mid. Ages, ch. 7, p. 278, Harper's Ed. 1837.)

LXXVII. The monk Winfrid, otherwise called Boniface, another missionary of the popes, complained, on his arrival in Germany, that the clergy were plunged in debauchery and adultery, (*Fleury Hist. Eccl. an. 742.*) as it appears, said he, by the children which they have after their ordination. He caused a council to be called forthwith, and condemned to imprisonment and scourging, all priests, clerks, monks and nuns who were found guilty.—This was not difficult: for the councils of the middle ages were always composed of bishops of the same party. The clergy of the ancient churches were seldom summoned to them, except to hear their condemnation. They preserved however, for a long time, their liberties in spite of the popes. About the beginning of the tenth century, pope Leo VII, wrote to Gerard, arch-bishop of Bavaria, as follows, "We are informed of a deplorable disorder. The priests of

your country dare publicly to marry, and a question is made, whether their children can be promoted to holy orders. How criminal these marriages are, may be seen by the council of Nice, which forbids priests to cohabit with their wives, and by that of Neocæsarea, which orders the deposition of a priest who marries; which we will should be executed. But the children should not bear the iniquity of their fathers." (See Hallam's *Mid. Ages*, ch. 7, p. 272. Ed. of Harper's, 1837.)

Pope Leo could not have selected authorities less to his purpose, for we have seen that the council of Nice allowed priests to live with their wives—it only forbade *sub-introductæ*. Such however is the main foundation of the law of celibacy. All the councils and decretals support the cause of celibacy by the authority of the council of Nice. Whether the bishops of that day were really ignorant of the acts of that council, or whether they designed to impose upon the credulity of the people, is a point we will not attempt to determine.—St. Adalbert, bishop of Prague, in 988 renounced his bishoprick, to avoid as he said, three evils, which appeared to him to be without remedy, and which he was unwilling longer to witness, (1,) the plurality of wives, (2,) the marriage of priests, (3,) the sale of Christian slaves to Jews.

LXXVIII. In Italy the morals of the clergy were even more deplorable. (Sigonius, *Rer. Ital.* l. ix.) In fact this law of celibacy covered all Europe with scandals and crimes. The civil laws were no sufficient barrier against its demoralizing influence, and at the commencement of the eleventh century, Peter Damien remarks, that the incontinence of the clergy subjected them only to simple penances, without deposition or degradation. He wrote a book against the Ecclesiastics of his time, the very name of which imported the infamy of the subject. (Bayle's dictionary, Art. Damien.)

LXXIX. We have now come to the time of Gregory VII, who was the chief restorer of the law of celibacy. But before advert- ing to his motives, and the means, he used for the object, the reader's attention is invited to some of the political causes which prepared the way for his success.

During the ages of ignorance, which we have just passed over, the usurpations of the bishops had been carried to excess in every part of Europe. Those of the popes, however, had not reached their height, because during this period the popes (especially from Formosus to John XII, deposed by the emperor Otho) addicted themselves to atrocities, and infamous pleasures, more than to objects of ambition. But upon the return of tranquillity to the papal see, the pretensions of the popes, were put forth without limits, and soon without obstacles. The bishops had prepared the way for them; for although they thought they were labouring for their own aggrandizement, they were in fact labouring in the cause of the popes, just as the usurpations of demagogues and aristocrats, after the destruction of a popular government, terminate in the elevation of a monarch or despot, who usually reaps the fruit of their labours.

Still it must be confessed the bishops could not place their usurpations upon a solid foundation, otherwise than by putting them

under the protection of the popes. It was necessary for them in order to prevent the people from resuming their rights, to find or create an independent power, which could impose upon the people, and which by force or policy, could embarrass and keep in check the political sovereignties. In this way was formed the alliance between the bishops and the Roman Pontiffs. Hence the ardour of the Diocesan episcopacy to exalt without limit the papal authority, which served as their defence, and maintained them in their temporal possessions, which they chiefly valued, while it took from them only some spiritual claims, of which they made but little use. This system was not at once perfected in all its parts, yet it was far advanced when Hildebrand was elected pope, under the name of Gregory VII. No man was better fitted to succeed in such a project. His character was most audacious and enterprising. Feeling that he could not increase, nor even maintain by his own strength, the usurpations of his see, he early perceived the necessity of deriving the means of success, from the very states which he meant to subjugate. As he was already regarded the immediate sovereign of all ecclesiastics, who by their wealth and number were a formidable body in every kingdom, his first effort was to withdraw them entirely from every other jurisdiction, and make them wholly dependent upon him. The first step necessary to reach this object, was to subject the immense wealth of the clergy which was designed for their subsistence, entirely to the control of the popes. This would give them patronage, and of course create dependants. Hence the urgency of the popes to invest themselves with the right of nomination to all benefices. Hence the celebrated quarrel about investitures. (Hallam *Mid. Ages*, ch. 7, pp. 280, 284, Ed. 1837, Harpers.) This quarrel cost Germany alone more than eighty battles, and Europe the lives of many millions of men. (Fra Paolo's *Treatise upon Benefices*.) At length however the popes prevailed against the emperors. The next stroke of papal policy was to sustain the ecclesiastics against the jurisdiction of the civil powers. Hence the zeal of Gregory, and his successors for ecclesiastical immunities, which caused much trouble to France and England. (Hallam *Mid. Ages*, ch. 7. p. 298.) Finally, it was necessary in order to insure the dependence of the clergy, to isolate them from every other interest and influence. Hence the law of ecclesiastical celibacy. The cares of a family necessarily involve the subject of them in the duties of a citizen. A wife and children, are ties which bind the husband and father to his country. Divided affections, and divided efforts would be the result, if priests were allowed to marry. Gregory and his successors saw this, and to secure absolute devotion to the interests of the papal throne, determined by all means, and at all events to prevent the marriage of the clergy. Hence their efforts to extend celibacy—hence the excommunications and cruel tyrannical laws to enforce the law of celibacy. The course of policy thus marked out, we are now to see how it was executed. (See Hallam's *Mid. Ages*, chap. 7, pp. 278, 281—2.)

LXXX. The Chronicle of Germany, at the year 1074 (*Chron. German*, lxx., p. 119,) informs us that Hildebrand, known also as

Pope Gregory VII. having assembled a council at Rome, forbade priests to continue to live with their wives, and those who were destined to the priesthood, to contract marriages in future. This decree met with much opposition in Germany. The bishop of Constance refused to compel his clergy to obey this decree. The pope wrote a letter to him. To end the quarrel, a council was assembled at Erford. (*Lamb de Kinaffbourg*) The arch-bishop of Mayence presided. The priests detested this law of the pope. Most of them had wives. They relied, in opposition to it, upon the testimony of the gospel of St. Paul,—upon the divine institution of marriage. The arch-bishop was of the same opinion, but through fear of the pope, dissembled. The council was opened by reading the brief, which ordered the priests to renounce their wives, or the priesthood. (Fleury, ann. 1074.) A great murmur arose. They declared that both obligations being sacred, they could not lawfully renounce either. They urged the evils of forced celibacy, "*Quo quisque vir melior*" says the author "*aut Sacerdos sanctior, hec pluribus vehementius repugnabat.*" They treated Gregory's decree as heretical—a senseless doctrine, and as tending to immorality. The arch-bishop insisted upon obedience to the brief of the pope. They waxed warm, and the arch-bishop came near losing his life by violence, and he actually escaped by the use of violence.

LXXXI. The next year new letters from the pope required the clergy to observe celibacy under pain of excommunication. A new council was held at Mayence. Many bishops were there. A legate from the pope being present, denounced the severest penances upon those, who persisted in keeping both their benefices and their wives, but with scarcely better success than at the preceding council. A few indeed, through fear of indigence or dislike to their wives, promised to obey. The facility of supplying their places with concubines, was also a motive with some. Yet these, adds the Chronicle, in the end, kept both their wives and their churches. Some lived with *Focariae*, or with married women. So that this prohibition of Gregory served to multiply *irregularities*.

Those who refused to submit, upon returning to their churches, assembled their people, complained bitterly against the pope, and justified their marriages by scripture, so that when their successors came to take possession of their places, provided with excommunications and bulls, they were rejected by the people. The partizans of the pope then had recourse to violent means, put to death some of their adversaries, hoping thereby to frighten the rest. But it turned out quite differently. The people in many places rose against the pope. Many dioceses in France and Germany joined with the diocese of Mayence, to oppose the pope. The princes also aided them, and especially the Emperor Henry IV. who had been excommunicated by Gregory VII.

LXXXII. In England the disorder was scarcely less, according to the the testimony of Matthew Paris, (*Hist. Aug. an. 1074.*) who calls this decree of Gregory, a new example, and an indiscreet judgment. (*Novo exemplo et ut multis visum est, inconsiderato iudicio*) Scarcely was it made known says this historian, than it occasioned a schism, worse than heresy. A small number of priests

observed continence, some pretended to embrace it for the sake of enriching themselves, but almost all defiling themselves with an infinity of crimes. Henry of Huntingdon, another English historian, relates that when Gregory undertook to introduce this usage previously unknown, the decree appeared very excellent to some, and very dangerous to others. *Quod quibusdam, mundissimum visum est, quibusdam periculosum, ne, dum munditias viribus majores appetent, in immunditias horribiles ad Christiani summum dedecus inciderent.* (see also *Polyd. Virgil, Hist. Angl. l. vi. p. 117. Assentinus annal. Boior. l. v. p. 355. Kyriander, annales Trevisenses, &c.*)

LXXXIII. The ecclesiastical history of France, also gives us at this period the example of a bishop, publicly contracting marriage, after his promotion to the episcopacy, and having several children. (See Fleury, ann. 1078.) It is hardly credible that a bishop would have done such an act, if marriages among priests in that day were uncommon. It is true he was deposed by Gregory VII. and doubtless by measures similar to those adopted in Germany; and we must remember all the sovereigns of Europe, had not as much firmness to protect their subjects as the Emperor Henry IV. In fact the melancholy fate of Henry IV., would naturally deter other sovereigns from incurring the risks that he did.

LXXXIV. The successors of Gregory VII. followed his steps. They invented new means of multiplying this sacred militia in every kingdom, which having none of the duties of a citizen to fulfil, existed only for their service. Doubtless one of the chief means of the excessive power of the popes, was the constancy with which they pursued every purpose, in spite of every obstacle. Every new pretension put forth by one pope, was obstinately persisted in by his successors, and each making some little advance, they reached at length the object; success in one project, suggested another, which was pursued with equal pertinacity and vigour. Thus by degrees, the papal edifice was reared; and it is remarkable, that it was to the same principles precisely, that the ancient republic of Rome owed its power: viz:—the constancy of the senate was the principal cause of her conquests, and in spite of the continual change of her magistrates, ambition (which was the dominant principle) always reigned with unabated activity.

LXXXV. In England coerced celibacy was not established so late as 1130, notwithstanding a decree of a council held at London for that purpose. Henry II. seeing that the majority of the priests were married, and that the new ordinance displeased many persons, allowed the clergy to marry, as was usual, said he, during the time of his father and brother under arch-bishop Lanfranc. The cardinal of Crema, in the character of legate, had been sent expressly to support this decision. He spoke in the council with great energy, representing under the blackest colours, the crime of a priest, who, leaving the arms of a woman, should dare to touch the consecrated Host: but it happened on the night following, that the police surprized him under circumstances, which proved that his practice was at variance with his doctrine. The discovery made a great noise, put an end to his legation, and obliged him to leave the kingdom immediately. (Hoveden, p. 478. Huntingdon, p. 382.

Matt. Paris, p. 48.) Such too often were the examples given by these papal advocates of celibacy, and as the reader will readily believe they did not contribute to the progress of the pretended reform. Matthew Paris says, that the priests continued to marry till a century after this time, notwithstanding the prohibition—that they retained both their wives and their churches, and that their children were allowed to inherit from them until 1237, when a COUNCIL deprived them of that right. (Hallam Mid. Ages, ch. 7, p. 278.)

LXXXVI. In Poland the celibacy of the clergy was not established at this epoch. (Cromer, l. vii. p. 174.) The cardinal of Capria went there however in the capacity of legate, and compelled the married priests to separate from their wives and concubines. The legate succeeded without difficulty. Thence he passed into Bohemia, but there he found many obstacles. His efforts with the priests proving ineffectual, he attempted to gain the candidates for ordination, and to obtain from them a promissory oath to observe continence. But, says Du Bravius, (Hist. Bohem. l. xiv. p. 115.) the priests conjured them to remember that they were born free, and not to allow a new servitude to be imposed upon them, nor submit to mutilation and degradation from the rank of men. They said that there were monks enough who had renounced the world and its pleasures—that the legate ought to be satisfied with them considering their number: but as to *ministers*, whose avocations called them into the world, it was unjust to impose on them a yoke which their fathers were not able to bear. (See also the account of an occurrence at Rouen, Fleury, Hist. Eccl. ann. 1119.)

The legate finding that persuasion would not succeed, resorted to violence. The bishop whose authority was sovereign, aided the cardinal. He exiled many priests—condemned many to die of hunger in prison. In this way he hoped to reduce them to submission. But they preferred death to this new reform.

LXXXVII. Still by perseverance and severity, celibacy was gradually introduced into all the states of Europe. Nothing was gained by it, but the substitution of scandalous concubinage for lawful marriage. The most cursory perusal of the historians of the twelfth century, will satisfy the reader that almost all the ecclesiastics openly kept concubines, and that the court of Rome having less interest to prevent such scandals, than honourable and lawful marriage, made but a feeble opposition to it. The vice of concubinage was not a ground of exclusion from a nomination to a benefice. It would be easy to produce many acts of councils against the concubinage of ecclesiastics, and to show how this vice filled the church with scandals from the epoch of the interdiction of marriage, until the reformation. But the reader must be referred to ecclesiastical history; for so notorious is the fact, that authors most accustomed to suppress the truth or shape it to suit their purposes, have not been able to conceal or disguise it. The severity of law, so far from extirpating the evil, yielded to its overwhelming influence. The councils of Germany (Father Paul's Hist. council of Trent) allowed the use of concubines to young ecclesiastics. Almost every where the priests applied to their ordinaries for permission to

use the same liberty. The bishops, to prevent licentiousness, required each priest to be content with a single woman, and obliged him to maintain her and her children. These licenses were soon subjected to a tax, and that contributed to multiply them. The next step was to regard these licenses as a requisite of the bishops, and then no ecclesiastic was allowed to dispense with obtaining one of them. Agrippa (*De vanit. Scient.*) says that it was a proverb, which in his time was commonly put into the mouth of the bishops; *Habeat vel non habeat, aureum solvet pro concubinâ, et habeat si velit.* The same author speaks of another permission equally scandalous; *Quo certâ pecuniâ Episcopis solutâ absentis mariti uxor, praeter adulterii offensam alteri cohabitare permittitur.* These excesses says he, are so multiplied and so notorious, that one knows not whether most to wonder at the impudence of the bishops or the patience of the people in submitting to them. (Agrippa de Lenonia.) Nicholas of Clemangis (*de corrupt Eccl. Stat.*) says, *Quale est quod in plerisque dioecsesibus, rectores parochiarum, et certo et conducto cum praelatis pretio, passim et publice concubinas tenet.* A council of Normandy in proscribing such taxes uses this language, *Propter eorum (Presbiterorum) foeminas nulla pecuniae emendatio exigatur.* Such details are disgusting, but they show what was the result of that zeal for imaginary perfection, and of those indiscreet laws which, though ostensibly adopted to attain it, were in truth revived and enforced in the eleventh century in aid of pontifical ambition. The impolicy of them is obvious without the light of experience. Every married man is interested to maintain the sanctity of marriage. Whereas, every *celèbètier* when under the influence of his own passions, is interested to destroy it. A civil ruler may safely act upon this consideration, and if the public morals are a proper subject of his care, he may interfere and by law, forbid coerced celibacy. Even in the dark ages the necessity of such interposition was felt. In many parts of Germany, Switzerland, and France, the civil authority not only allowed the concubinage of priests, but required it as a means for the protection of the honour of the citizens. Such a remedy—so contrary to the purity of the gospel, proves the enormity, and the multitude of crimes from this source. Clemangis says: *Taceo de fornicationibus et adulteriis clericorum, a quibus qui alieni sunt probro caeteris ac ludibrio esse solent, nam Spadones aut Sodomitae appellantur; Denique laici usque adeo persuasum habent nullos cœlibes esse, ut in plerisque parochiis non aliter velint presbiterum tolerare, nisi concubinam habeat, quo vel sic suis sit consultam uxoris, quae ne sic quidem usque quaque sunt extra periculum.*

LXXXVIII. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the effects of this law of celibacy, were so deplorable, that the wisest and best men of those times, were anxious to restore to the clergy the right of marriage. Even Æneas Sylvius often said, that if there had once been good reasons to forbid priests to marry, there were better reasons in his time to allow it, and in one of his works he regards the interdiction of marriage, as the fruitful source of condemnation to many priests who might be saved in lawful marriage. *Fortasse non esset pejus Sacerdotes quamplures uxorari, quoniam multi salvarentur in Sacerdotio conjugato, qui sterili in praesbiteratu dam-*

nantur. (Annal. 10, l. ii.) Polydore Vergil (*De Rer invent.* l. v. c. 4,) expresses himself with great force upon the subject. He says the law of celibacy has been more decried than any other ecclesiastical institution—that it has caused the greatest dishonour to religion—the greatest pain to virtuous men—that it has been the occasion to the priests of continual debauchery. The celebrated John Gerson, who figured at the council of Constance, was evidently opposed to the law of celibacy, though he does not in terms say so. But in his treatise concerning the spiritual life of the soul, and in his dialogue of wisdom and nature, he sets forth the evils of celibacy with great force, while on the other hand he maintains the reasons for requiring it very feebly. The Emperor Sigismund asked for the abrogation of this law at the council of Constance. Cardinal Zaberell supported the proposition. But reasons of policy prevailed against it, not only at this council, but also at those of Pisa and Basle. (Lenfant, *Hist. du Conc. de Basle.*)

LXXXIX. Such was the state of morals and of public opinion at the epoch of the reformation. This great event, to which under God our age owes so much, well nigh extinguished the domination of the popes. Indeed the ball is yet in motion, and it will ultimately crush the power of the papacy. One of the immediate causes of the reformation, was the extreme corruption of the clergy. It is true that the papists of that day, accused the priests and monks who left the papal church, of being actuated by the desire of women. But the reader may judge from the preceding pages, whether it became *them* to bring the charge of libertinism upon those who were no otherwise obnoxious to it, than that they were guilty of an honourable and virtuous marriage. Indeed it soon became apparent to the Catholic princes of that day, how much more virtuous were the lives of the married Protestant ministers, than the priests of their own communion. At the council of Trent, Ferdinand the emperor, made strenuous efforts to obtain permission for the priests to marry. France also desired this change. (Fleury, *Hist. Eccl. ann.* 1563.) The duke of Bavaria specially requested it, and sustained his views by a memorial, in which he set forth political, as well as theological reasons for the abolition of the law of celibacy.

XC. It is an astonishing fact, that the kingdoms of Europe should have been so long subject to the influence of a foreign authority, whose interests, were absolutely opposed to theirs. Another fact equally astonishing is this, that a power should arise amidst the monarchs of Europe, so contrived, that an obscure individual, born of the humblest parentage, could rise to what would seem a chimerical dignity, towering above the throne of the very sovereign, whose subject he was born, from which he might govern, or at least cripple or annoy not only his own sovereign, but kingdoms which he had never seen and never would see. Yet such was the papal hierarchy. Gregory VII. (to mention no others) was born of obscure parents. He was, at first but a simple monk of Clugni, and by means of factions and cabal, he rose to a degree of power, which enabled him to awe almost all the Potentates of Europe. His controversy with the Emperor Henry IV. is well known. (See Hallam's *Mid. Ages*, ch. 7, p. 282. Harpers' ed. 1837.) These facts are al-

together peculiar. History furnishes no parallel or precedent. Yet prophecy distinctly marked both this power and its peculiarities nearly ten centuries before it arose. Dan. vii, 8. The political powers of Europe, though nominally sovereign, could neither interpose obstacles to the corruption of public morals, nor apply a remedy without the permission of the papal court, not however for want of physical force, but because that force was nullified by superstition. But this permission the sovereigns of Europe could never obtain. With the exception of Philip II. of Spain, all desired it. And the reasons of the refusal will now be explained.

XCI. Pius IV. upon learning that the article of the marriage of priests was under discussion at Trent, expressed his dissatisfaction to the legates, it being evident, said he, that the introduction of marriage among the clergy by turning the affection of the priests towards their wives and children, and consequently towards their families and country, would detach them from their dependence upon the holy see, and that to permit them to marry, would be the destruction of the hierarchy, and the degradation of the pope into the rank of the bishop of Rome. The cardinal of Carpy, said in the same council, that the wives and children of priests would be so many hostages, who would answer for their obedience and fidelity to their princes, and would make them at length renounce their fealty to the holy see, and that soon the power of the pope would not extend beyond the city of Rome. Mr. De Thou, relates an answer of another pope still more frank—Charles IX. having asked through an ambassador for the communion under both species, and also, for the marriage of priests, the pontiff answered, he had always thought it right himself, and that the emperor had made the same request of him, first, for the states of his son, the king of Bohemia, and then for his own states, but the cardinals soon changed the pope's mind. The cardinal of St. Angelo, afterwards a pope, said that he would never consent to give France so detestable a poison, as a remedy. He thought it expedient rather to let the kingdom perish by its malady, than save it by a remedy worse than the disease. *Se nunquam assensurum ut Galliarum populis tantum venenum pro medicamento proponeretur, multoque sibi consultius videri, ut hoc morbo laborantes perire sinant, quam ut tale iis remedium petentibus concedant.*

XCII. The influence of Rome directed the council of Trent. Inspired by the legates of the pontiff, it answered to the proposition to remove this obligation, "that it is not the part of a good physician to cure one evil with a greater—that if priests were ignorant and incontinent, it was no reason for prostituting the priesthood to married men—that the popes had not been willing to permit it, alleging that marriage was a carnal state, and that it was impossible to be at the same time alive to the things of the flesh and the things of the Spirit." This sort of reasoning deceives nobody now-a-days. But these reasons have never prevented the unmarried Catholic priests from mingling in temporal things, and even from taking part in the cares of government. Still that council concluded under its anathemas all those who should maintain that it was lawful for priests or monks or those who had taken vows of celibacy to marry.

XCI. It is not our design to pursue the history of celibacy, or rather the history of these scandals subsequently to the council of Trent. Since the revival of learning, public morals have lost much of their former grossness, and these vices have rather sought secrecy: and since the reformation, the purity of the Protestant clergy has compelled the Catholic priesthood to observe greater decency of deportment. Still complaints against them, and suspicions of them, especially in Catholic countries have not ceased, and there is the same sort of misunderstanding between them and the other orders of citizens as formerly, though not perhaps to the same extent.

But nothing of this kind exists in the Protestant communions. It is believed that no book has ever been written for the purpose of charging the Protestant clergy with such improprieties of conduct. Individual delinquencies have occurred, and the eagerness with which these instances are seized by the Catholic priesthood, shows how little foundation exists for any general charge. Compare this with the universal cry of Catholic historians against the morals of ecclesiastics before the reformation, and the reader will easily perceive on which side the advantage lies.

XCIV. Every government should contain within itself all the principles necessary for its police and melioration. It should have authority to adopt regulations shown to be useful to the state. It is a monster in politics, that authority for these purposes should be lodged in the hands of a foreign power. An independent government is or ought to be the sole judge of the means necessary to its own prosperity, and it should have the right to employ them at pleasure. It would not be more absurd to go to Rome for permission to cut down an American forest, or to introduce into the United States a new kind of commerce, than it would be to obtain permission for any of its citizens whether clerical or lay to marry, *that is*, to obtain permission to adopt measures for the preservation of the purity of morals, and for the increase of its population. It belongs to the civil power to decide what impediments should prevent marriage. But the interests of the Roman clergy being usually at variance with the civil power, they reckon as nothing the civil contract which is the essence of marriage; and under pretence of making it a sacrament, they have set themselves up as the sole judges in this matter. At this point the papacy has been in perpetual conflict with the civil power, and always will be, until it abandons the notion that marriage is a sacrament. Far be it from us to say, that religion should not exert an influence on civil government. On the contrary, it is our fervent prayer, that the principles of the holy gospel should reign in the hearts of all men. But these principles are profaned when they are adulterated by admixture with human inventions, or when they are perverted into the support of the secular views of a corrupt hierarchy.

XCV. As to monastic institutions; the right of the state to control, govern and abolish them, is founded in the very essence of civil government. Every individual is accountable to the civil society of which he is a member, for all the services which he can render while he continues to enjoy its protection. The body pol-

itic has the right to call to its aid all its members; and vows which interfere with these rights are of no validity. A monastic order is an assemblage or body of men who have laid aside the character of citizens—who have isolated themselves and renounced the service of their country at all times—both in war and peace. (See Le Vayer, de Bontigny *Diss sur les voeux.*)

XCVI. In London, whole streets are built upon ground which before the time of Henry VIII. was occupied by a single convent, and thousands of men subsist within the space occupied there by some twenty or thirty monks. In the neighbourhood of London and elsewhere in England, there are large villages erected upon the ruins of some ancient monasteries, and instead of a lazy sterile family, living upon the labours of others, there are multitudes of families which contribute to the interests of agriculture, commerce, the arts and manufactures.—In view of the influence of these institutions upon the interests of civil society, as it has been imperfectly represented in the preceding pages, let the reader attempt to estimate the influence which such institutions, if they get a footing among us, would have upon this country, particularly upon the western states. Suppose the new unsettled lands of the west, were to a considerable extent to be bought up, and annexed to monasteries and kindred institutions. Even American enterprize would receive a check by them, or at least a new direction.—But it is not necessary to portray the consequences of such a calamity. In the history of the past, the reader may learn what are the inevitable results of coerced celibacy and monasticism upon the moral, social and political interests of mankind.

MEMOIRS, TO SERVE AS A HISTORY OF THE SEMI-PELAGIAN
CONTROVERSY IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

No. III.

The General Assembly of 1831; with a notice of its principal acts and a sketch of some of its prominent actors. By a member of that Assembly.

As the Assembly of 1831, was to the Pelagian party in our church, in some measure, both the summit and gibbet of their glory; at once the darkest moment in the history of our struggles, and the turning point from which we date the commencement of our ascension up to the broad day-light of our present condition, we shall, with permission, go a little more into detail, as it regards both men and measures, than we should otherwise have considered ourselves called upon to do. Two parties had now become so palpably distinct and antagonist, that a leading member of the Pelagians declared it on the floor, and gave the house to understand that he had come up to the Assembly for the purpose of sustaining Mr. Barnes, and changing the character of the Board of Missions, the two great points for which the opposing party was collected and

drilled. Two parties had, indeed, been known to exist in our church in their distinctive characters for years: but the surpassing honour and glory of bringing them publicly out, and arraying them on tangible ground against each other, was reserved for the Rev. ALBERT BARNES; a young man of youthful talents, crude and undigested theological views, and who exhibited a peculiar childishness in the whole business;—in the first place a childish temerity in at once jumping into that Pelagian ditch, around which older and wiser men and of more character, have been long lingering but hesitated to plunge; and in the second place, a childish state of theological and historical knowledge, inasmuch as he appeared actually to suppose that the calibre of other men's minds, and the amount of other men's information was to be measured by his own; and hence when he, for the first time, discovered the exploded system of Pelagius among the musty records of the past, he seems to have taken it for granted, that the whole theological world was as ignorant as himself! Deceived by this belief he went to work, at once, to astonish the age and cover himself with laurels, and fill his coffers with wealth by brushing the dust off this ancient system of heresy, and giving it a new suit of virbiage, and ushering it by a new name into modern society! In the third place, he exhibited a peculiar softness in permitting himself to be held out in the forefront as a sort of shield by such men as BEMAN and PETERS, "et id genus omne," who being older tacticians, were willing to give him the notoriety, provided he shielded them in a measure from the attacks of the enemy, in accomplishing their purposes of overturning the doctrines and order of our church.

To understand this subject more clearly, we might briefly mention that Mr. Barnes, at the time of the late Dr. James P. Wilson's death, was the pastor of the church at Morristown, N. J. Being a young man, callow and unfledged, and yet pretty conceited withal, as well as having a taste for error—he wrote and preached, daring a revival, and for the express instruction of young converts, a sermon "on the way of salvation," into which, not only did he, by a strange fatality neglect putting any thing about "the way" of salvation, but actually filled the place thus left vacant with doctrines more than semi-pelagian, and a daring, though boyish attack on the binding character of our constitution! Shortly after this he was called to be the pastor of the 1st church in Philadelphia, although the church had never heard him! This however did not prevent this enlightened and conscientious religious body signing a paper, which declared that from their past experience of his labours they were satisfied, &c. &c.

On the first movement in this matter, Dr. Ely solicited and published a criticism on the heretical sermon mentioned above, which first opened the Barnes controversy; yet when the Presbytery objected to Mr. Barnes' theological sentiments, Dr. Ely threw his vote and influence in his favour, and helped to compose that majority which accepted him as a member of Presbytery, and installed him over the 1st church, without examination and without retraction! This conduct at once so grossly unfaithful to the master, and so entirely unexpected, drew forth a complaint and protest from the mi-

nority to the Assembly of 1831. This party then complaining of the Presbytery of Philadelphia for endorsing the sentiments: 1. That the atonement in itself saves no one. 2. That Christ did not pay the penalty of the law. 3. That a minister is not to be bound by the standards which he voluntarily adopts, &c. &c., came up to this Assembly desiring and expecting redress. The sentiments in Mr. Barnes' sermon, it is true, were in no sense of the word new, as we have before said, for from the days of Pelagius, they were occasionally used down to those of Dr. Beman, &c. But they had never before come under the direct *surveillance* of an orthodox court until they were taken up by the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

Having then gotten Mr. Barnes to break ground and advance in such a bullying manner as necessitated his Presbytery to take notice of his errors, and this case being all prepared for the Assembly, every exertion was made to support their system by carrying him through unscathed. To accomplish this, Dr. Ely, the editor of the only orthodox newspaper east of the mountains, and who had been for many years fiercely orthodox, was at once and most unaccountably subsidized; and thanks be to God, went over to the Pelagian party with his paper, wealth, eccentricities, tergiversations, &c. &c. By this movement, it is said, that the Doctor completed his celebrated and arduous task of circumnavigating the entire theological world, and like the hunted hare terminating in the same system of error in which he started. At this time, however, his defection put us to much inconvenience and greatly encouraged the enemy. Multitudes of extra Philadelphians were scattered over the land containing every sort of defence of Mr. Barnes, and every sort of denunciation of his opponents. At one time, praising him as entirely orthodox; at another running down our system: to-day extolling Mr. Barnes to the empyrean as talented and pious, and the next decrying all and every one who was not willing to sail in his wake. This together with a long and loud cry of persecution, created an extensive sympathy for the man, and through him for his sentiments all over the land. Many were influenced to believe that his doctrines were misrepresented; many cared not what he believed; many liked him the better the more heterodox his opinions—in fact the Jews and Herodians—the Scribes and Pharisees had here common and neutral ground, and they joyfully embraced it. In addition to this, Dr. Beman spent a part of the autumn and all the winter preceding this Assembly in the south; as it is supposed, principally in making preparations for the approaching contest. In concert with Drs. Ely and Beman, Mr. Peters, the secretary of the Home Missionary Society, and the Coryphæus of the party, assailed the truth and its supporters in a series of papers issued at Cincinnati!

Here then was Ely with his "Philadelphian" in the east and north, Peters in the west and north, and Beman in the south. All acting in concert, in order to carry a majority in the Assembly of 1831. Here was amalgamationism with a vengeance, Ely, Beman and Peters! Yes, and they aimed too at a most extraordinary amalgamation. Peters and Ely wished to amalgamate our Board of Missions with that of which the former was the head, and there-

by unite Presbyterianism and Congregationalism! Beman and Barnes wished to go still farther, and to throw into the mess Pelagius and all his *isms*! Skinner wanted to go farther still, and take in *all*! Yes, all denominations, and amalgamate them into one! Dr. Cox would go farther still, and not only amalgamate all denominations, but all *colours*! What a precious compound these precious Doctors would make! Mr. Editor, you have been at sea, did you ever see a dish which the sailors call *lobscouse*, which is composed of all the scraps of bread and beef and pork and fish and potatoes and sourcrot and onions, &c. &c., which had been left from every meal for a week before?

Let us now for a moment look in upon those noted characters who laid down for a time the arms of a most rancorous hostility against each other, for the purpose of crushing Presbyterianism. Ely and Barnes we have already presented. Dr. Skinner not being a member of this Assembly, and withal not so prominent as he either wished to be or thought he was, we shall step over and commence with Dr. Beman, a man of some talents, much tact and of great capacity for all kinds of work and of tergiversation. His character and standing are, each entirely *sui generis*. With those who needed and desired his help he was for the time being, at least, supreme dictator; while on the contrary, in the estimation of those less interested, or opposed to him, his moral character stood in an inverse ratio to his tact and talent. Never, perhaps, did there figure a man in a court of Christ, wielding so much power and with such absolute control who did it upon such a small capital of moral character. Through a whole life acting in such a manner as to make great demands upon the forbearance of the community, he was ever bitter and uncompromising in regard to all against whom he acted. Living in a house of glass, and in which deeds were done which I may not detail, he was constantly throwing stones against the houses of others and raking up all their alleged misdemeanors that he might arouse the public indignation against them. Witness his conduct in church and state, whether as a Pelagian or an Abolitionist. And yet to a great extent, provocative as his conduct has been, he has escaped that amount of external indignation, at least, which might have been expected to overtake him. In fact his character to a great degree, saved him from the effects of his conduct. Like a certain animal that prowls upon our barn yards, he has been permitted to escape rather than run the risk of being exposed to the peculiar odor and virulence by which he defends himself. This odor and virulence too, be it known, are always condensed and poured out in a ratio proportioned to the truth of the allegations brought against him, and to the enormity of the conduct charged upon him. Witness for instance the audacious language which he uses as an Abolitionist, notwithstanding his own previous conduct in the premises. As if the heap of malice and dirt under which he attempts to smother every man who has any thing to do with slavery would for ever cover up from the knowledge of society his own doings pertaining to that system, he throws on both as it regards quantity and quality enough of fœtid and malicious epithets to accomplish fully his purpose; and as his whole life and charac-

ter in all their tergiversations have been a continuous scene of consistent inconsistencies, he is necessitated, in order to turn public attention from himself, to keep continually hurling his poisoned and offensive missiles at all around him. This then was the man whom Dr. Ely had branded both as weak and wicked, who was nevertheless chosen by that same Dr. Ely and the Pelagian party as a suitable and fitting personage to stand at their head as moderator of the Assembly! "Ex uno disce omnes." This exaltation was also in part the fruit of his southern pilgrimage the preceding winter.

Such then being the man chosen to preside in the first Assembly in which error triumphed, and chosen too with a premeditated unanimity, let us take a brief peep at a few of his principal coadjutors. Amongst these, Absalom Peters claims and deserves the first niche. For years previous to this a contest existed concerning the proper manner of conducting the educational and missionary concerns of the church. The Orthodox party as a matter of course and universal usage, were for permitting the church to raise and educate and mission her own children; but the Pelagian party with the spirit of the papacy, was determined to take them from under the control and influence of the church, and make the world stand god-father for them and superintend their education and afterwards mission them into whatever field it desired. At the head of this enterprise stood Mr. Peters with his society, so organized as to include within its radius every variety of theological opinion however antagonistical, as the felly does the spokes of a wheel. By the avowed principles of his society, no man could be objected to on account of doctrines, provided he came otherwise sufficiently recommended. So far did this extend, that even Dr. Taylor's certificate could not be questioned! By legislative enactments and the original constitution of the society, Dr. Peters was pleasingly shut up to one course of action, and that was, by throwing a continuous stream of Pelagianism into the Presbyterian Church, so to dilute it as in a few years to change both its doctrine and ecclesiastical character. The only thing in the way of this desired consummation was the Boards of the church, and hence these must be put down. Two purposes therefore were to be accomplished by this Assembly, the support of Mr. Barnes, and consequently the upholding of error, together with the prostration of our ecclesiastical Boards, especially that of missions, and consequently the propagation of error of all shades and shapes. This last object was to be accomplished under cover, and by the instrumentality of the former—that is, the popularity of Mr. Barnes as a man, and as a persecuted man, and as an errorist, and as the pastor of a large and wealthy congregation, and the necessity of rescuing him from the gripe of old-school dominancy, &c. &c., composed the lever by which our Boards were to be overturned. To do this, Dr. Beaman was to be chosen Moderator, while Mr. Peters was to be his right-hand man on the floor. Here he was the leader, and admirably was he fitted to his work. Cautious by natural constitution; calculating by education;—wary by habit and purpose and necessity;—suspicious by the reflected colour of his own mind he was the very reynard of his party. This little personage, yclept

Absalom, although a misnomer, as it regarded the whole man moral and physical, stood at the head of the Home Missionary Society, and seemed to be actuated by one great aim, and that was to exalt that society of which he was the chief, conscious that just in proportion as he advanced its interests he advanced those of Absalom Peters! In fact, if he is not greatly misunderstood and injured, he seldom thinks or plans or acts, but the absorbing subject of all is,—Absalom Peters!

Another gentleman, equally prominent in his way with the last, though in reality but his echo, was a Mr. Lathrop. He also was of an eastern and a congregationalist lineage; a retainer of Peters; an agent of the Home Missionary Society; a man of most consummate impudence, a trifling stock of sense, but of great devotion to the interests of that great Diana, by the making of whose shrines he procured his bread and clothing. This man was well fitted, and always ready to do any sort of *Peterish* work, or in fact any sort of work except that which required moral or intellectual talent. Labouring under a “diarrhæa verborum,” which no remedy could arrest, which he appeared to have no power himself to stay, and by which he was constantly bespattering and daubing every thing around him, he was a perfect nuisance. But as it regards *actions*, we fear to speak; let his conduct, however, in surreptitiously withdrawing from Dr. Witherspoon the Report of our Board of Missions, and doing it from a strange house, and out of a private closet, in the absence of the Doctor and the family, decide! In truth he was to Absalom what the automaton chess player is to Maelzel; whatever string Absalom pulled, Daniel complied with, whether it was to open his mouth or his hand—to pour out a torrent of words or secure a document!

Another of the worthies who may not be passed over in silence, and who also hails from New England and congregationalism, was the Rev. Elipha White. Nobody who has ever heard and seen him putting forth his mental pellets against Presbyterianism with a tempest and fury which exhibits him “to bursting nigh,” can possibly ever forget him. In this Assembly he united most heartily with his Congregationalist brethren in attempting to subvert the doctrines and order of the church; but having failed in doing it in the way devised by Beman and Peters he has ever since, (for he is a stereotype member of the Assembly,) attempted to do it by producing discord and ultimate division among us on the slave question. His position here is peculiar, for while he is an intimate friend and ally of the abolitionists, and rumour says an abolitionist himself at heart, yet he professes to be an ultra pro-slavery man! By this means he can attempt driving at us on one extreme, so as to provoke and alienate the south by exhibiting us as not going far enough on one side, while the abolitionists can make a sortie at the same time upon us from the opposite extreme, so as to make us appear to err on the other side! Be this as it may, he is the only pro-slavery man whom I ever knew to have the confidence of the abolitionists, and the only one I ever knew who gives his to them! Dr. Fisher, the worthy moderator of the schismatics of '38, in explaining to a friend the reason why Mr. White did not sit and act with

them, inasmuch as they had his heart and confidence, said, that he could do them (the schismatics) more and better service by apparently acting with the Old-school men to whom he would be a gin and a trap! And how was he to be an abolitionist "gin and trap"? Evidently by bringing forward pro-slavery propositions to rend the Assembly!

The exhibition which this gentleman made of himself in the Assembly of 1831, when charging Dr. Spring with bribery, because the Doctor, with the spirit of the Christian, and the manners of a gentleman, proposed obviating a difficulty and accomplishing an object which appeared to press upon Mr. White's heart, was painful and humiliating in the extreme; and has, I presume, as securely immortalized him with every member of that Assembly as ever the etymologist did any other bug or beetle by placing it on high among his collection transfixed on a needle for the inspection of the curious.

Another personage who played a prominent part in this Assembly as a warm partizan, and who, from the estimate that he evidently set upon himself, will feel hurt to be so far down in this list of notables, was the Rev. Leonard Bacon, a *Congregationalist delegate from the city of New Haven*. This gentleman, with an indelicacy which, far and low as human nature has fallen, is happily rare, not only interfered in a matter purely Presbyterian, and in an emergency peculiar and critical in our church, but took an interested and active part against us! "The Spectator," a quarterly publication issued at New Haven, not only Congregationalist but Pelagian, and which no doubt ranks Mr. Bacon among its patrons and contributors, came out with a long article against us in the number preceding the meeting of the Assembly; and that it might have the more and better effect it was issued a length of time sooner than its usual publication day! This again was followed up by missionary Mr. Bacon from the same place, who might perfect against us the work so auspiciously commenced by "the Spectator!" And faithfully did their delegate do all in his power by the most indelicate interference to perform his Pelagian purposes. Such a pitiable exhibition of human infirmity we have seldom witnessed. And all this too, was accompanied with a manner and an air which reminded us of Dr. Pangloss in the old play, who, ever and anon, demanded respect by reminding those around him that he was "an L. L. D. and an Ass." Pay attention to me gentlemen on the subjects peculiar to Presbyterianism, for I am Leonard Bacon from the city of New Haven, and a delegate on this floor from a Congregationalist Association! What are the opinions of such men as Drs. Green and Miller and Fisk and Spring, &c., on this subject when compared with that of the Rev. Leonard Bacon of New Haven? Now these identical words did not escape from his lips, but such sentiments did proceed from his whole air and manner and conduct. No person of any mental perspicuity could see him and hear him without perceiving that in his own estimation, though wisdom might possibly survive him, yet at his demise she would experience at least an uncomfortable shock!

Such, then, being the prominent materials of which the majority

of this Assembly was formed, we may easily judge of its doings. The commencement was at once indicative of its course and spirit. When the clerks presented the roll, one individual was excepted to as being neither a Bishop nor an Elder, and consequently not qualified to be a member of the house; but, although in their own language, "the constitution in its letter admits *Elders* only either to Presbytery or Assembly," yet they contended that this layman, holding no office in the Presbyterian Church, not even a Presbyterian communicant, should nevertheless sit as an Elder in the highest court known to our constitution! I recollect as if it were but yesterday the debate on this subject; and I recollect too the astonishment of the senior editor of your Magazine, who was in that Assembly as an Elder, and for the first time, and who had come from other courts of at least less pretension to conscientious action, that men of God should connive at, much less argue for such a flagrant breach both of the letter and spirit of that constitution which they were sworn to support! Yes, and I recollect his powerful, lucid and triumphant argument under which Dr. Beman shrunk, and before which his plausible reasons shrivelled up as the messengers of Nebuchadnezzar did before the fire into which they threw the children of God. And I recollect the able and unanswerable argument of Dr. Miller too, which was equal to demonstration, that we *could not*, admit a mere layman sustaining no office in the church to a seat in the Assembly, and that we *might not*, even if we could, admit a man to legislate and make laws to bind us, who himself not only belonged virtually to another denomination, but who shewed by the position he occupied that he would not come under these laws or be bound by them himself! It would be like admitting a monarchist to a seat in a Legislature to make laws for Republicans, though he was at once an alien and on principle opposed to the system in which he wanted to legislate! But the Assembly had been picked and packed by Ely, Beman, Peters & Co., and all that could be said passed for nought; for when they were all literally out argued they then voted down the constitution and admitted this man to a seat, though he was not only, not an officer, but, for aught we knew, not even a Presbyterian! In fact the presumption was, that he was not even the latter, for no man of God bound by Presbyterian laws, would have dared to trample thus upon the sacredness of his profession and oath.

This discussion and vote by which the constitution of the church was trampled on, was the opening drama of the Assembly, and took place before the choice of a moderator;—but very appropriately, just after the perpetration of this act, Nathan S. S. Beman, D. D. abolitionist, amalgamationist, &c. &c., was chosen moderator! How beautifully in keeping were the two acts! As in duty bound, the minority protested against this most flagrant breach of the constitution; in answer to which the majority, leaving the constitutional argument, contended that by a compact entered into with "the General Association of Connecticut" in 1801, we were bound to receive men who held no office in our church, though say they, it is not denied that there is an appearance of departure from the *letter* of the constitution, in so doing. Here then it may be

seen to what a fearful length we had gotten, when a few New England Congregationalist leaders, could, in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, carry with them a majority, in doing that, which was so palpably wrong, that even they themselves substantially acknowledged it! Yes, and as a proof of that and of the force of truth as elicited by the discussion, and the very lucid and able protest presented by Mr. R. J. Breckinridge and others, we subsequently carried a resolution declaring such appointments to be "inexpedient and of questionable authority, and therefore, ought not in future to be made." Here then is a proof that this Assembly constituted the pivot upon which orthodoxy and error turned. This was the lowest point in which we ever stood just at the time of carrying the vote, by which this committee-man was admitted to a seat, or perhaps at the moment in which Dr. Beman was chosen moderator. And the first step upwards in our return towards Presbyterian order, was the carrying of the vote against the future admission to the Assembly of men, who were neither pastors nor elders. And yet, so fierce and so far gone were some of those men, that they not only debated and voted against the cautiously worded proposition that the appointment of such men was "inexpedient and of questionable authority," but entered their protest upon the minutes. Now it may be asked, who were those, who, while they admitted that the practice was against the "letter" of the constitution, yet fought with so much pertinacity against redressing it? They were such men as the Rev. Dr. Hillyer, Mr. Chauncey Eddy, &c., but it is worthy of remark here, that while the two leaders, Beman and Peters, in the language of Professor Dickinson, hunted their followers on, hallooing "*ste boy*." Yet no sooner did they get them underway in this downhill chase, then they actually deserted them! Yes, it is a singular fact, that neither Beman nor Peters would sign this protest! And just as singular, that Dr. Hillyer, Mr. Eddy, &c. should stand out as more prominent in their adherence to ultra heterodoxy than their leaders;—that they should outstrip them in the race, and come out so far ahead! It is also another humiliating fact, that these men, not only went where their leaders would not go, and did what their leaders would not do, but that they went and acted in company with such men as Elipha White, and Frederic A. Ross, and Daniel W. Lathrop!

Another item worthy of remembrance in connexion with this subject is, that during this Assembly it was well ascertained that there was, at least, another gentleman on the floor, who was sent there, not only in derogation of the constitution, but that he might have an unquestioned seat, was in derogation of truth, styled a "ruling elder," in his commission, which barefaced and naked *untruth* was endorsed by two clergymen, the moderator, and clerk of the presbytery that sent him! Yes, and the protestors above mentioned hesitate not to say that "very many churches have from time to time been represented in the General Assembly by standing committee men in place of Elders!" And yet, except on one or two occasions, these men were uniformly certified to by their presbyteries as elders! What an awful and fearful exhibition does this give of Pelagian morality and temerity! If in the commercial world men,

without any pretensions to religion, should act so, they would be sent to the Penitentiary! And how desirable the legislation, which at once, delivered our church from foreign interference, and shut up our New-school brethren, to the necessity of abstaining from endorsing in future, an official untruth, in testifying by their signature, a man to be what they know he is not.

Another item in this Assembly worthy of record, was the conduct of the moderator. As I have neither time, nor space, nor inclination, to follow him through all the remembered acts of unblushing partiality of which he was guilty, I will dispose of this item, by recording two memorable acts, alike dishonourable to the moderator and the gentleman with whom the acts associate him. In the most important committee of that important Assembly, to which was committed business involving the dearest interests of Presbyterianism, viz: That on the case of Mr. Barnes, Dr. Beman put the Rev. Leonard Bacon, a minister of another church, and holding principles on the subjects of doctrines and discipline, and the conducting of missions, antagonist to those of the Presbyterian church! That a man of another denomination, and inimical to our system should be put upon any committee, much more upon a committee involving the very vitals of our system; and that such a man with such sentiments should accept of such appointment, are propositions which for indelicacy, arrogance, and barefaced partiality, can find no match except in each other! In these respects they are one and indivisible, alike contemptible and dishonourable, in the giver and receiver. And yet with a committee so constituted, having on it such men as Mr. Leonard Bacon, Derick C. Lansing, Frederic A. Ross, Elipha White, &c., that a report should have been brought in, unanimously condemning Mr. Barnes's sermon, as "containing a number of unguarded and objectionable passages," and only supporting him on the foundation of his own "explanations," and that too in a packed Assembly, proves that our darkest moment had come; and that the turning point had been reached, if not past.

Having then gained two points, viz: that Mr. Barnes had not published that which was defensible, nor even tolerable, except in connexion with his own "explanations;" and that committee-men should not in future be admitted to seats in the Assembly; and having carried them too, against a majority collected for the express purpose of preventing them, are we not warranted in saying that God was on our side? For as Balaam could not say what he would, when he came up purposely to curse Israel, neither could these men do what they would, when they came up purposely to destroy Presbyterianism.

But this will appear still more manifest, by turning to the next great object for which this Assembly was picked and packed, viz: to change the direction of our Board of Missions, and put it virtually into the hands of Dr. Peters. This was perhaps *the business* "par excellence," for which Peters, and Beman, and Ely, had electioneered during the previous year. As long as the old members of the Board remained, Mr. Peters had no hope of subsidizing that body;

and until this was done, Dr. Beman saw no prospect of handing over our church into the hands of Dr. Taylor. Something must be done, and that something most evidently was to change the members of the Board, and substitute men opposed to the action, of which they were to be chosen guardians! To make this change, the Moderator appointed a committee, on which there was not *one friend* of the Board of Missions! and the chairman of which, Dr. Hillyer, was actually one of the vice-presidents of the antagonist society! And what is more, this committee not content to sweep the whole Board, with a few exceptions, had the gross indelicacy of putting off a firm friend, belonging to the synod of New Jersey, and of filling his place with their own chairman, the Rev. Dr. Hillyer, vice-president of the Home Missionary Society! That the chairman of a committee of nomination, should nominate himself, or permit himself to be nominated, and then gravely report that nomination, and to make that nomination, displace a man every way his equal, is in itself an exhibition worthy of its parentage. But when we take into view, the fact that Dr. Hillyer not only reported himself as a substitute for one whom he displaced, but that he was an *opponent* of the institution, of which he volunteered to be a director, and a vice-president in the opposing society, while the man whom he displaced, was a friend and supporter of the institution from which he was driven; I say, when we take this view of the subject, is not our indignation kindled at the barefaced atrocity of the act, while we pity poor human nature, that it could go so far away out of sight of every thing like correct principle; and yet do it under the guise and sanction of religion! Alas! what an exhibition of the old popish doctrine, that the end sanctifies the means! Hence these men did evil that good might come.

Could conduct at once so monstrous, indelicate and impolitic, take place except where God was not! Every man who was present will recollect the scene which took place when that committee reported. Poor Dr. Hillyer, I believe, thought that the last day had come, and he appeared not to be quite ready for it. Suffice it to say, such was the noise which they heard in the air, that they thought, like the ancient Assyrians, that "the king of Israel had hired against them the kings of the Hittites, and the kings of the Egyptians. And they arose and fled, and left their tents and their horses, and their *asses*, and even the camp as it was!" Yes, they literally "left the camp as it was," so that we re-elected the identical Board! Here was another proof that the day of our redemption drew nigh. One of the remarkable occurrences in this most remarkable transaction was, that although the "host" fled "leaving the camp as it was," there was a certain part of the live stock thus abandoned, which was determined not to stay. The minute is recorded thus: "The following persons, viz: Dr. Thomas M'Auley, [!!] Mr. George W. Blight, Rev. James Patterson, Dr. John McDowell, [???] Dr. Thomas H. Skinner, Rev. Albert Barnes, and Mr. James Moore, members of the Board of Missions, handed in written communications, tendering the resignation of their seats as members of said Board, with their reasons for the same. Mr. James Kerr also resigned his seat

as a member of the Board. These resignations were accepted." On this we make no comment.

Another feature in the transactions of this Assembly, which will arrest the eye of the future historian, is the stand taken against the Plan of Union of 1801, as altogether unconstitutional. As long ago as 1826, its constitutionality was not only questioned, but denied; and during this Assembly, it was declared in Mr. Breckinridge's protest "that the agreement (Plan of union of 1801) is one altogether anomalous to our form of government: and so far as it does extend, is in derogation of it;" and again, "The constitution cannot be obligatory, and yet something else, which is against, and adverse to the constitution, be obligatory also, unless a sense can be found in which the same proposition is both false and true, at the same moment, and at every successive moment." Again, in 1835 the Assembly goes so far as to forbid any more churches to be formed on this plan. Thus it will be seen, that for at least eleven years the thing was objected to, previously to its abrogation. In fact, as soon as its workings began to make its existence, and its spirit manifest, so soon did true Presbyterians object to it, and the more it was seen, and known, and felt, the more objectionable did it appear, until God delivered us from its thralldom, by the instrumentality of the memorable and glorious Assembly of 1837. In 1831 then just at the black moment of electing Dr. Beman Moderator of the Assembly, was our cause in its *nadir*, but from that moment, it commenced its ascension up to its present bright zenith. Three vital points were then carried by us, though a minority in this Assembly; and these three, the very points for which the majority had been picked and packed! True, we carried only the *principle*, while they carried the present practice; but time has shewn that this principle, like a worm at the root, has finally destroyed them. At that Assembly we put down the disgraceful and destructive practice for all future time of foisting upon us, mere Congregational Church members, instead of Presbyterian Elders! And we left the brand of heterodoxy on the character of Mr. Barnes, burning the deeper, from the fact that it was applied by the hands of his own friends, who, in their zeal to deliver his body from present bondage, were willing to give up his character to future reprobation! And we carried the whole of our Board of Missions, though in the face and hands of a powerful and numerous enemy, by a retreat as deserving of celebrity in the annals of clerical warfare, as that of the hero of Corunna's was in military! And more than this, we stirred up and threw additional day-light in upon the nefarious darkness of the Plan of Union of 1801, which we flatter ourselves, hastened the glorious consummation of 1837! How marvellous that so much was done, and that too of such a vital character, by a mere handful, against a fierce determined and overwhelming majority, collected for the express purpose of overturning Presbyterianism! Ah! though Goliath was there, and his legions were there, David also was present, and more than all, David's God was there!

In looking back then from the height of the present, down upon the past, we are at once humbled and gratified by the unfailling

evidence which our Heavenly Father has given of his presence and blessing, notwithstanding our unfaithfulness. In addition to this, we are struck with the means by which the King of Zion caused these men in the midst of their wisdom, to defeat their own cause. Ahithophel is wise, but God is wiser. Look now at these men in their ardour, and in their strength too, how they were permitted to discomfit themselves by a hope too sanguine, and an action too premature. In fact, during the whole scene of their aggressive attacks on our church they *moved too soon!* They have uniformly acted before they were ready, in their feverish and puerile anxiety to accomplish their purpose. Though in 1831 they had a majority, yet it is evident that they were not sufficiently fortified to withstand the storm which their hasty action caused. And though they carried a majority in the subsequent Assemblies, yet they had not power to bear up against the unitedness of opposition which their premature developements produced; and to cap the climax of this hasty action, they went out from us at last, most manifestly, not only before they were ready, but sooner than they either knew or desired! And now, by a premature and silly movement of their own, see them standing outside, and yet by the unholy agency of civil contention, groping for the door, and unable to find it, though it is just at hand. Lot's God has closed it, and darkened their eyes, and put confusion into their counsels, and neither they nor Cæsar can find nor open it. To that great God be all the glory of our deliverance. Amen!

G.

JUNKIN ON THE MORAL GOVERNMENT OF GOD.

CHAPTER III.

On the extent of the Covenant: or, The representative character of Adam.

It has already been remarked that the first man stood in a "two-fold relation, 1. As man. 2. As the head and representative of mankind." We have viewed the covenant in reference to the former only. Our attention must now be turned to the latter. And

SECTION I.—*The general doctrine of representation.*

To represent is to act in the legal character of another—to sustain his relations in law—to act for him. The term is commonly used, in civil, as well as in religious things, to express in brief, the whole doctrine of principal and agent. And I prefer it to any other term, though it be not found in our English Bible; because there is no other term in the language, which, to a republican ear, sounds more harmoniously, or conveys the idea more clearly. All Americans are so familiar with it, and with the doctrine which it is used to express, that, to their understanding it speaks a volume. Every American who is lifted above brutish ignorance, knows, that a representative is one who acts for others, in the making and execution of laws, or the transaction of business; and that, by consequence, those who are represented, are bound by the acts of their represen-

tative, just as though they had been performed by themselves immediately. It has always therefore appeared to me futile in the extreme, to object to the word merely because it is not a Bible term. Hundreds of words are in constant use, by the very persons who raise such objections, which are not found in our English Bibles. Moreover, the inconsistency of such objectors is the more glaring, from the fact, that they are for discarding the use of the Bible term *Covenant*, yea, and the *thing* too, and for introducing a new nomenclature, such as "providential developement"—"God's moral constitution"—"social organization," &c.

But let us hold to the doctrine. It can be expressed by a variety of terms. It is a *fact*, the evidence of which is as long and as broad as civilized society, that one man performs moral acts, binding in right, and in law, by the agency of another. It is not the goose quill, nor the flesh and bone and muscle that holds it, which makes the contract contained in the deed; but it is the rational mind which acts by, and through them as instruments. And it is a *fact*, that the same rational mind does make use of another pen and another hand too, to confirm and ratify a similar contract. Here there is no room for discussion, to elicit proof of the fact, or to throw light on the doctrine of representation. The only questions that seem admissible, is the philosophical enquiry, *how* can this be? How can A transfer, as it were, his moral person into B; so that B's moral transaction with C, is not his own, and does not bind him, but is A's and binds him only?

Now if any man insist on a reply to this enquiry, and desire to make the inexplicability of the fact, an objection to the doctrine; I answer, he is no philosopher. For it is no part of sound philosophy to make the inexplicability of a *fact* an objection to the doctrine which contains it. It is no part of philosophy to accommodate facts to a theory—but on the contrary, the glory of the modern philosophy consists in admitting facts, however inexplicable, upon good and sufficient proof, and building the theory and the doctrine upon them. Who does not know that the fact of gravitation is as yet inexplicable? Who does not know that the facts of magnetic attraction are unexplained? And yet does any philosopher deny them? Just so, who knows not the fact, that one man often acts by and through another? What then if we cannot explain the mode of the fact? It is undeniable, that I can transact business, that shall be binding in law and conscience, in a hundred different places at the same time; a hundred miles distant from each other, and not be present personally in either of them? Do you say "how can these things be." We testify things we do know, and the objector is just as much bound to explain the facts as we are.

The truth is, the doctrine of a moral unity between two or more persons, is an original element in the science of morals. An identity exists between the agent and his principal—they are one in law, to the whole extent of the agency; that is, to the whole extent of the representative authority. Now it is clearly manifest, that the actual existence of this moral unity is one thing, and the *manner* in which it is constituted is another thing. These two may obviously be viewed apart from one another,

The former may be a subject of enquiry, and may be settled, and its settlement constitute the basis of the most important transaction; whilst the latter may be left entirely untouched. I am a foreigner, resident in your country. I find a body of men met together in a certain building—they pass laws, some of them affecting my dearest interests and extending over me the fostering wing of their protection. It is important for me to know whether these men are really authorized to pass such laws. Are they the representatives of this nation? May I safely make purchases under their acts? Now here is a mere question of fact, and it is plain, I may obtain perfect satisfaction on this point; without at all going into the other questions, how did those men become representatives? What is the manner of election in each state? Were the elections all fair and just? &c. But we must defer this for the present, and proceed to consider

SECTION II.—*This doctrine of Representation is taught in the laws of nature, and is essential to man's social existence.*

Let history unroll her cumbrous volumes until the ample scroll shall girdle the globe, and I challenge the line, which tells of a nation, where the principle in question has not been recognized: yea, where it does not form a prominent feature of national character. Take our savage men, and is not the wild leader of the roving clan, as he ranges mountain, hill and dale, at once the lord and the representative of the train that follows him? Is not the tawney sachem the moral head of his tribe? Do they not look to him, to act for them?—To make peace or proclaim war? And in what does civilization consist? What constitutes the secret of its meliorating influence? Does it reveal the principle of representation; or does it only correct the manner of constituting the relation of representer and represented? Look at the condition of civilized nations, in connexion with barbarous nations; and where do you find the point of contrast in their social system? Not in the absence of representation from the one, and its presence in the other; but in the manner in which their bodies came to possess representative form. Just as nations approximate perfection in civilization and morality, and consequently, freedom; do they look well to the manner in which men come in fact to represent them. But the *fact itself* is indispensable to social men. There must be government, and therefore one or a few must represent, must act in many things, for the whole. Now from this inevitable necessity we infer that such is the moral law of man's creation. God so created him that he cannot exist in society, for which he is obviously adapted, without the exercise of the principle of representation. Take away this, and where is government? Where your constitution? Where your laws? Where your officers? Where your social system?

Hence, we should conclude, without ever having looked into it, that the Bible,—supposing it to be a book intended for human good, must embrace and teach the doctrine of representation. To affirm this is the object of our

III SECTION.—*Adam acted in the Covenant as the representative of all human persons: he was the moral head of the race.*

For the proper illustration of this position, a number of distinct remarks are necessary.

1. *Persons* only are capable of being legally and morally represented. This will appear from a moment's reflection, upon the nature of the thing. A representative is one who stands in the legal relations of another, and acts for him; so that the act of the one becomes binding in law and morality upon the other. Now who can conceive of a moral obligation, lying upon any but a moral being? I am aware, however, that by a fiction of the law or a figure of rhetoric, we speak of representing property: and so we speak of property being bound. But no person supposes that a moral obligation can lie upon an inanimate substance, or that it is capable of acting through a vicarious substitute. All men know, that when we speak of representing property, we simply mean, the giving to those who hold it of an influence in appointing the representative greater than their due proportion, if numerically considered: and when property is said to be bound, it is simply meant, that the right to it has passed over, under certain conditions, to a person different from the formal or reputed owner.

Neither can a *nature* be represented. Nature is the aggregate of properties belonging to any person or thing. When the apostle speaks of men being "partakers of the divine nature," he merely teaches the doctrine of sanctification; that they are accommodated to the moral likeness of God; made in a measure holy—have in a higher degree than before, some of the properties whose aggregate, in perfection, constitute our idea of God.

The notion we attach to the term *nature* is a mere abstraction—it exists only in thought: there is no such thing as human nature apart from personal existence. It is not therefore human nature that Adam represented in the covenant of works, but the human persons who possess it.

2. The extent of every federal representation depends solely upon the covenant which creates it. That is to say, the number of persons which the representative *acts for*, and the identical persons themselves, must be determined by the covenant agreement by which he becomes a representative. Consequently, it is the will of the parties to a covenant which determines the amplitude of its range. Of this we have abundant examples in our federative system of government. In some departments and for specified purposes, a single individual represents the whole American people. In others, one represents twenty, thirty, forty thousand. This depends upon the will of the parties who enter into the national covenant. There is nothing else to limit and define it. For it is perfectly obvious that the action is the same, whether one man, or one million are to be affected by it. The humble representative of the humblest freeholder in the nation, may meet the authorized representative of the whole nation; the two may make a contract for the sale and purchase, or exchange of property; which contract is equally binding upon the nation on the one hand and the individual on the other. Numbers do not affect it. The same principle you find in the criminal code of all civilized nations. An individual meets his

neighbour and murders him ; the law hangs him. A dozen of individuals associated together, meet a man and murder him—one murders him—the law hangs them all. Here the thing done is the same, but the persons affected by it are as one to twelve.

The commerce of society too, deals largely in this principle. A commercial agent is despatched to a distant port, and negotiates a heavy contract. Now, who are to profit by the speculation? How many mercantile houses shall share in the spoils of victory? Why simply those whom the agent represented—for whom he acted. And is not the action the same, whether one or one hundred are benefitted? But now, on what does the extent of the negotiation, as to the persons affected by it, depend? Manifestly on the fact of their being represented by the agent. Every man to the whole extent in which he is so represented must profit by the adventure; and this is fixed and determined by the compact which created their agent.

Thus also is it in the great and momentous concern before us. There is nothing to limit and bound the covenant of God with Adam—nothing to determine whether Adam only; or Adam and Eve; or Adam, Eve and the whole race, shall be affected by it for good or ill, as the issue may prove, but the will of the parties. If God so willed it, and Adam so agreed to it,—that he should act for all human persons—should represent the race; then so it was and so its effects are, and must be. The moral body is one. The head and members go together: their destinies are the same. The question before us, therefore, is a very simple one. It refers to a mere matter of historical fact. Did Adam act for all men?

3. Let us see to the scripture proofs. And as we have the history of the world's creation, and its government for more than sixteen centuries summed up in the five few brief chapters of Genesis, it would be unreasonable to expect much detail concerning this covenant: and this especially seeing it endured unbroken perhaps not a single week, or even day. Our proofs therefore of Adam's representative character must be almost wholly from other parts of scripture.

(1.) The first class of proofs shall be taken from the other covenants which God made at different times with man. Of those three may be mentioned, viz :

The covenant with Noah, Genesis ix., which guarantees to mankind, exemptions from destruction by a flood of waters, the succession of seed time and harvest, and the use of animal food.

The covenant with Abraham, by which the visible church, strictly so called, is constituted; and the possession of Canaan is pledged, and also a limiting of the great promise of Messiah to his descendants.

The covenant with Israel at Sinai, which restricts for a time, the blessings of Abraham's covenant, to the nation of Israel.

It will be observed that in all these, not the persons immediately present alone are concerned; but they extend to vast multitudes; to generations yet unborn. They, therefore, contain the principle, which we contend prevails also in the original covenant after which

they are modelled. Moses records it in Deut. xxix. 14, 15. "Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath; but with him that standeth here, with us this day, before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day." The Sinai Covenant, and all the others, included generations of generations, who were to be affected by them for good or for ill. Thus a presumption arises that the Adamic covenant was to affect his posterity. This is strengthened by all his history. "For it was not said to our first parents only, (observe Witsius i. 69.) *Increase and multiply*; by virtue of which commenced the human race, is still continued: Nor is it true of Adam only, "*It is not good that man should be alone*: nor does that conjugal law concern him alone, "*Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh*; which Christ still urges."

(2.) But we rest not on presumption, however strong. We refer to the facts of scripture: and among these we find that the penal consequences, the melancholy evils of the breach of the covenant by Adam, fell upon his posterity as well as upon himself. We find also that the Bible refers all our woes to Adam's act as their origin. Through him as the door they all flooded in upon our wretched world. "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin." Rom. v. 12. Here is the fact: and from it we argue the preceding cause of it. All the race of Adam suffer. This is a moral effect and must have a moral cause. For as before hinted, in the government of a perfectly holy being, the suffering of holy beings unconnected with sin, is an impossibility. The human mind is so constructed that it cannot believe God would impose pain and anguish, where there is no sin. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" If therefore, death came upon all men by the act of the first man, it is undeniable that his act stands in the relation of a moral cause to the universal fact. But now it is impossible that Adam's sin could be the cause of death passing upon all men, unless all men were morally connected with him. If he did not act *for them*—if he did not represent them, they could not justly be exposed to suffering and delivered over to death, on account of his sin. The moral sense of all men revolts at such an idea. What! shall men suffer who have not sinned! Shall God be charged with inflicting pain and even death, where there is no transgression!! Who is this that sits in judgment and condemns the Governor of the universe!!!

(3.) But passing all that remains of the context, Rom. v. 12—20, whose strength we will have occasion to bring out hereafter; let us advert to I Cor. xv. 21, 22. "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead: For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." This text relates to the resurrection of the body, and only affects our argument, by confirming the same point as the passage from Romans; whilst it contrasts Adam and Christ, and shuts us up to the necessity of either rejecting the covenant, representative character of Christ, or of admitting the covenant representative character of Adam. If Adam is not a public moral head, neither is Christ. If the latter be, the former must have been.

(4.) A similar contrast is found in the 47th verse of the same chapter, "The first man is of the earth, earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven." Now, wherefore this bringing together of Adam and Christ? It cannot be because of any personal qualities, either of resemblance or of disparity. For in Adam there is nothing peculiar, that he should be thus compared and contrasted. Nay, but the point of similarity is in their official relations. Both are heads, moral heads of distinct moral bodies of men, whose destinies are connected in law with their conduct respectively. Hence in Romans v. 14, he is called "the figure—the *type* of him that was to come," that is of Christ. Adam was the type of Jesus Christ, who is the anti-type to him. In their legal relations, they were like to one another. As in the printer's art, the letter is the exact resemblance of the type; so the representative character of the Redeemer is exactly like the representative character of Adam.

From this branch of the subject, there arises a question or two, more curious perhaps than useful, to which however, a moment's attention may be given. What position did Eve occupy? Was she an original covenanting party? Or was she represented by Adam?

Doctor Ridgley, who briefly but candidly states the arguments in favour of the man alone being the covenant head to the exclusion of the woman, yet gives his own opinion in opposition to it. It appears to me his objections are not valid, and that Eve was not a representative, but was represented in Adam. Because

(1.) When God gave Adam the covenant, as formerly remarked, Eve was not created. It is true, that the term Adam means the race: it is a generic term, as well as a proper name: and that in Genesis ii. 27, 28, it is said—"in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, be fruitful and multiply," &c.; and that the covenant is not mentioned until the 16th verse of the ii. chapter. But it is also true that the ii. chapter from verse 4, is an account more in detail of what is contained in general in the first. In verses 4—7, he gives an account of the creation, especially of the vegetable kingdom, its want of cultivation and of man. In verses 8—17, the planting of the garden is described, the tree of life and of knowledge, the rivers, the putting of Adam into the garden to dress it and to keep it, and the command relative to the forbidden fruit. Then follows a notice of his loneliness, his need of a social companion, his inspecting the animals, and naming them; but finding no suitable help, and then the creation of the woman to supply this deficiency. It is manifest the woman was not created until after the covenant was given. "Adam was first formed, then Eve." Surely Paul did not mean by Adam, here, to include Eve! Therefore Eve was not created when Adam was, but after the command relative to the forbidden fruit was delivered; and consequently was not a party to the covenant.

(2.) But if, because the word *Adam* sometimes means man in general, it is right to infer that Eve, who was taken out of Adam, was really a party to the covenant, which Ridgley seems to account

the chief reason for his opinion—the same is true of Cain and Seth, &c., and they were parties also. I see no reason in the peculiarity of manner in her extraction, why she should be accounted a party, more than Abel or Cain. In truth, as I hope to show, the physical, or material connexion has nothing at all to do in the matter—forms no moral connexion whatever.

Besides this argument from the generic sense of the word man, would include Christ, for he is called the second man. "The first man is of the earth—the second man is the Lord from heaven." Now if *man* in the former case is generic and includes Eve, by what rule of criticism can it be restricted in the latter? I therefore think that when the apostle says, "By one man sin entered into the world": he does not mean—"by one man and one woman!"

(3.) But moreover if Eve was a party *like Adam*, there must have been three parties to the covenant, or then Adam and Eve must have been, before its formation, a moral unity; which, that they were for any other purposes than those included in the marriage covenant, I think there is no evidence.

(4.) The truth appears to be, that God gave this covenant to the *person*, Adam—as indeed how could human nature, a mere abstraction enter into covenant? not however as an *individual person only*, but also as a representative of all other human *persons*. The *individual* Adam and the *representative person*, Adam, was to stand or fall for *himself* and for his *representative body*.

But in this body representative, Eve was included, yet only until she should have a personal existence and capacity to assume for herself, her covenant liabilities. Then she was under the covenant *for herself only*. Had she sinned and Adam retained his integrity, she would have perished and Adam and his representative body would have remained uninjured. Had Adam failed and Eve maintained her integrity, Eve would have survived the wreck of the race. When she sinned, she alone fell, the covenant was not broken until Adam, the federal head, had transgressed; then only "earth felt the wound."

"And nature, sighing through all her works,
Gave signs of woe, that all was lost."

THE GENERAL COUNCILS: WITH THEIR PRINCIPAL DECREES.

No. II.

*Reputed General Councils after the Seventh Century.**Constantinople, A. D. 754.*

THE style of the seventh General Council was assumed by the synod of 338 bishops convened at Constantinople by the Emperor Constantine Copronymus in the year 754. They met to offer resistance to the grievous error of image-worship with which the Church at that time began to be afflicted. But their zeal was more particularly directed against images of Christ; for, as they argued, he being God as well as man, it was impossible to represent Him by an image. For either the image would represent only His manhood, which would not be Christ, but merely a division of the two natures which are in Him, or otherwise it must be supposed that the incomprehensible Deity was comprehended by the lines of human flesh: in either case the guilt of blasphemy would be incurred. But they were also opposed to the use of all images in religious worship; considering it to be a dishonour to the Saints, and a mere taint of heathenism. They show it to be condemned by the Scriptures, and uncountenanced by the fathers of the Church, citing Epiphanius, and Gregory, and Chrysostom, and Athanasius, and others, and accordingly they forbid images altogether, not suffering them even in private houses, for fear of their becoming a sort of Lares or household gods. This council is remarkable on two other accounts. First, for that it is the first which enjoined, under anathema, the invocation of the Virgin and other saints. Secondly, for the remarkable evidence it indirectly affords against the modern doctrine of transubstantiation as taught in the Church of Rome; but which was then unknown to the Catholic church. One of the Arguments which they bring against the use of images is that *Christ himself had sanctioned one, and one only image of himself, even the bread in the holy Eucharist.* It does not appear that this council was received as a general one by the Church at large at any time; and only by the Church of Constantinople for a short period.

VII. Constantinople, Nice 2. A. D. 787.

The synod to which the style of a General Council has been more usually allowed, is that of 350 bishops assembled by the Empress Irene and her son Constantine, first at Constantinople, and thence transferred to Nice, in the year 787. They were assembled to support the worship of images, and consequently reprobated and condemned all that had been done at the former council; and passed the most monstrous decrees. The Bishop of Rome, Adrian, sent legates to it, and approved of what was there transacted. Its decrees in favour of image-worship were vehemently opposed in the West by the Emperor Charlemagne, who wrote, or caused to be written against it, certain books called the Caroline books. The English bishops also were very earnest in their opposition to it, and the learned Alcuin is stated to have drawn up a strong memorial against it, in their names, replete with sound and Scriptural argument. In the year 794 Charlemagne assembled a great council at Francfort on the Maine, composed of 300 bishops from Germany, Britain, Gaul, Aquitaine, and Lombardy, at which he himself in person, and two legates from the Bishop of Rome were present. In this council the decrees of the Nicene Synod, called Constantinopolitan, because there first assembled, were considered and expressly condemned. In the year 814, the Nicene Synod

was again condemned at Constantinople. Again in 824 it was condemned by a great assembly of bishops at Paris.

Besides its decrees concerning image worship, the second Nicene Synod is remarkable for affording indirectly a testimony against transubstantiation no less forcible, when calmly considered, than that afforded by the former self-styled seventh council. For in answer to the argument against images adduced by that council from the bread in the Eucharist, being the image of our Lord's body, the obvious thing would have been to have alleged the doctrine of transubstantiation, had it then existed; but this they do not. They merely content themselves with affirming that it is His very body and His very blood, (which for *sacramental* purposes Protestants freely admit and maintain,) and cite with unqualified approbation, in illustration and corroboration of their assertion, the liturgy of St. Basil, from which it appears that the change which that holy father contemplated and prayed for, was a spiritual change for sacramental purposes for the use of the communicants; and not material abstracted from the use.

Constantinople, A. D. 861.

The style of a General Council was assumed by a synod of 318 bishops, who met at Constantinople in the year 861, under the Emperor Michael. They assembled partly to re-establish image worship, but chiefly to confirm the violent intrusion of Photius into the See of Constantinople, and the deposition of Ignatius his predecessor. The Bishop of Rome had two legates present who consented to all that was done. But the acts of the council were not received at Rome; and the legates asserted that fraud and violence had been employed to procure their consent. Conc. viii. 735 and 964.

VIII. Constantinople, A. D. 869.

The Romans have attributed the authority of a General Council to the synod of 102 bishops who assembled in Constantinople under the Emperor Basilius, in the year 869. They met for the purpose of replacing Ignatius in the See of Constantinople, and of passing censure upon Photius: they also re-enacted the decrees of the deuterio-Nicene Synod, respecting image worship. The Bishop of Rome (Adrian) sent representatives to it. Conc. viii. 967—1495.

Constantinople, A. D. 879.

The Greeks ascribe the name and authority of a General Council to the assembly of 383 bishops convened at Constantinople in the year 879. They met after the death of Ignatius, to re-instate Photius in the See of Constantinople, who then entered into an agreement with John, Bishop of Rome, whose representatives were present at the council, by virtue of which, (as appears in the first canon of this council,) their respective sentences of ecclesiastical censure were to be mutually observed. They condemned the preceding council. During all this period, when the rivalries between the Sees of Old and New Rome were at their greatest height, the mutual charges and recriminations, of forgeries and impostures, in documents, make it very difficult to place much reliance upon the genuineness of the acts ascribed to any of the opposing councils. The conduct of Binus in respect to the Florentine council, to which long afterwards the style of the eighth General Council was given in the acts, altering the eighth into the sixteenth, that it might not clash with the Roman assumption, is an indisputable proof that even if it be true that the Greeks have sometimes interpolated their documents, the Roman advocates are not a whit behind them in the disgraceful practice. For the account of the council, see Conc. ix. 324—329. The canons are given Conc. viii. 1525. The fraud of Binus is pointed out in Beveridge's Pandect. ii. 170.

In this council the creed as it originally stood was confirmed, and a additions forbidden; thus excluding the addition, *filioque*, concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, which had been made in the west. In excluding the words they did but the same that had been recommended by the Bishop of Rome, Leo III. in 809, who caused the creed, without these words, to be engraven in Greek and Latin on silver tablets in his chapel; and forbade them to the deputation from the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, who waited upon him concerning this matter.

IX. Lateran, 1. A. D. 1123.

The ninth General Council, according to the Romans, is that of upwards of 300 bishops, convened in the Lateran Church at Rome, by Pope Callixtus II. in 1123. It does not appear that there were any Eastern bishops present. The object of their meeting was to oppose the Emperor Henry's interference in the appointment of bishops. An agreement was made between the Pope and the Emperor, the latter engaging that the elections of bishops should be free, and the former that the bishops should receive their temporalities from the Emperor. At this council twenty-two canons were made, two of which, namely 3d and 21st, related to the celibacy of the clergy. Conc. x. 891—900.

X. Lateran, 2. A. D. 1139.

The tenth Council, accounted General, is that of about a thousand bishops convened in the Lateran Church by Pope Innocent the Second in the year 1139. They met to condemn the opinions of Arnold of Brixia, and Peter de Bruis, who are stated by some to have contended against infant baptism, and endowments of churches, as well as against the adoration of the cross, and other points. They passed thirty canons, in one of which, the seventh, they revived the old Eustathian heresy, forbidding people to attend the ministrations of the married clergy. Conc. x. 999—1012.

XI. Lateran, 3. A. D. 1179.

The Romans give the style and authority of a General Council, the eleventh in their list, to the Synod of 300 Bishops convened in the Lateran Church at Rome, by Pope Alexander III. in the year 1179. They met, partly to make decrees concerning the election to the Papacy, determining that an election by not less than two-thirds of the College of Cardinals should hold good; and partly to oppose the exertions of the Cathari, Patarenes, and Albigenses, whose religious opinions were beginning to spread extensively. The Roman writers speak of Eastern Bishops being present at this council; but it should be understood that these were not members of the Eastern patriarchates, but of the Roman Schism in those dioceses; where, as at present, (in all lands,) they had schismatically intruded in opposition to true Bishops. The council passed twenty-seven canons. Conc. x. 1503—1534.

XII. Lateran, 4. A. D. 1215.

The twelfth Council to which the Romans ascribe the authority of a General one, was composed of 412 bishops, among whom, according to the Roman accounts, there were present, the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and representatives of those of Antioch and Alexandria. It was assembled in the Lateran Church in the year 1215. It would appear that the chief objects for which it was assembled, were to endeavour to promote a reconciliation between the Greek and Roman Churches; or, in other words, to bring the Greeks under the Roman yoke; and also to put a further check upon the Waldenses and Albigenses. Notwithstanding all the noise which it has made in the world, there is every reason to believe that nothing was really transacted at it. Matthew Paris, Platina,

and Nauclerus, as cited by Bishop Taylor, and Du Pin as cited by Collier, all agree that the seventy canons which passed by the name of the canons of the fourth Lateran Council, were not passed at it: that they were all drawn up by the Pope, who read them to the council, which determined nothing concerning them. Bishop Taylor says that the first who published them under the name of the Lateran Council, was Johannes Cochlæus, A. D. 1538. It does not appear that, if any thing was transacted at the council, it was ever received by the Greek Church. For the history of the council see Conc. xi. 117—119.

XIII. Lyons, 1. A. D. 1245.

The Romans account as their thirteenth General Council, a synod of 140 bishops, assembled at Lyons, in France, under Innocent IV., in the year 1245. They met chiefly for the purpose of excommunicating the Emperor Frederick, who had rendered himself obnoxious to the Roman Pontiff. They also made seventeen canons, none of which, however, need special notice here. Conc. xi. 633—674.

XIV. Lyons, 2. A. D. 1274.

The fourteenth General Council, according to the Romans, is that of 500 bishops assembled at Lyons, in the year 1274, under Gregory X. The Pope alledged three causes for summoning it. 1st, To send relief to the Holy Land; 2, to endeavour to bring the Greeks under the Roman yoke; 3, to rectify discipline, especially in the election of Popes.

The Roman writers boast much of the success of the Roman Pontiff in the second point, the Greek deputies having acquiesced in all his demands. But their triumph is without cause; for these deputies were not representatives of the Greek Church, but merely of the Greek Emperor, Michael Palæologus, whose political affairs made him desire to purchase peace with Rome, on almost any terms. The Patriarch of Constantinople, Joseph, would neither come to the council nor send a representative to it: and after the agreement between the Pope and the Greek Emperor's deputies, he persisted in refusing to come into it. For which cause he was deposed by the Emperor, and another, John, a favourer of the Latins, intruded into his See. Under John things were managed more to the Emperor's mind, and, in 1277, a council at Constantinople, for the time, established the Papal dominion. The intruder did not long enjoy his dignity; he found things so uncomfortable that he resigned his Patriarchate, after holding it seven years, in the year 1282, when Joseph was restored. In which year the short-lived agreement between the Pope and the Greek Emperor came to an end; the Emperor forbidding the Pope to be prayed for, at Constantinople, and the Pope (Martin IV.) excommunicating the Emperor. The Roman writers talk of the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch being present at this council; but these are to be understood, as was observed before, of the schismatical Roman Bishops, whom the Crusaders had appointed in those places, in direct violation of the canons. See Le Quier, Oriens Christ. i. 285—288.—Conc. xi. 937—998. *ibid.* 1032. Mosheim, iii. pp. 183—184.

XV. Vienne, A. D. 1311.

The Romans reckon as their fifteenth General Council, a synod of 300 bishops who were convened at Vienne on the Rhone, in France, in the year 1311, by Clement V, for the suppression of the Knights Templars; and to check the fanatical Beguards. There is nothing among the transactions which took place there—which we need pause here to note. Conc. xi. 1537, &c.

Aquileia—Perpignan—Pisa, A. D. 1409.

The style of a General Council was assumed by each of the synods of Aquileia, Perpignan, and Pisa, which assembled in the year 1409. That of Aquileia was under Gregory XII., and that of Perpignan under Benedict XIII. the two rival popes. The third, namely that at Pisa, was assembled by a portion of the college of cardinals without any ecclesiastical sanction but their own. They summoned the rival popes before them, and, upon their not appearing, passed sentence upon them declaring them to be notorious heretics, and disturbers of the peace of the church, and deposing them both from the Papal dignity, a compliment which Gregory and his synod at Aquileia were not slow in returning, after which they elected another to that office by the name of Alexander the Fifth. Thus there were three rival Popes instead of two. Some writers call the Synod of Pisa the sixteenth General Council. Conc. xi. 2102—2140.

XVI. Constance, A. D. 1414.

The next General Council recognized by the Romans, is that of 250 bishops who assembled at Constance in the year 1414, under John XXIII., the successor of Alexander V., mentioned above. They met for the purpose of putting an end to the schism in the Papacy, which they accomplished for a time by deposing two of the rival popes, Benedict XIII. and John XXIII., (Gregory XII. sent in his resignation,) and electing in their stead Martin V. This Council also passed a decree by which the bishops were restored to their privileges, and no longer deemed the vassals of the usurping Bishop of Rome. They declared that a General Council was superior to the single bishop who held the Roman See, and he amenable to that tribunal. The Council is also remarkable for the sentence of heresy pronounced against Wiclif, who was dead, and against John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, who were burned alive at the instigation of the council, in violation of the Emperor's safe conduct. It also passed an impious decree concerning the administration of the Eucharist in only one kind. The Church of Rome chooses only to consider as of authority, the decrees of this council in matters of faith, and in the condemnation of Wiclif and the others. Its decisions in regard to the superiority of a General Council over the Bishop of Rome, were reprobated by the subsequent Councils of Florence, and the fifth Lateran. Conc. xii. 1—294.

Pavia.—Sienna, A. D. 1423.

The style of a General Council was assumed by that which assembled pursuant to a decree of Constance, at Pavia in 1423, under Martin the Fifth, and was thence removed to Sienna on account of pestilence. In this Council there was much deliberation concerning the attempted reduction of the Greek Church under the Roman yoke. The style assumed by the Pope, through his ambassadors, when treating with the Greek Patriarch, as mentioned in this Council, is, perhaps, worth noticing. It is as follows, "*The most holy and most blessed, who hath the Heavenly judgment, who is Lord upon earth, the successor of Peter, the anointed of the Lord, the Lord of the Universe, the Father of kings, the Light of the World, the Supreme Pontiff, Pope Martin.*"

The acts of this Council are not deemed of authority in the Church of Rome; nor does it hold a place in the list of their General Councils. Conc. xii. 365—380.

XVII. Basle, A. D. 1431—1442. Lausanne, A. D. 1449.

The next council recognized by the Romans as General, is that which in pursuance of a decree of the preceding one at Sienna, was assembled at Basle in Switzerland, in the year 1431. It was convened by Martin V., and his successor, Eugenius IV. The object which the Fathers here as-

sembled set before them and pursued with eagerness, was the reform of the many abuses which had been the fertile subject of complaint for many years. But they were not allowed to pursue their course without interruption. One of the first steps was to confirm anew the decrees of Constance concerning the superiority of a General Council over the Bishop of Rome, its power to punish him, if refractory, and its freedom from being dissolved by him. These and some other wholesome regulations, which restored the Church to a portion of her liberty, and restrained the tyrannical and most injurious usurpation of the Roman Pontiff, excited the wrath of Eugenius, who attempted to dissolve the Council. Upon this they summoned him to the Council, and threatened to declare him contumacious. Hereupon he revoked his order for dissolution, and engaged to adhere to the Council. But upon the Pope again mustering courage to attempt to transfer the place of the Council to Ferrara, A. D. 1438, they summoned him and his cardinals, and upon their not appearing, declared him and them contumacious, and finally deposed him, A. D. 1439; and elected in his stead Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, under the name of Felix V. This was met in turn on the part of Eugenius and his adherents in the Council, which, by this time, had moved from Ferrara to Florence, with excommunications and anathemas. Finally, the Council of Basle moved for an adjournment to Lausanne; and Eugenius being now dead, and Felix having resigned, they agreed to recognize Nicholas V., the successor of Eugenius, and so came to an end. Besides the dispute with the Pope and the endeavour to curtail the Papal power; a chief point which engaged the attention of this Council was to effect a reconciliation between the Eastern and Western Churches. Only a small portion of the acts of this Council are deemed of authority in the Church of Rome. Conc. xii. 459 and Seq. xiii. 1—4, and 1335.

XVIII. Ferrara, A. D. 1438. Florence, A. D. 1439.

The next General Council, according to the Latins, is that of 141 bishops which was assembled at Ferrara, under Eugenius IV., in opposition to that which he had before convened at Basle. It met in the year 1438, but a plague breaking out in Ferrara, it was the next year transferred to Florence. The chief object of the Council was to consider the means of effecting a reconciliation between the Greek and Roman Churches; an attempt to accomplish which was undertaken with much zeal by the Pope and the Western Bishops on the one hand, and the Greek Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople (Joseph) on the other, which last were present in person, and attended by many Eastern Bishops. The chief points discussed were the doctrine of Purgatory, the Papal Supremacy, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, all which the Greeks denied. At last, after much discussion, the Greek Bishops (with the exception of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who died at the Council) Mark, Bishop of Ephesus, the Patriarch of Heraclea, and Athanasius, were, by force, and fraud, and bribery, prevailed upon to join in articles of union. However, this was to little purpose. No sooner were the Greek deputies returned to Constantinople than the church there indignantly rejected all that had been done; and in a Council at Constantinople, held, according to their own account, a year and a half after the termination of that at Florence, all the Florentine proceedings were declared null and the Synod condemned. The Patriarch of Constantinople (Gregory) who had succeeded Joseph, and was inclined to the Latins, was deposed, and Athanasius chosen in his stead. The Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and the chiefs of the old Patriarchates of Ephesus, Heraclea, and Cæsarea, were all present and concurred in these transactions. Some writers have styled the Synod of Florence, the eighth General Council. Conc. xiii. 1—1264. For the Council of Constantinople which condemned it, see *ibid.* 1365.

Pisa. Milan. Lyons, A. D. 1511.

The style of a General Council was assumed by the French and Italian Bishops, who, without any occurrence on the part of the Bishop of Rome, assembled at Pisa, in the year 1511, thence moved to Milan, and afterwards to Lyons. Its proceedings were condemned by the Pope, Julius II., and they are not recognized by the Church of Rome.

Lateran 5, A. D. 1512—1517.

The next Council admitted to be a General one by some of the Romans, is that of no more than 114 bishops assembled by Julius II., in opposition to that of Pisa abovementioned. They met in the Lateran Church in the year 1512. There is nothing worth noticing in its proceedings: and, indeed, according to Bellarmine, its authority altogether is a matter of dispute among the Romans themselves. Conc. xiv. 1—344. Bellarm. de Conc. lib. ii. c. 15.

XIX. Trent, A. D. 1545—1563.

The last Synod which claimed the character of a General Council, is that which was convened by Paul III., at Trent, in the year 1545, and, by repeated prorogations, was continued throughout the reigns of his successors Julius III., Marcellus II., and Paul IV., and at last concluded under Pius IV., in the year 1563. For the enormity of its decrees, for its outrageous violations of former General Councils; and for its rash and reckless sentences of anathema, whereby, if they are to be understood retrospectively, four-fifths at least of the Fathers of the Church, will be found to be condemned, it is without parallel in the annals of the Christian Church. The number of bishops present at it was extremely limited. Labbé and Cossart state, that in the fourth session (which set forth the new canon of Scripture,) there were three legates, eight Archbishops, and forty-three bishops, fifty-four in all; in the sixth (which issued the decrees concerning Justification), four Cardinals, ten Archbishops, and forty-seven Bishops, sixty-one in all: in the thirteenth (which defined Transubstantiation), four Legates, six Archbishops, and thirty-four Bishops—forty-four in all. In the last session, Labbé and Cossart have scraped together the names of seven Legates, two Cardinals, three Patriarchs, thirty-three Archbishops, and 237 Bishops, as present; making in all 282, besides eleven proxies. If this is correct, then the Council was very far from being of one mind. In a Roman edition of the Council, A. D. 1763, which contains "*Patrum subscriptiones, eadem prorsus ratione, ordineque, quo visunter in authenticis actis, in Pontificio archivo custoditis,*" there appear no more than 200 signatures of cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops and bishops, present; and nineteen of persons representing themselves as proxies for thirty-four others. This is the utmost strength of a synod which dared to anathematize the Church of God from its foundation, and to set up a new communion; and of these about two-thirds were from Italy, the rest, with very few exceptions, from France and Spain: and the most flagrant of all the outrages which were there perpetrated, were the work of cabals varying from forty to sixty persons. Conc. xiv. 725—938.