ROMANISM,

THE

ENEMY OF EDUCATION,

OF

FREE INSTITUTIONS,

AND OF

CHRISTIANITY.

ASTOR LIBRARY NEW-YORK.

BY N. L. RICE, D. D.,
PASTOR OF THE SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, ST. LOUIS.

CINCINNATI:
MOORE, ANDERSON & COMPANY,
28 WEST FOURTH STREET.
1853.

Digitized by Google

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1853, by
MOORE, ANDERSON AND COMPANY,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the District of Ohio.

[This work was published several years since, under the title of "Romanism not Christianity" — several thousands were sold. It is now re-issued under a title more clearly indicating the character and contents of the work. In the language of the *Princeton Review*, "it is eminently a book for the people, for the times, and for our country."]

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

THE controversy between Romanism and Christianity seems now destined to be the great controversy of the nineteenth century. In Europe and America, Rome is making renewed and vigorous efforts, to regain her lost power; but the United States is her favorite field of missionary enterprise. The extent of our territory, the cheapness of our land, the fertility of our soil, and our free institutions, hold out strong inducements to immigration from Europe. These, with other causes, no less potent, are flooding our country with immense crowds of foreigners, the very large majority of whom are ignorant and degraded; and a still larger number have learned from infancy to yield implicit obedience to the teachings and the commands of the Roman clergy. This rapidly increasing population is placing in their hands a tremendous power, which may well excite apprehensions in the minds of Americans.

The Roman clergy, too, would *seem* to have become the friends of *popular education*, and are zealously engaged in establishing, in every part of our country, and particularly in the great West, permanent institutions for the education of the youth of both sexes. To aid them in this work, large sums of money are annually transmitted by societies in Europe—whose object it is, to extend the influence of Popery. And, although the clergy disclaim any design to interfere with the religious views of Protestant youths, thus inducing large numbers of Protestants to

Digitized by Google

patronize their schools, they do boast, in their letters to their European patrons, of the number of converts gained thus from our ranks.

The time has come when it is most important that every man, who is the friend of true religion, or of free institutions, should understand the character of this growing influence; when Protestants should know what are the differences between us and the church of Rome; and on what grounds they *protest* against her exclusive claims. Many intelligent men have been accustomed to regard Popery as a system so full of all manner of absurdities and ridiculous superstitions, that it cannot bear the light of the nineteenth century—especially in this enlightened country. They forget that a large proportion of the population of our country are almost wholly ignorant of the Scriptures, and of the nature of true religion; and, consequently, are easily misled on this important subject. The Roman clergy are well aware of this state of things. "The missions to America," says the Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, "are of high importance to the church. The superabundant population of ancient Europe is flowing towards the United States. Each one arrives, not with his religion, but with his indifference. The greater part are disposed to embrace the doctrine, whatever it be, that is first preached to them. We must make haste; the moments are precious. America may one day become the center of civilization—and shall truth or error establish there its empire? If the Protestant sects are beforehand with us, it will be difficult to destroy their influence."

Digitized by Google

Romanism is, indeed, full of absurdities; but it claims a venerable antiquity; its rites are, many of them, imposing, and its doctrines, when skillfully set forth by a cunning priest, are not without plausibility. Besides, it is a religion admirably adapted to please the carnal mind. Human nature has always been disposed to a religion of pomp and show, of external rites and ceremonies, a religion which proposes to save by human merit, rather than by divine grace, and which does not severely condemn loose morals. Such a religion is that taught by Rome. Who, then, can wonder that it gains converts, especially when it finds access to the uninformed and susceptible minds of the young.

The present unhappy controversy in the Episcopal church, should be instructive to other denominations. In that church has arisen a party, not of ignorant persons, but of men of learning, who are really Papists, and who are rapidly going over to Rome. The reason of this state of things is doubtless to be found in the fact, that that church was never thoroughly reformed. Not a few of the evangelical ministers of the Episcopal church have discovered, and are now proclaiming this truth, and calling for a complete expurgation of the leaven of Popery. But there are facts enough to show the folly of folding our arms in self-security, under the impression that Popery cannot live in a country so enlightened as ours. Its exclusive claims will be zealously, plausibly pressed in every part of our land; and therefore it is our duty to place an antidote, if possible, in the hands of every family and every individual.

Digitized by Google

The following lectures were delivered by the author to his own church last winter, in the course of his ministerial labors. The interest they were the means, under God, of awakening on the subjects discussed, and the desire of many who heard them, to see them in print, have induced him to prepare them for the press. He is aware that the number of books on this extensive controversy is very large; but he hopes the work he now ventures to place before the public, may fill a place, and be of some service to those who are seeking the truth. Almost all the works he has read on this controversy are either too costly for general circulation, and too learned for the mass of readers, or devoted to the discussion of only a few of the important points of difference between Protestants and Papists. And most of the publications designed for popular use, while they state and refute the doctrines of Rome, do not state them in the language of the standard writers of that denomination, and refer to the author and the page. Consequently, Romanists deny that their church holds such doctrines; and the minds of readers are left in doubt whether there has not been misrepresentation; or, confiding in the solemn declarations of uncandid men, they are strongly prejudiced against the very doctrines the writer is defending.

Fifteen years ago, the author of these lectures was providentially located in Bardstown, Ky., where, at that time, Romanism was the controlling influence. He purchased a number of the standard works of Romanists, and read them carefully. A lengthy discussion of the subject, with strong opposition, made him familiar with the doctrines of

Digitized by Google

Rome, and with the mode of defense adopted by her clergy. The results of his studies are now thrown together in the form of popular lectures. The doctrines of the church of Rome are stated in the precise language of the decrees of her general councils, her catechisms, and her standard authors; and the principal arguments relied on for the defense of them are carefully considered. It is often said that it is unfair to charge all the folly and wickedness of the church in the dark ages, upon Romanists of the present day; that they have improved as much as others. This objection, which, though not valid, has much weight with many minds, is obviated by quoting, almost exclusively, works of *modern date*—such as are now read and circulated by Romanists. From these it is easy to prove that Rome is now just what she has ever been; that the increasing light of the nineteenth century has not yet illumined her darkness.

On a subject on which so much has been written by men eminent for their learning and talents, it is not to be expected that much, if anything, that is really new, can be presented. In these lectures, however, if the author is not mistaken, the *manner* in which the different subjects are discussed, will be found somewhat different from that most commonly adopted; and he ventures to think, that for popular discussion, it has some advantages. It has been his design, not to say all that might be said on any one point, but enough to satisfy the sincere inquirer after truth.

The present volume is designed to present a fair and tolerably complete outline of the controversy between Protestants and Papists. Those who will take the trouble to

Digitized by Google

give it a careful reading, it is believed, will be at no loss to know what Popery is, and to distinguish between its errors and superstitions, and the gospel of Christ. In the lecture on the *true church*, it was not the purpose of the author to enter, at any length, into the discussion of the question, whether the ordinances, as administered by the Church of Rome, are valid (though some remarks are briefly made, bearing on that point), but rather to enable the inquirer to find the true church, and to expose the plausible, but sophistical, arguments of Romanists, in favor of the exclusive claims of theirs.

For the lecture on *Education in Roman Schools*, the author bespeaks a careful perusal. This subject, he is convinced, is practically of the very first importance. The true character and design of Roman schools are not understood; nor are Protestants half awake to the importance of establishing permanent institutions, especially *female* institutions, of a character which will bring them into successful competition with those established by the Roman clergy.

These lectures have been prepared more hastily than the author desired, in consequence of other pressing engagements—especially those connected with the pastoral care of a newly organized and rapidly increasing church. Such as they are, they are now thrown before the public, in the hope, and with the prayer, that the Head of the Church will bless them as a means of guarding the minds of many against the insidious attacks of error, and leading them to a knowledge of the truth, as it is contained in the pure Word of God.

Digitized by Google

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

Bible a Light to the Feet—Right of Free Discussion—Cannot defend our Faith without assailing that of Romanists—Relative Positions of Church of Rome and Protestants—Exclusive Claims of the former, as seen in Decrees of Council of Trent—Anathemas—Standard Authors quoted—Infallibity Key-stone of Roman Arch—Rule of Faith of Rome—Stated by Bishop Hughes—Bishop Milner—Church Defined by Hughes—Church not really their Rule, but Pope and Bishops—Protestant Rule—Protestants and Papists agree on two Points—First Argument against Roman Infallibility—Cannot be Proved by Tradition—Nor by Scripture—Milner's Doctrine concerning the Canon, and the Interpretation of Scripture—Marks of the Church—Impossibility, according to Milner, of ascertaining whether Church of Rome has them—Impossibility of joining the Church of Rome without denying her Infallibility—Controversies in Church of Rome disprove her Infallibility—Different Opinions concerning her Infallibility—Where it is Lodged—Transalpine and Cisalpine Opinions, as stated by Butler—Practical importance of the Question in Dispute—Singular Character of the Controversy—It can Never be Settled—Absurd Distinction between *Faith* and *Opinions*—Alternative if Pope and Council should Differ—Controversy concerning the Pope's Temporal Power—Popes take advantage of their Undefined Authority—Acknowledgments of Butler and Milner—Dilemma in which Popes are placed—Church Ignorant or Unfaithful—Authority of Universities worthless—Contradictory Opinions concerning General Councils—Infallible Definition of General Council necessary—New Testament silent on this point—The Doctrine of *Acceptation* perfectly Indefinite—Infallibility of General Councils of a *New Kind*—Not Scriptural—First Christian Council—Its Inspiration—Excellence of the Bible.—11.

LECTURE II.

Example of the Bereans—Commended by Luke—Principles Deduced—Milner's Attempt to Evade the Argument—Meaning of 2 Pet. i, 19—Infallibility of Rome does not extend far enough—She is unable to Interpret a large portion of the Bible—Absurdity of her Claims—Her Infallibility does not extend to Discipline and *Opinions*—Points included under these Heads—Taking Cup from the Laity—Unauthorised and presumptuous Change of Sacred Ordinance—Milner's acknowledgment in favor of the

Digitized by Google

Protestant Faith—Celibacy of the Clergy a Matter of Discipline—Purcell's Declaration—Fallible Discipline against the Scriptures—The Pope, in the face of God's Prohibition, Nullifies Marriage—Purcell's Position concerning Peter's wife—His Imputations against the Teachings of God—Reeve's Account of the Clergy of the 11th Century—Protestant Ministry never thus Degraded—Law forbiding Laity to Read the Scriptures—Its Presumption—Apostles not Fallible in Discipline—Opinions—What they are—Persecutions placed under this head—Bishop Hughes' Position concerning the Persecution of the Waldenses—His Defense makes the Matter Worse—Persecuting Edicts of 4th Council of Lateran—Bishop Hughes' weak Defense of the Council—Dilemma in which the Council is Placed—Cardinal Bellarmine's Defense of Persecution—Proves that the Church has Persecuted, and Justifies it—Inquisition Established by the Pope—Still Cherished at Rome—Hughes' Evasion—Persecution a Matter not of *Opinion*, but of *Morals*—Nothing in the Religion of Papists to forbid the most Horrid Persecutions—Scriptures Quoted in favor of Church Infallibility examined—Strange Inconsistency of the Roman Clergy—Matt. xviii, 15; xxiii, 20; xvi, 18—1 Tim. iii, 15—John xiv, 26 and xvi, 13—Fallibility of the Church Under the Old Dispensation—Traditions Condemned—Milner's Unsatisfactory Answer—Christ's Denunciation of the Jewish Teachings—Jewish Church Rejected and Crucified the Son of God—Milner's Answer Exposed—Evils of Church Interpretation greater than of "Private Interpretation."—Purcell's Declaration that the Bible is a Dead Letter.—35.

LECTURE III.

Scribes and Pharisees successors of Moses, yet False Teachers—Argument from Succession Inconclusive—Unity of Faith does not prove Faith True—Evils resulting from Implicit Faith in Fallible Men—Evils resulting from the Roman Rule—Corruption of the Word of God by Human Compositions—Apocrypha Rejected by the Jewish Church—Testimony of Josephus—Acknowledgments of Bishops Trevern and Milner—Dilemma—Testimony of Dr. Jahn—Christ and Apostles never quoted Apocryphal Books, nor charged Jews with Unfaithfulness—Apocryphal Books not received by the Early Christian Writers—Catalogue of Melito, Oregin, Cyril, Athanasius, &c., &c.—Not sufficient to prove Theological Doctrines—Placed in Second Canon till the Meeting of the Council of Trent—Old Traditions—Meaning of the Word, as used by the Bible, and by the Fathers—The Point in Controversy Stated—Jewish Church had no Divine Traditions—New Testament affords no evidence in favor of Oral Traditions—Protestants do not Rely on Oral Traditions—Unanimous Consent of the Fathers—Who are They—All Fallible—Several of them fell into Serious Errors—Differed from each other, and from Rome—Church of Rome makes

Digitized by Google

New Articles of Faith—Papists not permitted to hear God Speak to Them—Milner's Declaration on the Subject—People Required to Read Original Languages, &c.—Rome cannot Correct her Errors—All Roman Catholics must Believe and Defend Them—Decision of the Council of Constance concerning the *Safe Conduct* granted John Huss—Contradictory Statements of Hughes and Reeve—No Faith to be kept with Heretics—Superiority of the Protestant Rule.—65.

LECTURE IV.

Individual Accountability, and the Consequent Right of Free Investigation—Folly and Wickedness of Enforcing Religious Faith by Civil Penalties—Fundamental Principles of Romanism Inconsistent with Liberty of Conscience and Human Freedom—They put the Mind completely in the Hands of the Clergy—Their Commands enforced by tremendous Sanctions—Judicial Forgiveness—Council of Trent and Catechism of Trent—Keys of the Kingdom—Unlimited Power of the Pope and the Clergy—Gods on Earth—Their Power of a Peculiar Kind—Nothing in their Character to render it Harmless—Many of Them, especially in Roman Countries, grossly Immoral—Avowed Principles of the Roman Clergy with regard to Religious Toleration—Deposition of King John—Bellarmine's Principles—Hughes' Evasion—Notes in Rhemish Testament—Sentiments of the Belgian Bishops—Dr. Crotty's Acknowledgment—Councils of Lateran and Constance decide in favor of Persecution—Inquisition recognized by the Council of Trent - Devoti's account of its Origin and Design—Mode of Arrest, as stated by D. Antonio Puigblanch—Still Cherished in Rome—The Pope and his Clergy Responsible for It—Bishop Hughes' Opinion of It—Encyclical Letter of Gregory XVI—Intolerance in all Roman Countries—Persecutions in the Island of Madeira—Views of the Roman Clergy of this Country—Their commendation of the Encyclical Letter of Gregory XVI—Bishop Hughes' Views of Spanish and Italian Intolerance—The Objection, that Protestants have Persecuted, Answered—Political Power of the Roman Clergy of This Country—Withering Influence of Popery on the Morals and Prosperity of Countries where it Prevails.—89.

LECTURE V.

Christ the only Head of His Church, the Husband, Head, and Foundation—Doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy, Stated—If true, it must be very Clearly Revealed—Milner's Admission—Must be Proved by what Papists call *Private Interpretation* of Scripture—An insuperable Difficulty in the Way—Inconsistency of Romanism—First Argument—Qualification and Authority of Pope Undefined and Indefinable—Ambiguous Language of the Council of Florence—Practice of the Popes—John, King of England

Digitized by Google

and Otho, Emperor of Germany Deposed—Alexander VI gave America to Ferdinand and Emmanuel—Second Argument—Titles and Honors claimed by the Pope, Prove his Apostacy—Scriptures relied on to prove Supremacy, examined—Peter a Married Man—History—Practical working of the Doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy, proves it False—Church of Christ not united under one Visible Head—Question, where was Your Church before Luther?—Answered—119.

LECTURE VI.

Repentance a Change of Mind—The Doctrine of Penance Stated—Command to do Penance not in the Scriptures—If we admit the Doway Translation, Penance Required before Baptism—*Sacrament* of Penance not in the Bible—Two of its Parts Unscriptural—The Kind of Confession Protestants Admit—Division of Sins into Mortal and Venial, Absurd and Unscriptural—The Language of Roman Writers Perfectly Indefinite—Moral Code of Rome Rotten—Calculated to Make Men Dishonest and Untruthful—Stolen Property not always Restored—St. Ligori's Moral Theology—This Distinction Necessary to Auricular Confession—Auricular Confession not found in the Old Testament, nor in the New—Meaning of Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven—Tendency and Effects of Auricular Confession—Declarations of Ligori—Testimony of Rev. J. B. White—Of Waddy Thompson, Esq.—Satisfaction Stated—Doctrine of Protestants—No Temporal Punishment Due to Sins Forgiven—Priests, Prophets, Christ, and the Apostles Never Prescribed Penances—Doctrine of Satisfaction Contradicts those Scriptures which Speak of the Atonement of Christ—If Temporal Punishment Due to Sins Forgiven, Due to those Committed *before Baptism*—Absurdity of the Doctrine—Doctrine of No Practical Advantage, but Calculated to Deceive—Gives to the Clergy Tremendous Power—145.

LECTURE VII.

No Condemnation to Believers—Therefore Doctrine of Indulgences and Purgatory False—Doctrine of Indulgences Stated—Power to Grant Indulgences not given the Church—Doctrine Founded on *Division* of Sins into Mortal and Venial, and Temporal Punishment Due to Sins Forgiven, and therefore False—No such thing as Superabundant Merits of Saints—No Counsels, in addition to the Commands of Christ—The most Devoted Christian Fails in the Discharge of his Duty—Merits of Christ, though Infinite, are not at the Disposal of the Pope or the Church—Dilemma in which Romanists are Placed—*Conditions* on which Indulgences are Granted, and the Use Made of the Doctrine, Prove it False—Blessed Beads—Indulgences Used to Excite Men to Engage in War—To Build St. Peter's—

Digitized by Google

To Fill the Pope's Treasury—The Doctrine a Source of Power to the Clergy—Purgatory—Decree of the Council of Trent—No Such Place Mentioned in the Bible—This Doctrine Inconsistent with the Work of the Holy Spirit—The Burning of Fire Cannot Produce Holiness—Passages of Scripture relied on, Examined—Moses' Law Prescribes No Sacrifice for the Dead—Old Testament Contains No Prayers for the Dead—Limbo Patrum—Doctrine of Purgatory a Source of Wealth and Power to the Clergy—Cruelty of the Doctrine—175.

LECTURE VIII.

Lord's Supper—Its Nature and Design Stated—Doctrine of Rome Stated—It Involves Contradictions and Absurdities—Contradicts the Testimony of the Senses—Not a *Mystery* nor a *Miracle*—Examination of Scripture Passages—Scripture Usage—Romanists Interpret only *Part* of our Saviour's Language Literally—Bread and Wine still called Bread and Wine—Examination of John VI—Bishop Trevern's Inconsistency—The Changes made in this Sacrament by the Roman Clergy, Prove their Doctrine False—Taking the Cup from the Laity and Non-Officiating Clergy—Acknowledgment of the Council of Trent—Reason Given for this Change, examined—The Roman Clergy by Fallible *Discipline* change that which was Infallibly Established—Implied Charge of Bishop Milner against his Church—The Faith of Protestants most strikingly Illustrated by Administering the Supper as it was Administered by Christ—The Roman Faith Requires a Change—Additions made to the Lord's Supper—The words "Soul and Divinity," added to suit the Faith of Rome—Ridiculous Directions to Communicants—The Doctrine of Rome Proved False by the Worship of the Bread and Wine—Processions in Romish Countries—Thompson's Testimony—Doctrine of the *Mass*, further Evidence against Transubstantiation—The Doctrine Stated—Its Absurdity—Mystical Effusion of Blood, Unmeaning—Purposes for which Mass is said to be Offered, Prove it False—No *Priests* in the Christian Church, and therefore no *Sacrifice*—No *Altar*—Scriptures speak of no Sacrifice of Christ, but that on the Cross—This Doctrine a Source of Power and Wealth to the Clergy—205.

LECTURE IX.

God the only Object of Religious Worship—Worship of Images, Saints, and Relics, Stated—Use of Images and Pictures in the Worship of God Unlawful—Second Commandment—Its Meaning—Omitted in Romish Catechisms—Charge made against Pagans lies against Rome—Picture of Trinity—Romish Exposition of Second Precept Proved False—No Picture or Image of God in Jewish Temple—Jews led to Idolatry by Brazen Serpents—Scriptures afford no Precept, Permission, or Example of Worship

Digitized by Google

of Saints or Images—No Saints' Days in the Bible—Absurdity of Praying to Saints—Miracles wrought at the Tombs of Saints not Real—Thompson's Account of the Church—Mosheim's Account of Relics—Milner's Defense of the Doctrine—Inspired Men did not thus reason—Superiority of the Scripture Doctrine—235.

LECTURE X.

INVENTIONS OF ROME.

Efficacy of Ordinances and Ceremonies, a Popular Doctrine—Suited to the Carnal Mind—Disposition to Multiply Ordinances, Illustrated by Paganism and Judaism—This Error leads Men to Undervalue True Religion and Pure Morality—Romish Church more Corrupt than the Jewish Church—Holy Days Unauthorized by the New Testament—Consequent Desecration of the Sabbath—Acknowledgment of Bishop Trevern—Arch-Bishop Eccleston's Doctrine Concerning the Sabbath—Extreme Unction—True Design of the Anointing mentioned by James—Acknowledgment of the Catechism of Trent—Prayers of Rome—Litany of the Blessed Sacrament—Prayer to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and of Mary—Litany of the Infant Jesus—Unmeaning Repetitions—Holy Ashes—Ceremony of Blessing the Ashes, as contained in the Roman Missal—Holy Palm, Its Virtues—Holy Fire—Holy Water—Corruptions of the Ordinance of Baptism—Apostolic Baptism, Contrasted—Blessed Candles—Holy Medals—Agnus Dei's—Their Wonderous Virtues—Ceremony of Blessing Horses at the Convent of St. Anthony at Rome—Impiety of this Custom—Bishop Hughes' Defense of It—Legends of Saints—Absurd Story of St. Philip Nerius—Miracle of the Pope's Horse—Soul of Theodoric carried to Hell by Pope John—St. Peter's Chains—Miraculous Discovery of the Body of Stephen the Proto-Martyr—Translation of the House of Loretto—Stories concerning St. Januarius—Miraculous Liquefaction of his Blood—Breviary full of such Stories—Do the Roman Clergy Really Believe Them—Church of Rome, Apostate—267.

LECTURE XI.

CHRIST HAS BUT ONE CHURCH.

Desirableness of being in Communion with It—Rule for Finding the True Church—Traditions of no Service—We cannot Rely on the Writings of Uninspired Men—Differences among Romish Historians—The People generally cannot Enter into these Controversies—Romish Catalogues of the Popes Prove Nothing—The Question, Where were the Protestant Churches before the days of Luther, Calvin, &c., Answered—Efforts of the Roman Clergy to Blacken the Characters of the Reformers, Waldenses, &c., Unavailing—Objection that the Reformers did not Work Miracles, Refuted—

Digitized by Google

True Church must be Discovered by the Scriptures—Apostolic Church and Church of Rome, Compared—Their Organization and Officers—Their Worship—Their Ordinances—Their Doctrines—Church of Rome Excommunicates and Anathematizes all who Refuse to Believe her Errors—She Requires all to Commit Idolatry—Position taken by the Council of Trent—Reason for Refusing to Recognise the Church of Rome—The Church by coming out of Babylon did not Unchurch Herself—Answer to the Question, How shall We Find the True Church—Unity of the Church—Unity of Rome, not Scriptural—Protestant Churches Traced up to the Apostles—A Brighter Day in the Future History of the Church—293.

LECTURE XII.

DUTY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF PARENTS.

The Rising Generation the Hope of the Church and of the Country—Great Influence of Teachers, evident from the Design of Education—Teachers must Secure the Respect and Affection of their Pupils—Policy of the Roman Clergy—Objections to Roman Schools—They Cannot give a Thorough Education—Religion and Morals a Forbidden Subject of Investigation—These Intimately Connected with other Branches of Science—Natural Philosophy and Astronomy—Philosophers in Roman Countries—They Cannot Teach Mental and Moral Science—Moral Principles of Romanists Radically Unsound—Their Effect on the Morals of Youth—The Perfection of Roman Virtue Consists in Punishing the Body, &c.—Account of Virgin Rosa, and of Antonius—The Breviary abounds in such Stories—Endorsed by Rev. J. Reeve—Desecration of the Sabbath—Moral Principles of the Jesuits—Roman Schools will not Teach History Correctly—Nor the Principles of Civil and Religious Liberty—Government of the Jesuits, a Perfect Despotism—The Real Design of Roman Schools to make Converts and Money—Neglect of Popular Education in Roman Countries—Character of St. Joseph's College—Roman Schools Adapted to make Converts—Exclude Protestant Books—Conversion of Dr. Riley in Georgetown College—Boasting of Papists—Sin of Protestant Parents in Exposing their Children thus—Character of Nunneries—Degradation of Nuns—Milly McPherson, the Lost Nun; and the celebrated Law Suit in Kentucky—Letters of Nuns to their Priests—Capital Error of Protestants—Conclusion—319.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

ROMANISM NOT CHRISTIANITY.

LECTURE I.

PSALMS cxix, 105, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path."

By this language of the Psalmist, we are taught that the Word of God presents with much clearness the doctrines and duties of revealed religion, and consequently, that it can be understood by the sincere inquirer after truth. It is *light;* and light—when there is an eye to see—reveals surrounding objects. He represents himself as walking through a dark region in a dangerous way, and the word of God as his lamp—the light by which the safe path is clearly revealed. In another Psalm he says, "The entrance of thy word giveth light." And Paul, the apostle, says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." These passages of God's word afford a suitable introduction to the discussion, on which I propose now to enter, of the prominent doctrines of the Reformation.

The Reformation of the 16th century is an event of deep interest to all classes of men—to the Christian, to the statesman, and to the friend of free institutions. The Christian looks to it as the period when, as once of old, the Bible, found amid the rubbish of human traditions which had been accumulating for ages, began again to pour forth its pure light upon the astonished minds of the benighted people; when Christianity arose from her long-confin-

Digitized by Google

ued prostration, and began to put on her strength, and to clothe herself in her beautiful garments. Many who make no pretensions to religion, regard it as the event by which the true principles of civil and religious liberty were developed, and the fetters which ecclesiastical and civil despotism had riveted upon the bodies and souls of men, struck off. After the lapse of three centuries, the principles of the Reformation are still wielding a tremendous power over men, and moulding the character of the mightiest nations on the globe; and it requires not the spirit of prophecy to predict, that their influence in years to come is not likely to be more circumscribed. The character of these principles, and their effect upon the Christian church and the world, present a subject of legitimate inquiry, a subject replete with valuable instruction.

It is not a little strange that when we propose to discuss these great principles, many well-meaning persons take the alarm, as if we were commencing a species of *persecution* against Roman Catholics. Far from it. We have no denunciations to hurl against persons who may differ from us; nor do we intend to say a word which can give just ground of offense to any one. But we do intend, with all freedom, to discuss the merits of great practical principles which exert a mighty influence in moulding the character and fixing the destiny of individuals and of nations. It is a self-evident principle, that when there are equal interests involved in any subject, there are equal rights to investigate and discuss. Now, I am as deeply interested in the question—for example—whether the Pope of Rome is the divinely appointed head of the church of Christ, as any man on earth; and so are the people to whom I preach, and to whom I am most solemnly bound "to declare the whole counsel of God." Consequently, my right freely to discuss the subject, is most unquestionable.

But why, one is ready to ask, do you not preach your own faith without assailing that of others? What is my faith on the point just mentioned? It is not simply, that Christ is the head of the church, but that he is the *only* head. Now, Roman Catholics claim that the Pope of Rome is the visible head of the

Digitized by Google

church, the vicar of Christ on earth; and they pronounce us heretics and rebels against divine authority, because we refuse to acknowledge his claims. We cannot, therefore, defend our faith without proving the Pope's claims to be spurious. When a Roman priest attempts to prove that the Pope is the head of the church, he is as truly chargeable with persecuting me, as I am with persecuting him in proving the opposite. The charge of persecution, in either case, is ridiculous. If the claims of the church of Rome are founded in truth, the man who would convince me of that fact, would be my best friend; if they are false, I could do no greater kindness to a Roman Catholic, than to convince him of his error.

It is important to the right understanding of this subject, to define clearly the relative positions of the church of Rome and Protestant denominations. In doing so, as in all the statements I shall make in regard to the tenets of the Roman church, I shall quote the decrees of her councils, her catechisms, and her standard authors. I prefer to quote, as far as possible, those authors who have written in the English language, and are now circulated as standard writers, that there may be no dispute about *translations*, nor whether the doctrines quoted are *now* held and taught by that church. I intend that every intelligent hearer shall be able to understand the force of the arguments I adduce.

The claims of the church of Rome will be seen in the following decree of the Council of Trent, which met in the 16th century, and which is regarded by Romanists as infallible: "In order to restrain petulant minds, the Council further decrees, that in matters of faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one, confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to wrest the sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which hath been held, and still is held, by holy mother church—whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Writ—or contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers, even though such interpretations should never be published. If any disobey, let them be denounced by the ordinaries, and punished according to law."

Digitized by Google

The creed of Pope Pius IV, published after the meeting of the Council of Trent, and which was designed to embody the doctrines of the Council, requires of all who join that church, the following professions: "I acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolical Roman church, *the mother and mistress of all churches;* and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Bishop, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ." Again: "I most truly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same church. I also admit the sacred Scriptures according to the sense which the holy mother church has held, and does hold—to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers."

Such are the high pretensions of the church of Rome. She claims to be the divinely appointed expounder of God's revelation to man, and forbids, under severe penalty, any one to understand that revelation otherwise than as she directs. And every one of her dogmas is enforced by an *anathema*—a destructive curse—upon the man who ventures to deny its infallible truth. I give a single example. The first canon of the Council of Trent on transubstantiation, reads as follows: "Whoever shall deny, that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and, consequently Christ entire, but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign, or figure, or by his power—*let him be accursed.*" With a similar *anathema* is every one of the doctrines of Rome guarded. And when the Council was about to adjourn, the presiding cardinal, the Pope's legate, exclaimed: "Anathema to all heretics!" and the Bishops responded, "Anathema! anathema!"

Now, if these claims of the church of Rome are founded in truth, and these *anathemas* divinely sanctioned, what a condition we Protestants are in! But, if her claims are spurious, and,

Digitized by Google

consequently, her anathemas unsanctioned by Christ, what shall we say of those who thus presume to "lord it over God's heritage," and curse men for not abandoning Christ to follow them? Will not their *anathemas* recoil on their own heads?

These pretensions of the church of Rome are founded upon her claim to *infallibility* in her teaching. She professes to be guided in all her decisions concerning doctrines and morals, by the spirit of inspiration, and therefore demands that her dogmas shall be received as the word of the eternal God. This doctrine of church-infallibility is the keystone in the Roman arch. He who disbelieves this, must abandon her communion. We are *Protestants;* and against all her exclusive pretensions and anathemas, we enter our solemn protest, and assign our reasons.

Let me distinctly state what is the rule of faith acknowledged by the Roman church, and what rule is acknowledged by Protestants, and then proceed to examine their respective claims. The Roman Catholic rule is thus stated by Bishop Hughes, of New York, in his written discussion with Dr. J. Breckenridge: "Our rule of faith is laid down in the Apostles' creed—I believe in the holy Catholic church."* It may be well here to remark, that the creed called the Apostles', as all agree, was written, not by the Apostles, but long after their death. Moreover, it does not say, "I believe in the holy Catholic church, *as an infallible rule of faith.*" We, too, believe in the holy Catholic church; but we do not believe in the church of Rome; nor do we believe in any church *as a rule of faith.* Dr. Milner, an eminent Roman bishop, thus defines the Roman rule: "Scripture and tradition, and these propounded and explained by the Catholic church."† The *church*, then, is the Roman Catholic rule. It may be well, therefore, to inquire what Hughes and Milner mean by the church. Hughes thus defines it: "By the church, I understand that visible society of Christians, composed of the people who are taught, and the pastors who teach, by virtue of a certain divine commission, recorded in the 28th chapter of Matthew, addressed to the Apostles and their legitimate successors, until

* Let. iv, p. 34. † End of Con., Let. x.

Digitized by Google

the end of the world."* Observe, the church consists of *the people and their pastors*, and they together constitute "holy mother church"—the rule of faith. Now, it seems to us rather strange, that the church should be the rule of faith to the church—the school its own teacher! But so it is. Let us not, however, be deceived here. The church, we are told, is the rule of faith; and yet the people and the lower orders of the clergy, who constitute the great body of the church, are no part of that rule. The Pope and his bishops alone decide on matters of faith; and from their decision there is no appeal. So says Bishop Trevern, a standard writer in the church of Rome. "Let it then be established as a principle, that to the *bishops exclusively* belong the right of declaring what has, or has not, been revealed; that is, what is conformable or contrary to Scripture and tradition, or simply to one of the two."† The bishops, then, constitute the rule of faith. With what propriety they are called "holy *mother*," I cannot see; but, it is well to understand, that when Roman Catholics direct us to "holy *mother* church," as their rule of faith, they mean the holy *fathers*—the bishops!

The Protestant rule of faith is THE BIBLE, containing the Old and New Testaments, without the apocryphal books. We believe, that these Scriptures contain the whole revelation of God, which is designed to constitute a perfect rule of faith and of practice. We believe, that there is on earth no infallible interpreter of those Scriptures; that they are to be understood according to the well-known principles of language, and that such an interpreter is not needed.

Which of these rules is the one divinely appointed? This is a most important question. We are on a long journey, through a dark world, to heaven or to hell. Eternal interests depend on every step. We feel that we need a certain guide. I would be willing to follow any guide appointed by Jesus Christ; but I will follow no one who cannot fully establish the fact, that he has been so appointed.

In this discussion I might proceed directly to the proof of the

* Cath. Con., Let. v, p. 34. † Amica. Discuss., vol. i, p. 70

Digitized by Google

proposition, that the Scriptures are our only infallible guide—the light to our feet, the lamp to our path; but I prefer first to examine the claims of the church of Rome. If they be found spurious, it will follow, of course, that the Protestant rule is the only one divinely appointed. For, let it be remembered, Protestants and Roman Catholics agree on two important points, viz: 1. that God has given to man a revelation of his will; 2. that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments constitute a part, at least, of that revelation. We say, they contain the whole. Of this I propose, in the progress of the discussion, to give clear and positive evidence.

I. My first argument against the infallibility of the church of Rome, is, *that there is no evidence by which it can be proved.* Let it be remembered, that the whole revelation of God, according to the Romanists, is contained in *tradition and Scripture*—"*the whole word of God,*" says Bishop Milner, "*both written and unwritten*, in other words, *Scripture and tradition.*"* These are to be authoritatively expounded by the church. Now it is clear, if the whole word of God is contained in Scripture and tradition, that the infallibility of the church, if proved at all, must be proved from one or the other, or from both of these. There is no other source from which evidence can be adduced.

But this doctrine cannot be proved from *tradition*—"the unwritten word." For if there be any traditions of divine authority, they are confessedly in the keeping of the church; and their authority depends on her infallibility. Surely it cannot be expected that we will receive, as matters of faith, the traditions of a church which we do not know to be the true church of Christ; nor can it be expected that we will receive the traditions of a *fallible* church. What evidence can we have that the traditions of any church are of divine authority, unless assured, upon clear evidence, that she is inspired and infallible? In the passage already cited from Bishop Trevern, he asserts it as an established principle, that to the bishops exclusively belongs the right of declaring what has or has not been revealed, what is conformable

* End of Con., Let. x.

Digitized by Google

or contrary to Scripture or *tradition.* It may be well to quote another passage from the same author. After asserting the absolute necessity of an infallible interpreter of Scripture, he says—"We must say as much, and with still better right, for tradition. The same judge, the same interpreter that unfolds to us the sense of the divine books, manifests to us also that of tradition. Now this judge, this interpreter, I must tell you here again, is the teaching body of the church, the bishops united in the same opinion, at least in a great majority.*

Since, then, tradition is exclusively in the keeping of the church or her bishops, two points must be determined before we can know anything certainly about it, viz.: 1st. We must know which of all the rival communions is the true church of Christ; whether the Greek, the Roman, or some one of the Protestant churches. 2d. Having found the true church, we must be satisfied, before we can receive her traditions, if she have any, that she is infallible. For it is by no means self-evident, that the church of Christ possesses the gift of inspiration; this point must be proved. The infallibility of the church of Rome cannot, therefore, be proved by tradition; because that is in her keeping, and cannot be received and relied on, till her infallibility shall have been established.

The infallibility of the church of Rome cannot be proved from *Scripture*, for several most important reasons. In the first place, Roman bishops assure us, that we cannot know that the Scriptures are the word of God, but by the infallible decision of the church of Rome. So says the learned Bishop Milner:—"Supposing then you, dear sir, to be the Protestant I have been speaking of; I begin with asking you, by what means have you learned the *canon* of Scripture, that is to say, which are the books hich have been written by divine inspiration; or indeed that any books at all have been so written? You cannot discover either of these things by your rule, &c. Lastly, you have no sufficient authority for asserting that the sacred volumes are the genuine composition of the holy personages whose names they

* Amic. Discussion, Vol. i, p. 169.

Digitized by Google

bear, except the tradition and living voice of the Catholic church," &c. "Indeed it is so clear that the canon of Scripture is built on the tradition of the church, that most learned Protestants, with Luther himself, have been forced to acknowledge it, in terms almost as strong as those in the well-known declaration of St. Augustine."* It may be well to say, that I by no means admit the truth of the bishop's assertion concerning the acknowledgments of Protestants. But he asserts unequivocally that the canon of Scripture is built on the *tradition of the church*, and that, aside from her infallible authority, we can have no sufficient evidence that any of the books of Scripture were written by inspiration. But, as I have already proved, we must find the true church, and be satisfied of her infallibility, before we can receive her tradition, or believe the Scriptures inspired on her authority. I go to Bishop Purcell, if you please, and ask him whether he can prove to me that his church is infallible in her doctrines and morals. He affirms that he can; and he commences, just as Milner does, most inconsistently, by quoting Scripture to me. I stop him, and say, "Sir, I know nothing about Scripture. You assert that there is no sufficient evidence that the Bible is God's word, except the infallible decision of the Catholic church. I am now in search of the true church, and am trying to ascertain whether she is infallible; that if she is, I may commit myself unreservedly to her guidance. When I shall have been satisfied on these points, I will hear the church's decision about the inspiration of the Scriptures; but surely you do not expect to prove to me, that your church is infallible, by a book which, as you assert, I cannot yet know to be inspired. It may, of course, be a mere system of priestcraft." The bishop replies—"You, as a Protestant, admit the truth of the Scriptures, and therefore I quote them." "Yes, sir, I admit the truth of the Scriptures *precisely because I do not believe your doctrine.* But if you convince me, that the authority of the Scriptures depends on the tradition of the church, I will not admit their inspiration, until I am satisfied of her infallibility." Perhaps he will reply, that he quotes the Bible

* End of Con., Letter ix.

Digitized by Google

as uninspired, but authentic history. But is it to be expected that my faith can rest upon uninspired history? Even if it could, the infallibility of the church is not a historical fact, which might be recorded by uninspired men, but a matter of divine revelation, which God only can teach.

Dr. Milner's method of escaping this difficulty is truly remarkable. He says, "True it is, that I prove the *inspiration* of Scripture by the tradition of the church, and that I prove the *infallibility* of the church by the testimony of Scripture; but you must take notice, that independently of, and prior to, the testimony of Scripture, I knew from tradition, and the general arguments of the credibility of Christianity, that the church is an illustrious society, instituted by Christ, and that her pastors have been appointed by him to guide me in the way of salvation."* Observe, he knew *from tradition;* but tradition, as we have seen, is in the keeping of the church, and its truth depends on her infallibility. Yet, Dr. Milner tells us, he found tradition, and learned from it, that the church was instituted by Christ, and that her pastors were appointed as his guide! That is, he found the *testimony* before he found the *witness*, and proved the competency of the witness by the testimony! But he was enlightened on this subject, also, by the *general arguments* for the credibility of Christianity. So, then, his faith in the infallibility of his church rested, not on divine testimony, but on general arguments for the truth of Christianity! Can such general arguments prove the church inspired? May not Christianity be true, and yet the church be fallible? The truth is clear, that if, as Roman bishops constantly affirm, the authority of Scripture depends on the tradition of the church, her infallibility cannot be proved from Scripture—for we must find the true church, and be satisfied of her infallibility, before we can have evidence that the Bible is true. But, even if this difficulty were removed, and we could have evidence of the inspiration of the Scriptures, we are met by another, greater, if possible, than the first; for we are distinctly informed by the Romish bishops, that we cannot possibly *understand* the Scriptures without the

* End of Con., Let. xi.

Digitized by Google

assistance of the infallible church. So says Dr. Milner: "In the first place, it is certain, as a learned Catholic controvertist argues, that a person who follows your [Protestant] rule, *cannot make an act of faith;* this being according to your great authority, Bishop Pearson, an assent to the revealed articles, with a *certain and full persuasion* of their revealed truth. * * * * Now, the Protestant, who has nothing to trust to but his own talents in interpreting of the books of Scripture, especially with all the difficulties and uncertainties which he labors under, according to what I have shown above, never can arrive to this *certain assurance* and *absolute* security, as to what is revealed in Scripture; the utmost he can say, is, *such and such appears to me at the present moment, to be the sense of the texts before me; and if he is candid, he will add, but perhaps upon further consideration, and upon comparing these with other texts, I may alter my opinion.* How far short, dear sir, is such mere opinion from the certainty of faith!"* The Bishop not only denies that we can, without the aid of the infallible church, understand the Scriptures, but he even denies our right to attempt it. He says, "Before I enter on the discussion of any part of Scripture with you or your friends, I am bound, dear sir, in conformity with my rule of faith, as explained by the Fathers, and particularly by Tertullian, to protest against your or their right to argue from Scripture, and, of course, to deny any need there is of my replying to any objection which you may draw from it—for I have reminded you, that *no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation;* and I have proved to you that the whole business of the Scriptures belongs to the church."†

It strikes us as rather singular, that the Bishop should quote Scripture to us to prove that we cannot understand Scripture; and not a little strange, that we cannot as well understand the epistles of Peter, who, they say, was the first Pope, as the Encyclical letter of Gregory XVI, published in 1832. But the doctrine, you perceive, is, that we cannot understand the Scriptures, and that we have no right to reason about their meaning.

* End of Con., Let. ix. † Ibid, Let. xii.

Digitized by Google

Why, then, does this same bishop, as well as others, quote the Scriptures to prove to us that the church is infallible, when they tell us in the same breath, that we cannot understand them ?

That the force of this argument may be seen, let us inquire what are the marks of the true church. Bishop Milner gives four, viz.: unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity. Suppose, now, I am seeking the true church; the question arises, whether these are the marks of the true church, and whether the church of Rome has them. To prove that *unity* is a mark of the true church, Milner quotes a number of Scriptures. Of course, if I am to be convinced by these passages, I must be able to understand them. But let us look at the second mark, viz., *sanctity*, sanctity of *doctrine*. How shall I judge, whether the doctrines of the church of Rome are holy ? If we are to judge from their apparent effects upon the mass of those who embrace them, we must conclude that few systems of doctrine are less holy. But it is evident, that the doctrines of the church of Rome are holy, if they are the doctrines taught by Christ and his Apostles; and if they are not, they are unholy. We cannot, therefore, determine whether she has this mark, unless we compare her doctrines with those taught in the Scriptures. And the comparison, let it be noted, must be quite extensive: for a number of her doctrines may be true and holy, and yet, others may be of an opposite character. And, if she holds and teaches *even one* erroneous doctrine, it is certain she is not infallible.

Now, either I can, by my private judgment, understand the Scriptures, so as to compare the doctrines of Rome with them, and determine certainly whether they are holy, or I cannot. If I can, it follows clearly, that I do not need an infallible interpreter of Scripture. If I cannot, then neither can I determine whether that church has the mark in question. In either case, the claims of Rome fall to the ground. But, when I propose to enter upon this comparison of her doctrines with those of Christ and the Apostles, I am reminded that I cannot understand the Scriptures; that the utmost I can do, is to form a *mere opinion* which is far below the certainty of faith ! That is, Bishop Mil-

Digitized by Google

ner gives us certain marks by which the true church may be distinguished from all others, and then tells us plainly, that we cannot ascertain whether his church has those marks! How, then, I ask, are we to know whether the church of Rome is the true church, and whether she is infallible? Certainly, her infallibility cannot be proved from Scripture.

The position may strike many as a strange one; but I venture to affirm, *that no man can join the church of Rome without, in the very act, denying the truth of her principles.* Do you ask, how this can be? Suppose, then, I have heard a learned Roman Bishop attempt to prove the infallibility of his church. He has quoted many passages of Scripture, accompanied with his own comments; I have heard him through, and I am convinced; I believe that he has proved the infallibility of the church of Rome, and I propose to become a member of that church. Now, on what, let me ask, is my faith in the church of Rome based? Is it not based solely on my *individual judgment* of the strength and conclusiveness of his argument? I have heard his arguments, and my judgment is, that they prove the point. I have considered his expositions of the Scriptures he has quoted, and my judgment is, that he has interpreted them correctly. But this same Bishop who has so faithfully labored to convince me of the infallibility of his church, tells me, that according to the doctrine of this same church, all the decisions of private judgment respecting the meaning of the Scriptures, are wholly uncertain; that the utmost I can say is, such and such appears to me, at the present moment, to be the sense of the texts before me; but perhaps, upon further investigation, and upon comparing these with other texts, I may alter my opinion. It is certain, he says, that I *cannot make an act of faith* upon my private judgment. If this doctrine be true, I can only say to the Bishop, the meaning of the texts you have quoted, *appears* to me to be as you say; but, upon further investigation, I may change my opinion.—Will he receive me into his church on such a profession? No. "How far short," says he, "is such mere opinion from the certainty of faith?" Well, if I say to him, "Sir, I am *certain* that

Digitized by Google

your interpretation of the passages of Scripture you have quoted, is correct, and I *can* exercise faith upon my private judgment;" do I not, in making such a profession, contradict both him and his church? And if I contradict his church, do I not deny her infallibility? There is no escape; the doctrines of the church of Rome are suicidal. No man can enter within her pale, without, in the very act, denying her infallibility.

The conclusion appears to me unavoidable, that the infallibility of the church of Rome cannot be proved, either from tradition or from Scripture. In exalting her authority, she has destroyed the bridge on which we might pass from the regions of private interpretation into the city of the holy mother. Here I might leave the question, but I proceed to offer a second argument, viz.:

II. *The controversies in the Church of Rome, on the subject of her infallibility, prove her claims spurious.*—She is certain that she has infallibility; but whether that important gift is found in the Pope, the successor of St. Peter, she cannot inform us. Some of her bishops say, the Pope has it, when he speaks *officially*; others insist, that the bishops in general council have it, and that a council is above the Pope; and others still find it in the church. On this subject, Charles Butler, Esq., in his *Book of the Church*, gives us the following information: "In spiritual concerns, the *Transalpine* opinions ascribe to the Pope a superiority, and controlling power over the whole church, should she chance to oppose his decrees, and consequently, over a general council, her representative; and the same superiority and controlling power, even in the ordinary course of business, over the canons of the universal church. They describe the Pope as the fountain of all ecclesiastical order, jurisdiction and dignity. * * * * They, further, ascribe to the Pope the extraordinary prerogative of personal infallibility, when he undertakes to issue a solemn decision on any point of faith. The *Cisalpines* affirm, that in spirituals, the Pope is subject, in doctrine and discipline, to the church, and to a general council representing her; that he is subject to the canons of the church, &c. They affirm, that a general council may, without, and even against, the Pope's consent, reform the church.

Digitized by Google

They deny his personal infallibility, and hold that he may be deposed by the church, or a general council, for heresy or schism; and they admit, that in an extreme case, when there is great division of opinion, an appeal lies from the Pope to a future general council."*

Now let it be remarked, this is not a mere speculative question, but one of great practical importance. When the Pope speaks *officially*, or *ex cathedra*, do we hear the voice of Christ, whose vicar he professes to be; and must we, therefore, yield implicit faith and obedience? Or, do we hear the voice of a mere man, who may be in error; and may we doubt or oppose his sentiments? Surely this is a question of the utmost importance. The bishops beyond the Alps—the Transalpines—say, when the Pope issues his decision in regard to doctrines or morals, we hear the voice of Christ, and therefore must believe and obey. The *Cisalpine* bishops say, No, it is the voice of a *man*, who may be in error, who may even be deposed for heresy; and therefore we are not to render to his decisions implicit faith and obedience.

Roman Catholics talk fluently of the divisions among Protestants; but can they refer to any one point on which Protestants differ, which is of greater importance than this? We can, at least, agree *when* and *where* Christ speaks to us, even if we sometimes differ concerning the meaning of his language; but the church of Rome cannot determine *when* he speaks. How, then, can she interpret his language? Some hear him through the Pope; others do not there recognize his voice.

Truly this is a singular controversy. Would Christ impart to any man the important gift of inspiration, that he might guide his church in the path of truth, and yet not let him know his own inspiration, or not enable him to satisfy his people on that point? When Moses was divinely appointed to lead Israel to the promised land, he not only knew his own qualifications, but was enabled to satisfy the people on that head. Now, in regard to the popes, one of two things is true, viz: either they do not know whether they are infallible or not; or they cannot give to the church, the bishops. such evidence as will satisfy them. Why

* Let. x..

Digitized by Google

have not the popes decided "this dispute, so long agitated in the schools," as the Bishop Trevern says it has been? If they knew they were not infallible, why have they permitted so many bishops and people to believe and defend their infallibility? If they knew themselves infallible, why have they allowed so many others to doubt and dispute it? What are we to think of a man, who, knowing himself fallible, will yet permit those under his guidance to regard him as speaking under the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit? Or, shall we say, the popes knew themselves infallible; but Jesus Christ, though he imparted to them infallibility, has not given them the evidence to convince their bishops and people that they have it?

But what is still worse, the church, even in a general council, cannot settle this dispute. The Council of Trent, like other councils, was profoundly silent on the subject. Indeed, the question never can be determined; for the church, we are told, cannot make new articles of faith. To the end of time, therefore, this great practical question must remain undetermined. Romanists, indeed, tell us, it is matter of *opinion.* The truth is, those points about which the bishops of the church cannot agree, however important, they conclude to call *opinions;* and those on which they do agree, are dignified with a place amongst the *doctrines!* But this play upon words, this distinction without a difference, is only a vain effort to conceal an insurmountable difficulty.

But what if, at any time, the Pope and Council should differ? Why, Bishop Trevern says: "But if ever it should happen, which God forbid, and which we Gallicans think impossible, if it ever should happen, that the great number should separate from the head, it would then be necessary that one of the two parties should adopt the sentiments of the other, to preserve the church from schism, the greatest of all evils."* As the church cannot determine whether the Pope is infallible; neither can she decide concerning the limits of his authority. One party, as we have proved by Butler, and could easily prove by others, contends that he is above the church, and above a general council. The other

* Amica. Discuss., vol. i, p. 178.

Digitized by Google

maintains, that he is inferior to a council, and may be deposed for schism or heresy, by a general council. And the Bishop can only say, that if there should ever be a division about this matter, one or the other party must yield its claims!

And stranger still, the church of Rome cannot determine, or certainly has not yet determined, to what extent the Pope has *temporal power*, or the right, when he thinks the good of religion demands it, to depose kings and absolve their subjects from their oath of allegiance. Butler says, "*the Transalpine* divines attributed to the Pope a divine right to the exercise, indirect at least, of temporal power, for effecting a spiritual good; and, in consequence of it, maintained, that the supreme power of every state was so far subject to the Pope, that when he deemed that the bad conduct of the sovereign rendered it essential to the good of the church, that he should reign no longer, the Pope was then authorized, by his divine commission, to deprive him of his sovereignty, and absolve his subjects from their obligation of allegiance; and that even, on ordinary occasions, he might enforce obedience to his spiritual legislation and jurisdiction, by civil penalties."* The Popes were not slow to avail themselves of the *indefinite* authority conferred on them by their office. The tremendous progress of their unrestrained ambition is recorded by Butler, in the following language: "From an humble fisherman, the Pope successively became owner of houses and lands, acquired the power of magistracy in Rome, and large territorial possessions in Italy, Dalmatia, Sicily, Sardinia, France, and Africa, and ultimately obtained the rank and consequence of a great temporal prince. Here the Pope did not stop; but claimed, by divine gift, a right to exercise supreme temporal power over all Christian sovereigns, when a great good of religion required it."† Bishop Milner says, "it is undeniable, that different popes, in former ages, have pronounced deposition against certain contemporary princes and great numbers of theologians have held (though not as a matter of faith) that they had a right to do so."‡

Now, either the popes knew that Christ had given them no

* Book of Church, Let. x. † Ibid., Let. ix. ‡ End of Con., Let. xlvi.

Digitized by Google

such civil power as they claimed, or they did not. If they did not, they were amazingly ignorant of the plainest truths of the gospel they pretended to teach to the church, as well as of the nature and duties of the high office they professed to have received from Christ. For, Mr. Butler says, "This claim was unfounded; both the gospel and tradition declared against it, and it produced great evil."* And Bishop Milner says: "Even the incarnate Son of God, from whom he [the Pope] derives the supremacy, which he possesses, did not claim, here on earth, any right of the above-mentioned kind: on the contrary, he positively declared, that *his kingdom is not of this world!*"† If then, the popes put forth those claims *ignorantly*, how amazingly stupid they must have been! It is an article of the Roman Catholic faith, says Butler, that to the pope belongs "the *principal authority* in defining articles of faith;"‡ and yet he puts forth and exercises claims, as of divine gift, directly in the face of the plainest declarations of the Gospel! Nay, he claims power which, even Milner being judge, the Son of God himself did not claim, while on earth! And more than this, he was sustained in this claim, says Milner, by "great numbers of theologians;" and Cardinal Bellarmine, one of the most eminent of the Romish theologians, is found amongst the number. And these are the men to whom the church and the world are expected to look, as the divinely authorized expounders of God's word!!!

But if the claims in question were not set forth by the popes *ignorantly*—if they knew at the time, that Jesus Christ had given them no such power—what shall we say of their impious prostitution of an office they professed to regard as the highest and most sacred on earth? In the name of Jesus they deposed sovereigns from those offices which God in his providence had given them; and in the name of Jesus pretended to absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance. I can conceive of scarcely anything more impious. And if those theologians who defended those claims, were not stupidly ignorant, but did know they were defending falsehood, what shall we think of them? Are these the men to

* Book of Ch., Let. ix. † End of Con., Let. xlvi. ‡ Book of Ch., Let. x

Digitized by Google

whose expositions of God's word we are expected to look up with reverence? and to whose instructions we are required to commit our souls?

But, above all, what shall we say of "holy mother church," as the church of Rome is called, in view of the fact, that to this day she has never reproved those unauthorized and impious claims of her popes, sustained by great numbers of her theologians? Did the church know that Christ had given the popes no such power as they claimed and exercised? If she did not, she was more ignorant than Dr. Milner and Mr. Butler, and was a miserable interpreter of Scripture. If she did, why was not her reproving voice heard? Mr. Butler says, both the gospel and tradition were against the claims set forth by the popes; the church pretends to be the only authorized expounder of both gospel and tradition; and yet not one of her general councils has spoken against the impious claims so long set forth and exercised by them! Nay, even to this day, the pope is a temporal prince, exercising civil authority over a nation of people, making war and peace as other kings. And yet Christ, whose vicar he pretends to be, said, as Milner well remarks, that his kingdom was not of this world.

When, some years since, the question was agitated in England concerning the pope's temporal power, certain questions relative to it were sent to several universities in Europe. They answered, that the pope has no such civil power as divers popes have claimed. But why were not these questions sent to the pope himself? Why did he not inform the world, whether he repudiated the unhallowed claims of his predecessors? Who does not know, that the opinions of universities are of no value whatever? The pope is confessedly above them all; and again and again has he declared, that he has the right to exercise civil power over the nations. And of what avail was the oath taken by English and Irish Romanists on the same subject? Is the pope bound to regard it?

Let me appeal to the reason and common sense of the audience. Can you believe, that Jesus Christ appointed an office in

Digitized by Google

his church of such unspeakable importance, and so capable of being abused to the incalculable injury of the church and the world, without clearly defining the kind and the limits of the power connected with it, and the qualifications of the officer who should fill it? Suppose the kind and the degree of power to be exercised by the president of these United States, as undetermined as that exercised by the pope, and the qualifications of the man to fill the office no better understood; what would our constitution be worth? Will it be believed, that our Saviour was less wise than the framers of our civil government?

Again—was there ever a question in the Christian church, whether the apostle Peter was inspired? Was the question ever agitated in the days of the Apostles, whether Peter had the right to exercise civil power? No such questions were ever agitated. If, then, the popes be his successors, how happens it, that in the church of Rome there has been so much disputing about their inspiration and their authority?

Is a *general council* infallible? Some Roman bishops answer affirmatively, and some negatively. We might safely conclude that they have no infallibility, so long as they are unable to find it. But the first question that arises here is, *what is a general council?* We want a clear definition of this important body. We desire an *infallible* definition, too; for if it be fallible, it may be wrong, according to the reasoning of Roman writers; and, consequently, we cannot rely on it. Where, then, shall we obtain an infallible definition of a general council? We cannot get it from any council; for if a council declare itself to be general or œcumenical, we still desire evidence. Where shall we find it? Here we meet another puzzling difficulty, viz.: the New Testament says not a word about a general council. There is not even a distant allusion to such a body. This is quite as strange, if the doctrine of the church of Rome be true, as that the Constitution of the United States should say not a word about Congress, although it is to be the great legislative body of the nation! It is truly remarkable, that although the Apostles in their epistles, repeatedly warned the churches against false

Digitized by Google

teachers and religious errors; yet they never once directed them either to *Peter's chair*, or to a *general council.*

It is important to know what a general council is, and what proportion of those constituting it forms a *quorum*, that business may be infallibly done. Bishop Trevern, though he gives us no definition or description of a general council, says—"It is by *acceptation*, that we are convinced that a council is really œcumenical, and it is by acceptation equally that we know with certainty that the pope has pronounced *ex cathedra.*"* The church or the bishops, we are told, must *accept* the decrees of a council, before we can certainly know, that it is œcumenical or general; and they must *accept* the pope's decisions, before we can be sure that he has pronounced *ex cathedra.* Well, *what proportion* of of the bishops must accept the decisions of a council or pope, before they are to be regarded as infallible? "The bishops," says he, "united in the same opinion, *at least in a great majority.*"† These constitute the infallible judge. But the phrase—"a great majority"—is very indefinite. *How great* a majority must agree? Butler says—"When the general body, or a great majority of her [the church's] prelates, have assented to them [definitions and formulas of faith], whether by formal consent, or tacit assent, all are bound to acquiesce in them."‡ Here again all is indefinite. What does he mean by the general body or great majority? *How great* must the majority be? Now suppose the question is asked, what is meant by the Congress of the United States, and the answer, that when the representatives of the people are called together, and "the general body or great majority" are assembled, they can proceed to business; and when the United States, "at least in a great majority," *accepts* their decisions, it is clear that the body is rightly called the Congress. Would not the statement appear ridiculous? Could such a body know when to proceed to business?

But this is not the only difficulty involved in the doctrine of the infallibility of general councils. Their infallibility, if they have it, is altogether of a *new kind.* The only inspiration of

* Amica. Discuss., vol. i, p. 178. † Ibid., p. 169. ‡ Book of Ch., Let. x

Digitized by Google

which we read in the Scriptures is that of *individuals*. Moses was an inspired man, and so were Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and David, and Paul, and James, and Peter; and the writings of each of these men Roman Catholics themselves regard as the word of God. We do not find in the Bible a single example of a body of men, each of whom was fallible, constituting an infallible body. Yet such is the character of Roman infallibility; no one of the bishops pretends to be infallible, and yet the decrees of the council composed of these fallible men, we are told, are inspired and infallible! To say nothing of the absurdity of the idea, the fact that in the Scriptures we read of no such inspiration, the fact that Roman infallibility is of a *new kind*, is sufficient to render it more than suspicious. It evidently is not the genuine coin; it has not on it the stamp of heaven. The *successors* of the Apostles should have *apostolic infallibility*. Since the church of Rome has it not, we are forced to the conclusion that she is but a blind guide.

We have, in the Acts of the Apostles, an account of the first Christian council, which was an infallible council assembled to decide a great doctrinal question. Was it necessary to wait until it was ascertained whether the church would *accept* their decrees, before it could be known whether they were infallibly correct? No—that council said—"For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things," &c.; c. xv, 28. They knew they were under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and their decision was final. There was no waiting, as in the church of Rome, for the *acceptance* of the church.

The truth is plain, that the infallibility of the church of Rome, if she is infallible, is wholly of a *new kind*, unlike anything of which we read in the sacred Scriptures. And since we find there no intimation, that after the days of the Apostles, the church was to have a new kind of inspiration, we are obliged to conclude that her claims to inspiration are false and deceptive.

From the inconsistencies and contradictions of Rome, how pleasant to turn to the pure Word of God, "the lamp to our feet,

Digitized by Google

the light to our path." Truly, it is able "to make us wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Christ Jesus." Its glorious doctrines are set forth and illustrated with inimitable clearness and simplicity; and its promises, "exceeding great and precious," scattered richly over its sacred pages, cheer the heart of the believer on his journey to a better world. "We all with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." As "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work;" so, in this blessed volume we behold, written "in fairer brighter lines," the infinite perfections of our Heavenly Father, and the glorious plan of salvation which he has revealed.

This subject will be resumed in the next Lecture.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

LECTURE II.

ACTS, xvii, 11, 12. "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so."—"Therefore many of them believed: also of honorable women which were Greeks, and of men, not a few."

PAUL and Silas, as ambassadors of Christ, had visited Thessalonica, and, three successive Sabbaths, had entered the synagogue and reasoned with the Jews "out of the Scriptures," proving that Jesus was the Christ. The unbelieving Jews, in connection with certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, excited a great commotion in the city. The lives of Paul and Silas being endangered, the brethren sent them to Berea, where, entering the synagogue, they preached the gospel. The Bereans, more noble than the Thessalonians, heard them with deep interest, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether their doctrines were true. The result was, that many of them believed. From these facts the following important principles are deduced:

I. That the Scriptures were the only infallible guide in faith and practice, known either to the Apostles or the Berean Jews. The Apostles, we are told, "reasoned out of the Scriptures." The Bereans were not yet certain that their doctrines were true. How did they satisfy their minds on this subject? Not by an appeal to tradition, or to the high priest, or to the scribes and pharisees; but simply to the Scriptures. They certainly knew of no other source whence they could obtain certain information concerning the truth of the doctrines preached; and they needed no other.

II. The second principle deducible from the facts stated, is that by searching the Scriptures the people can ascertain their meaning, and can exercise true faith, without the aid of church

Digitized by Google

interpretation. The Bereans thus tested the truth of the Apostles' doctrines; and the result was, "many among them believed." Therefore, the doctrine of Romanists is not true, that those who search the Scriptures for themselves, "cannot make an act of faith."

III. To test by the Scriptures, the truth of the doctrines taught by professed ministers of Christ, is both a praiseworthy, and a safe course. "These were more noble than those of Thessalonica." Such is the commendation bestowed by the Holy Spirit on those who thus tested the doctrines, even of inspired men; although they could prove their divine mission by miracles. If it was both lawful and highly commendable in the Bereans to do so, and if they could correctly interpret the Scriptures of the Old Testament, is it not equally commendable in Christians now, and can they not, with the additional light of the New Testament, much more easily and certainly come to a knowledge of the truth? What, then, are we to think of the Roman clergy, who, while they claim to be the legitimate successors of the Apostles, shrink from the test to which they so cheerfully submitted, and condemn the people for doing precisely that which they so highly commended?

But, says Bishop Milner, in the effort to escape these conclusions, "They [the Bereans] searched the ancient prophecies to verify that the Messiah was to be born at such a time, and in such a place, and that his life and his death were to be marked by such and such circumstances."* Suppose we admit, though there is not a particle of evidence of it, that they confined their investigations to the ancient prophecies; it follows inevitably, that a part at least, of the prophecies of Scripture can, and must be understood, by the exercise of *private judgment.* Yet this same bishop, in order to prove that the whole business of interpreting the Scriptures belongs exclusively to the church, triumphantly quotes the passage, "No PROPHECY of Scripture is of any private interpretation." That is, he quotes a passage of Scripture to prove that individuals have no right to attempt to understand for them

* End of Con., Letter xii.

Digitized by Google

selves any part of the Scriptures, especially the *prophecies*, and then is compelled to acknowledge, that the Bereans did examine for themselves, even the ancient *prophecies*, did correctly understand them, and were commended by God for so doing! It is clear, therefore, that he grossly perverts the passage quoted. Peter was speaking, not of the *exposition*, but of the *inspiration* of the Scriptures. The Prophets, he says, are the interpreters of God's will to man; not the setters forth of their *individual notions*, their own private opinions—"for holy men spake of old as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Consequently, the prophecies, being given by inspiration, are "a more sure word, unto which," says Peter, "ye do well that ye take heed, as to a light that shineth in a dark place."* So far from forbidding an attempt on the part of the people to understand the writings of the Prophets, as being too obscure, he exhorts them to take heed to them, as a light shining in the midst of darkness.

Thus we find the first great doctrine of the Reformation, that the Scriptures are the only infallible guide in faith and practice, and that individuals can search and understand their sacred teachings, fully sustained. Let us further pursue this investigation—for it is one in which every human being is deeply, eternally interested.

I have offered two general arguments, clearly disproving the infallibility of the church of Rome, viz.: I. There is no evidence in favor of her claims, either from tradition or from Scripture. Not from tradition, because if there be traditions of divine authority, they are confessedly in the keeping of the church; and their authority depends upon her infallibility. Consequently, we must find the true church, and be satisfied of her infallibility, before we can receive her traditions. Not from Scripture, because that also, we are assured, is in the keeping of the church; so that we cannot know the Bible to be the Word of God, or understand its meaning, except as we rely upon the infallible church. Consequently, we must find the church, and be assured that she is infallible, before we can receive or understand the Scriptures.

* 2 Peter i, 19.

Digitized by Google

II. The controversies in the church of Rome, concerning her infallibility—whether the pope is infallible, and what is the kind and the extent of his authority; whether a general council is infallible; what is a general council, &c.—these controversies prove, that the church of Rome has not the gift of infallibility; that the inspiration which she claims, not being that of individuals, but of masses of men, is wholly unlike the inspiration of which we read in the Bible, and wholly unlike that of the first Christian council at Jerusalem.

I now proceed to present some additional arguments on this subject.

III. My third general argument against the infallibility of the church of Rome, is founded on the fact, that her infallibility, as claimed, *does not extend far enough.* It is not, in this respect, such infallibility as we read of in the Scriptures, nor such as the interests of the church require. In the first place, *a very large proportion of Scripture, it is admitted, she cannot expound.* It is a fact, that she has given no interpretation of the larger portion of the Bible. The reason why she has not, is given by Bishop Milner, "She does not dictate an exposition of the whole Bible, because she has no tradition concerning a very great proportion of it."* The church of Rome claims to be authorized and qualified by Jesus Christ to interpret his Word; she forbids all individuals to attempt what she calls *private interpretation;* and yet it is acknowledged, that she is unable to give any interpretation of a very large proportion of it. She cannot go beyond her traditions, and she has no tradition concerning that large portion of divine Revelation. Does not the Apostle Paul say, "ALL SCRIPTURE is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works?" But how can *all* of it be profitable, if a very large proportion cannot be understood? This large portion of divine Revelation, it would seem, must for ever remain a dead letter. The church cannot explain it, and she forbids individuals to attempt it. Can any rational mind

* End of Con., Let. xii.

Digitized by Google

believe, that Christ would have appointed and qualified his church, or her bishops, to interpret his Revelation to men, and yet have left her incapable of interpreting a very large proportion of it, which consequently must remain wholly useless? What would be thought of the Supreme Court of the United States, if, whilst claiming to be the only authorized interpreters of the Constitution, the judges should declare themselves unable to expound a very great proportion of it? Were the Apostles, whose legitimate successors the Roman bishops profess to be, confined in their expositions of Scripture, to *tradition?* Was it ever intimated, that they could not explain any part of it, because they had no tradition concerning it? No. The church of Rome pretends to an inspiration of a *new* kind, wholly inadequate to the discharge of those most important duties to which she professes to have been appointed. Her infallibility, therefore, is spurious, and her claims false.

Again: her infallibility, we are told, extends only to *doctrines* and *morals*, but not to *discipline* and *opinions;* and yet under these last heads are included matters most momentous to the interests of the church and the world. Bishop Hughes, of New York, says, "Besides *doctrines, articles of faith,* and *morals,* which are *immutable,* there is *discipline,* for which infallibility is neither claimed, nor necessary. * * * * There are, besides *doctrine* and *discipline, opinions*; but they are not about the divinity of Christ, or the real presence. They are on questions concerning which no positive revelation has been given by the Saviour, or preached by the Apostles."*

1. For her *discipline,* we are here told, the church does not claim infallibility. Let us look at some important matters of discipline, that we may determine whether her infallibility is apostolical.

The law by which she forbids the laity, the people, to receive the wine in the Lord's supper, is a matter, not of doctrine, but of discipline. Milner asserts, that the Catholic church, believing in the doctrine of transubstantiation, and "that the whole body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ equally subsist under each

* Breckenridge and Hughes' Written Discussion, No. v.

Digitized by Google

of the species of bread and wine, *regarded it as a mere matter of discipline*, which of them was to be received in the holy sacrament."* Now it is an admitted fact, that our Saviour, when he instituted this sacrament, did use both bread and wine. The Council of Trent says—"For although Christ the Lord did in the last supper institute this venerable sacrament of the eucharist *in the species of bread and wine, and thus delivered it to the Apostles*, yet it does not thence follow that all the faithful in Christ are bound by divine statute to receive both kinds." It must also be admitted, that Paul regarded both bread and wine as necessary to the sacrament; for he said, "As often as ye eat this bread *and drink this cup*, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread *and drink of that cup*."† Now it is certain, that our Lord had the best reasons for instituting this sacrament as he did, for using wine as well as bread; nor did he give the slightest intimation, that he intended any change in future. Even Roman writers acknowledge, that it is a *privilege* to receive the wine as well as the bread. "The French kings," says Milner, "since the reign of Philip, have had the PRIVILEGE of receiving under both kinds, at their coronation and at their death."‡ If our Saviour had good reasons, in instituting this sacrament, for using both bread and wine, how happens it, that the church of Rome has good reasons for withholding the cup? And if it be a *privilege* to partake of both kinds, by what authority do the Roman bishops deprive Christ's disciples of a privilege by him granted, and forbid any but the clergy to do what he permitted and commanded all to do?

In her discipline the church of Rome, it is admitted, is not infallible, and consequently she may err; and yet she ventures, as a matter of discipline, to change one of the most important ordinances instituted by our Saviour!—to forbid his people to partake of that ordinance as instituted by him!! Moreover, although it is acknowledged she *may* err in her discipline, she anathematizes every man who ventures to say, she *has* erred! In the second canon of the Council of Trent, on communion in one kind, &c.,

* End of Con., Let. xxxix. † 1 Cor. xi, 26, 28. ‡ End of Con., Let. xxxix.

Digitized by Google

we find the following language: "Whoever shall affirm, that the holy Catholic church had not just grounds and reasons for restricting the laity and non-officiating clergy to communion in the species of bread only, or that she hath erred therein, let him be accursed." The boldness of her impiety is astonishing. She first ventures to change one of the ordinances instituted by infinite wisdom, admitting that, as it is a matter of discipline, she may be in error; and then anathematizes any one who ventures to say, she has erred! The truth is, the change was made in order to sustain the absurd doctrine of transubstantiation. For, if the doctrine of Rome be true, there is no reason why wine should have been used at all, since, after the change, it is declared to be precisely the same as the bread! Dr. Milner admits, that if Protestants understand the ordinance aright, both bread and wine are necessary. "I do not deny," says he, "that in the mere figurative system, there may be some reason for receiving the liquid as well as the solid substance, since the former may appear to represent more aptly the blood, and the latter the body; but to Catholics, who possess the reality of them both, the species or outward appearance is no more than a matter of changeable discipline."* This is truly an important concession. It amounts to this: if the Protestant doctrine be true, the wisdom of Christ is seen in appointing wine as well as bread to be used; but if Romanists are right, there was no propriety in the use of both elements. Truly the church that ventures thus boldly to change divine institutions, and to impugn the wisdom of the Head of the Church, ought to possess the highest degree of infallibility, not only in doctrine, but in discipline!

2. The law forbidding the clergy to marry, is also a matter of *discipline*. Bishop Purcell, in reply to Alexander Campbell, says, "Now, in the first place, celibacy is no part of Catholic doctrine, at all. It is not an article of faith. The pope could, to-morrow, change that law, and allow the Roman Catholic clergy, as the Greek priests do, to marry. * * * * I glory in this feature of our *discipline*."† Here, again, the discipline of

* End of Con., Let. xxxix. † Purcell and Campbell's Debate, p. 191.

Digitized by Google

Rome is directly in the face of the Scriptures. It is not, and cannot be denied, that the Apostle Peter, when chosen by Christ, had a wife, and that Paul the Apostle, writing under divine inspiration, did expressly mention marriage as lawful and honorable in the clergy. In 1 Tim. iii, 2, 4, we read as follows (Doway Bible): "It behoveth, therefore, a bishop to be blameless, the husband of one wife—one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all chastity." Again, Tit. i, 6: "If any be without crime, the husband of one wife, having faithful children," &c. In these passages, the Apostle is describing the character of those who might be ordained as bishops. Does he require them to be unmarried? Does he not expressly mention married men as suitable persons to fill the office? Whence, then, I ask, has the church of Rome derived her authority for excluding all men from the Christian ministry, who do not choose to live a life of celibacy? By what right does she forbid ministers of the gospel to do what the Holy Spirit expressly permitted them to do? Who gave her authority to depose or exclude men from the ministry, simply because they possess precisely the character described by the inspired Paul, as suitable for that office?

This is not all, nor the worst. The church of Rome not only forbids what God expressly permits, and excludes men from the ministry for doing what he directly approves, but she undertakes to nullify one of his institutions in the face of his express prohibition! Our Saviour said of the husband and wife—"They are no more twain, but one flesh. *What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.*"* In the face of this solemn prohibition the pope of Rome does put asunder husbands and wives. If a Protestant minister becomes a convert to the church of Rome, and desires to enter her ministry, he cannot do so, until he has made himself guilty of putting away his wife, which crime the pope converts into a virtue! More than one case of this kind has recently occurred. Episcopal clergymen have joined the church of Rome, put away their wives in order to

* Matth. xix, 6.

Digitized by Google

assume the priestly office, and, as Roman papers inform us, one of them administered the communion to his former wife and daughter!

Peter, as Bishop Purcell is constrained to acknowledge, had a wife; but when pressed with this fact by Mr. Campbell, he replied—"My friend says, that Peter was married; but I defy him to prove that he retained his wife after he became a bishop."* What! we cannot prove that Peter did not, in order to be a good bishop, do what Jesus Christ expressly forbade any man to do! Let the bishop, if he can, produce the slightest proof, that Peter was ever guilty of the crime of putting away his wife. We prove, and he admits, that Peter, when chosen to be an apostle, had a wife; and we prove that, long afterwards, Paul, when pointing out the qualifications of a bishop, mentioned marriage as lawful and honorable. It is for the bishop to prove, that Peter put away his wife. Let him try.

But the bishop glories in this feature of Rome's discipline. "Death," exclaims he, "before dishonor, to a virginal priesthood."† That is, the bishop would sooner die, than pollute and dishonor himself and his office as the Holy Spirit expressly permitted primitive bishops to do! What a charge does he venture to bring against God!—that he expressly permitted the bishops of his church to dishonor themselves and their ministry in a way and to a degree to which death itself were to be preferred! Verily, when men pretend to be purer than God requires them to be, there is rottenness at the heart. When the Jews were most zealous in cleansing the outside of the cup and the platter, going through their self-appointed ablutions, Jesus Christ compared them to "whited sepulchres."

I must pause here long enough to give you, my friends, a glance at a portion of the boasted "virginal priesthood," as they are described by Rev. Joseph Reeve, a Roman clergyman, in his History of the Church—a work patronized by Bishops Hughes, of New York, and Kenrick, of Philadelphia. He says—"(A. D. 1074)—Simony and incontinence had struck deep root among

* Purcell and Campbell's Debate, p. 147 † Ibid., p. 191.

Digitized by Google

the clergy of England, Italy, Germany, and France. The evil began under those unworthy popes who so shamefully disgraced the tiara by their immoral conduct in the tenth century; the scandal spread, and had now continued so long, that the inferior clergy pleaded custom for their irregularities. Many even of the bishops were equally unfaithful to their vow, and with greater guilt. Hence, the corrupt laity, being under no apprehension of a reproof from men as deeply immersed in vice as they, gave free scope to their passions. To stem the torrent of so general a licentiousness, which then deluged the Christian world, required the zeal and fortitude of an apostle."* Such was the character of the "virginal priesthood" of the "*holy* mother church," during several successive generations. Such is their character, as drawn by a *friendly* hand—an ardent advocate of the purity and infallibility of his church. If such a man felt constrained to draw such a picture of the church, what should we see, could it be drawn by an impartial hand? Amongst Protestant ministers there have been men of corrupt principles and licentious habits; but so soon as discovered, they have been deposed from the ministry. But never could it be said, with even a shadow of truth, that the Protestant churches were "*deluged*" with the sin of licentiousness. Suppose those popes had been as Peter, whose chair they pretended to fill, and the clergy had had each his own wife, would this most disgraceful state of things have existed?

But the unnatural law forbidding the clergy to marry, we are told, is a mere matter of discipline, which the pope could at once change. In her discipline the church is confessedly fallible, and may err; yet she and her popes boldly venture upon a discipline directly contrary to that of Christ and his Apostles! What can we think of such infallibility? Rather, what shall we think of such daring presumption?

3. Once more, the law forbidding the laity to possess or read the Scriptures, is a matter of discipline. This law, as enacted by the Council of Trent, or by a committee by them appointed, and sanctioned by the pope, is as follows: "Inasmuch as it is mani-

* Reeve's Hist. of the Church, vol. i, p. 515.

Digitized by Google

fest, from experience, that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the bishops, or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented, and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. Booksellers, however, who shall sell, or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue, to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use; and be subjected by the bishop to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offense. But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles, without a special license from their superiors."*

Such is the law enacted by Rome to prevent the people from reading, not a Protestant translation, but even a Roman Catholic translation of the Holy Scriptures. This law, too, like those already noticed, is directly in the face of the command of Christ, "Search the Scriptures." It proposes to punish men for having "the *presumption*" to do that which God highly commended in the Bereans! Yet it is, we are told, a matter merely of fallible discipline! Still those who venture to disregard it are to be visited with pains and penalties, temporal and spiritual! I repeat the remark — the church that thus ventures to change divine institutions and annul divine laws, ought to possess the highest degree of infallibility, and to be able to give overwhelming evidence that she has it!

Is the discipline of the church of Christ, involving matters such as those just enumerated, so unimportant that he would withhold his divine guidance in reference to it, which he

* Index of Prohibited Books.

Digitized by Google

granted in reference to doctrines? Were the Apostles fallible in the discipline they exercised? When Paul directed the Corinthian church to excommunicate an incestuous man, was he not infallible? When he directed Timothy and Titus to ordain married men as bishops, did he not write by inspiration? When Luke commended the Bereans for searching the Scriptures, and thus testing the truth of the doctrines of the Apostles, was he not under the guidance of the Holy Spirit? Yet the bishops of Rome, the pretended successors of the Apostles, are confessedly fallible in discipline! And yet, fallible as they are, they alter divine institutions and annul divine precepts! Verily, their inspiration is not from above.

But the church of Rome has *opinions*, too; and these, we are informed, relate to matters concerning which God has given no clear revelation. Infallibility is not, therefore, claimed for opinions. But under the head of *opinions*, Roman bishops in this country place some things of incalculable importance—things involving great moral principles—things involving even the lives of men! Under this head, as we have seen, is placed the question, whether the Pope is infallible, and the question whether he has temporal power. Under this head, too, are placed all the terrible persecutions of the church of Rome. This is clear from the following language of bishop Hughes, in his oral debate with Dr. J. Breckenridge; "There is no difficulty in admitting that the Waldenses, as well as the Albigenses were *persecuted* by the Catholics. This is not the question. But the question is, did Catholics ever persecute by virtue of any tenet of faith or morals, held by them as having been revealed by Almighty God? I answer boldly, never." * Catholics, he acknowledges, have persecuted; but then they did not persecute *doctrinally*—they only persecuted by virtue of *opinion!* Happy distinction! But, after all, this defense makes the matter worse. If they had sincerely believed that God required them to persecute, this faith, though erroneous, would have been, at least, a palliation of the crime. But, it seems, they had no such faith; and yet

* Breckenridge and Hughes' Oral Debate, p. 291

Digitized by Google

they did persecute multitudes unto the death! God had given no revelation on the subject; and yet their *opinion* was, that they ought to kill incorrigible heretics!

This mischievous opinion has been held and acted upon, not only by bishops, and popes, but by general councils. The Fourth General Council of Lateran, assembled in Rome, A. D. 1215, passed a document from which I will read a brief extract.

"We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy extolling itself against the holy, orthodox, Catholic faith, which we before expounded, condemning all heretics, by whatsoever names called, having indeed different faces, but having their tails bound together by a common agreement in falsehood, one with another. And being condemned, let them be left to the secular powers present, or to their bailiffs, to be punished with due animadversion; if clergymen, let them be first degraded from their orders, so that the goods of persons thus condemned, if of the laity, may be confiscated; if of the clergy, they may be devoted to the churches from which they have received their stipends. * * * * And let the secular powers be warned and induced, and if need be, condemned by ecclesiastical censures, what offices soever they are in; that as they desire to be reputed and taken for believers, so they publicly take an oath for the defense of the faith, that they will study in good earnest to exterminate to their utmost power, from the land subject to their jurisdiction, all heretics, devoted by the church; so that every one that is henceforth taken unto any power, either spiritual or temporal, shall be bound to confirm this chapter by an oath. But if the temporal lord, required and warned by the church, shall neglect to purge his territory of this heretical filth, let him, by the metropolitan and the provincial bishops, be tied by the bond of excommunication; and if he scorn to satisfy within a year, let that be signified to the pope, that he may denounce his vassals thenceforth absolved from his fidelity, and may expose his country to be seized by Catholics, who, exterminating the heretics, may possess it without any contradiction, and may keep it in the purity of the faith; saving the right of the principal lord, so be it he himself put no obstacle

Digitized by Google

thereto, nor impose any impediment; the same law, notwithstanding, being kept about them that have no principal lords. And those Catholics, that taking the badge of the cross, shall gird themselves for the extermination of heretics, shall enjoy that indulgence, and be fortified with that holy privilege, which is granted to those that go to the help of the Holy Land."

Heretics, you observe, are excommunicated and anathematized. Then the secular powers are commanded to exterminate them, "as they desire to be reputed and taken for believers." If they do not obey, they are to be excommunicated and deposed, their subjects absolved from their oath of allegiance, and their lands to be seized by Catholics. Those who should go about this bloody work zealously, were to wear the badge of the cross and have granted to them indulgences, such as were granted to the crusaders.

This terrific document was read by Dr. Breckendrige in the oral debate with Bishop Hughes. What was the bishop's reply? He would not, he said, vindicate the measure [the persecution], but stated the facts, and circumstances. "The Fourth General Council of Lateran," said he, "was assembled especially for the purpose of condemning the error of the Albigentian heresy. In this capacity it was infallible—because, as the representative organ of the church, it was discharging the duty for which the church was divinely instituted—viz.: teaching all truth, and consequently, condemning all error. But when they pass from the definitions of doctrines to the enactments of *civil* or *bodily penalties*, their decisions are sustained by no promise of infallibility, and by no authority derived from God, for that purpose. Whatever *right* they may have derived from other sources or circumstances, to inflict *civil* punishment, it is certain that they have derived none from their vocation to the holy ministry or the imposition of hands." Again he asserts, "that the law for their suppression did not even pretend to rest for its authority on any *doctrine* of the Catholic church, but upon the reward of confiscated lands and promised indulgences."* That is, the holy, infallible council, did its appropriate work in condemning heresy; and

* Oral Debate, pp. 71, 117, 118, 127.

Digitized by Google

then, turning aside from the duties of their office, as ministers of Christ, and therefore having no claim to infallibility, they passed a most bloody law, requiring civil rulers to murder and exterminate heretics from their several countries, prostituting their sacred office, and the keys of the kingdom by threatening with excommunication, deposition, and confiscation of lands, those who should refuse to do the bloody work, and offering indulgences—those "heavenly treasures"—to those Roman Catholics who should undertake the work in good earnest!!! It was only the *opinion* of the council that it was the duty of the civil magistrate to exterminate heretics! It was an opinion, however, which civil rulers *must* adopt and act upon, or meet the thunders of the Vatican and forfeit their crowns! They must obey the bloody decree, or be treated as heretics.

Now, either the council knew, as well as Bishop Hughes, that they had no right to pass such laws; or they did not. If they did not, how shall we account for the fact, that an infallible council of bishops, legitimate successors of the Apostles, were so astonishingly ignorant of the appropriate duties of their office? Can we believe men under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who have not yet learned the duties of their office? who are so grossly ignorant as to believe themselves authorized to require civil rulers to murder those they choose to regard as heretics, and who even encourage them to do the work zealously, by the offer of plenary indulgences? If they did know that they had no right to pass such laws, what shall we think of their bold impiety, and of the shameful prostitution of their office, as ministers of the "Prince of Peace," who came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them?

But they persecuted heretics, says Bishop Hughes, not *doctrinally*, but by virtue of their *opinion*, admitted to be fallible. Truly, it was a small matter to the poor Waldenses and Albigenses, whether technically their extermination was matter of doctrine, of opinion, or of discipline. The result was the same to them; nor will jesuitical technicalities change the character of the crime of their persecutors.

Cardinal Bellarmine, one of the most celebrated theologians

Digitized by Google

of the church of Rome, maintains (as an *opinion*, Bishop Hughes says) that the civil powers ought to punish incorrigible heretics by death. I give a quotation from his writings, as translated by the Bishop. "We, therefore, shall briefly show, that incorrigible heretics, and especially those who have relapsed, may and ought to be cast out from the church, and be punished by the secular powers, with temporal punishment, and with death itself."* The Bishop further says: "Every instance adduced by Bellarmine of this, is an instance by the authority of the state or by some emperor; but inasmuch as the civil rulers, who *made* and *executed these laws* against heretics, *were Catholics*, and the church had 'cast those heretics out,' he speaks of it as if the church itself had executed the laws."† Bellarmine attempted to prove his persecuting tenet—1st, "from the Scriptures;" 2d, "from the opinions and laws of the emperors, which the church has always approved;" 3d, "by the laws of the church." You have just heard Bishop Hughes' explanation of these arguments. He admits that Bellarmine speaks as if the church itself had executed these laws. Yes, and Bellarmine was right. Pilate had Jesus crucified; but he did it at the instigation and demand of the Jews. The civil rulers killed heretics; but they were "Catholics," and they did it in obedience to "holy mother church." And as the Jews were charged with the crucifixion of Christ, so is the church of Rome justly chargeable with all the blood of pretended heretics, ever shed by the civil power. Bellarmine considered the church answerable for it; and he justified her. Bishop Hughes does not venture, in this land of liberty, to justify her; and therefore he either charges the civil rulers with it, or makes the vain effort to defend her by placing her persecutions under the head of *opinions*.

The Inquisition, that most cruel, and most horrid of all institutions ever known in this ungodly world, was established, and has ever been sustained by popes. Of the multitudes who have perished in its dungeons, by its tortures, and at its *autos da fe*, we shall have no correct history till the day of judgment shall fully

* Oral Debate, p. 220. † Ibid.

Digitized by Google

reveal the works of darkness. This institution, driven from all other countries, as Bishop Hughes says, is yet cherished in Rome. Says he "Now the fact is, and it argues great ignorance not to know it, that, at this day, *out of the city of Rome* the Inquisition does not exist, either in fact or in name—either civilly or ecclesiastically, in any country under the sun."* In the very center of Catholicity, and under the immediate protection of the pretended vicar of Christ, this most cruel and detestable institution still finds "a local habitation, and a name." But the Inquisition, so much cherished at Rome, Bishop Hughes says, does not constitute "any part of our religion!!" But what are we to think of a religion, claiming to be inculcated by a body of men under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit, which yet permits and influences that very body to establish and perpetuate such an institution? But we pass this for the present.

The church of Rome, we are to believe, is infallible in doctrines, and in morals, and the authorized interpreter of the Bible. Now, the Bible says: "Thou shalt not kill." The question then arises —is it right, is it the duty of civil rulers to kill men, simply because their religious faith differs from that of the church? We turn to the infallible interpreter for an answer. She tells us, through her Bishop Hughes, that she does not know; at least, she has no *faith*, no *doctrinal belief* on this subject; that it was the *opinion* of Cardinal Bellarmine, Peter Dens, and other standard writers, that the civil rulers were bound to kill incorrigible heretics; that the Fourth General Council of Lateran thought so too, and therefore commanded them in the name of Christ, and under threat of severe punishment, forthwith to exterminate all such; but the church has no *doctrine*, no *faith*, on the subject. It is all matter of *opinion*! Now, does not every man of common sense see, that this is a great question of *morals?*—a question to be determined by the correct exposition of God's word? And are we to be told, that God has given no clear revelation on this subject; and that, therefore, the church leaves it as a matter of *opinion?* If there is no law of God on this point, then it cannot

* Hughes and Breck. Oral Debate, p. 170.

Digitized by Google

be a sin to kill heretics; for "where there is no law, there is no transgression." And since the people, when left to opinion, must form the best opinion they can; will they not most probably adopt the opinion of the General Council of Lateran, and of Cardinal Bellarmine? Will they not do this the more certainly, when they see that the kingdom of heaven was closed against those in former days, who refused to adopt it? However this may be, it is an admitted fact, that there is nothing in the religion, the doctrines, and morals, of the church of Rome, which forbids the most bloody persecutions! A pope and a general council may command civil rulers to exterminate heretics, without rejecting any article of their religion, or even creating a single doubt concerning their divine inspiration!!! What a system is this to claim as its author the Prince of Peace, and his inspired Apostles! Suppose Paul, and Peter, and James, and John, had exhorted and commanded civil rulers to exterminate heretics by fire and sword; or suppose the question asked them, whether it is right, under any circumstances, to kill men, because they do not believe as the church believes; and suppose they had said, they could not give an answer;—that it was a matter concerning which God had given no clear revelation—consequently a mere matter of *opinion;* would any sane man have admitted their claim to inspiration?

The fact is, the Roman clergy in this country, not daring openly to defend religious intolerance, place the horrid persecutions of the church—which involve fundamental principles of morals—under the head of *opinions*, only as an expedient to save her infallibility. They stand, therefore, in the singularly absurd attitude of maintaining, that men may be under the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, and may yet in the name of Jesus Christ encourage and require the most horrid cruelty.

Is it not perfectly clear, that the infallibility claimed for the church of Rome, does not extend far enough; that it is wholly unlike that of the inspired Apostles?

IV. My fourth general argument against the infallibility of the church of Rome, is—*that the Scriptures quoted in proof of it, really give it no support.* Strange as it may appear, Roman writers

Digitized by Google

assure us, that by the exercise of our private judgment we cannot understand the Scriptures, and then quote to us passage after passage of holy writ, and appeal to our understanding whether the meaning is not *manifestly* what they take it to be! We believe we can understand the word of God; and since they inconsistently make their appeal to our understandings, we will examine the passages adduced.

1. The first passage we notice, and which is universally adduced by Roman writers, is Math. xviii, 15—"Hear the church." I give the quotation in the form in which it is frequently presented. The argument is this: Jesus Christ commands us to hear the church; he would not command us to hear a fallible body; therefore the church is infallible. But in reference to *what* are we required to hear the church? Let us take the passage in its connection: "Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." Now let me ask again, what are men required to hear the church about? Is it in reference to *doctrine?* No—but in reference simply to a difficulty arising out of an injury done by one member of the church to another—simply in reference to a case of *discipline.* But does not Bishop Hughes state distinctly, that in matters of discipline the church does not claim infallibility? And yet in the face of this declaration a passage is adduced, having reference exclusively to *discipline,* in order to prove the church infallible in *doctrine!* And to make the argument still more ridiculous, a passage is brought forward to prove the infallibility of the universal church, which relates simply to a matter of difficulty between two members of the church, as if such a case were ever brought before a general council!

2. The next Scripture proof we notice is the promise connected with the commission given the Apostles by our Saviour—"Go

Digitized by Google

universally confessed, so many thousands have done."* The Roman church, the bishop gravely informs us, never did prohibit the reading of the Scriptures to the laity; she only required them to be able to read them in the original Hebrew and Greek! Or, if they could not do this, she required that they should read the Latin Vulgate! And, pray, why this requirement? Why, says he, the church guaranties its fidelity as a translation. But if they desired to read the Word of God in a modern tongue, what then? Why, they must be furnished by the "bishop or inquisitor" with some attestation of their piety and docility. For what purpose? That they may not be injured by a translation, the fidelity of which the church does not guaranty? No—no; but lest they should convert that salutary food of souls into deadly poison. So, what the bishop says about the fidelity of the Latin Vulgate translation was designed only to conceal the real object of his church, in prohibiting the people from reading the Scriptures. The Roman clergy understood perfectly that the people would not be able to read the Scriptures in the original languages, nor in the Latin Vulgate. They, therefore, felt that they were perfectly safe in forbidding them to read them in their native tongue, until they could procure from "the bishop or inquisitor" a written certificate, that they were so docile, that they never would understand them otherwise than as the clergy directed! "At present, however," says the Bishop, "the chief pastors have everywhere relaxed these disciplinary rules." Have the the clergy become convinced of the error and iniquity of their discipline? Or are we to attribute this relaxation to the influence of Protestants, who, laboring under what the Bishop calls "*the Bibliomania*," are resolved to circulate the Scriptures, and to expose the tyranny of Rome?

But let it not be forgotten, that even those who are *permitted* by the Roman clergy to read the Word of God, must still regard the decree of the Council of Trent, "that in matters of faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one, confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to

* End of Con., Let. xlvii.

Digitized by Google

wrest the sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which hath been held and still is held by holy mother church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of sacred Writ; or contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; even though such interpretations should never be published." They must regard that solemn pledge contained in the creed of Pope Pius IV—"I also admit the sacred Scriptures, according to the sense which the holy mother church has held and does hold," &c. Of what possible advantage can it be to the laity to be permitted to read the Scriptures, if they are positively required to see with the eyes of the clergy, to believe the meaning of the Scriptures to be just what they assert? Verily the Roman clergy seem to have a deep and abiding conviction, that the Scriptures are not likely to make Papists of those who read them? They have, therefore, taken from the people "the key of knowledge," and forbidden them, under severe penalties, ever to hear God speak. They must only hear the pope and his bishops tell what, *they* pretend, God has said! "They be blind leaders of the blind."

V. The last evil I shall now mention, which follows the adoption of the Roman Catholic rule, is—that errors once admitted can never be corrected. *Humanum est errare.* To err, is human; and the man who claims infallibility for all the sentiments he advances, is obliged, in order to sustain his pretensions, to defend as true every error into which he may fall. All the doctrinal errors and superstitions, therefore, into which the councils and popes of the dark ages fell, are forever entailed on the church of Rome, and must be implicitly believed by the most enlightened of her members and her clergy. For, if it be admitted that any general council adopted a single error in regard to doctrine or morals, the claim of the church to infallibility must be abandoned forever. Accordingly, every Roman Catholic professes, according to the creed of Pius IV, as follows: "I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise I also

Digitized by Google

condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church."

As a single specimen of what Roman Catholics must ever defend, I will read the decision of the Council of Constance in relation to the *safe conduct* granted by the Emperor Frederick to John Huss. This man may be regarded as the morning star of the Reformation. He arose early in the fifteenth century, and preached in Bohemia some of the prominent doctrines afterwards taught by the Reformers of the sixteenth century. Charged with heresy, he was summoned to appear before the Council of Constance. Aware of the spirit of the church at that day, he took the precaution to obtain from the Emporer a safe conduct, that he might go and return, safe from violence. When Huss arrived at the place he was forthwith imprisoned, in utter disregard of his safe conduct; and when tried and condemned as a heretic, he was handed over to the civil authorities to be punished, and was accordingly burned at the stake.

But Huss carried with him the Emperor's safe conduct. How, then, could he be imprisoned and burned, unless the Emperor should most shamefully disregard his own solemn pledge of protection? He was a good Catholic; and the Council felt bound to relieve his conscience. That *infallible* body, therefore, came to the following decision, which I give as translated by Bishop Hughes, of New York:

"This present sacred Synod declares, that, out of any safe conduct whatever, granted to heretics, or persons accused of heresy, by the Emperor, Kings, or secular Princes, by whatever tie they may have bound themselves, thinking thus to recall those persons from their errors, no prejudice to the Catholic faith can or ought to arise, nor any obstacle be thrown in the way of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by which it might be less lawful for the competent and ecclesiastical judge, notwithstanding said safe conduct, to inquire into the errors of such persons, and otherwise proceed against them, and punish them, as justice shall direct, if they obstinately refuse to retract their errors—even

Digitized by Google

though they come to the place of judgment, trusting to their safe-conduct, and otherwise would not have come: nor is he, who makes the promise, when he has done what is in his power to do, bound by any further obligation."*

Such is this famous document, the obvious meaning of which is, that the Emperor, however solemnly pledged to protect Huss, was not bound to regard his safe-conduct. The safe-conduct, of course, had no reference to the *ecclesiastical* trial which Huss had been summoned to undergo, nor to any ecclesiastical sentence that might be passed upon him, but simply to the protection of his person from violence, until his return home. Roman writers are not quite agreed as to the best method of defending this decision; for defend it they must, since it involves a most important principle in morals—a subject embraced within the church's claim to infallibility. Bishop Hughes says, "He had obtained his safe-conduct from the Emperor, *as going to the Council*, only."† So then, according to the Bishop, the infallible Council felt themselves solemnly called upon to decide, that the Emperor was not bound by a safe-conduct *which had expired!* He saves their infallibility by making them a company of perfect *simpletons!* Unfortunately, however, the Council did not decide, that emperors and kings were not bound by a safe-conduct, after the time for which it was granted had expired. They decided, that they were not bound to regard a safe-conduct, "*by whatsoever tie they may have bound themselves*," to prevent heretics from being punished "as justice shall direct,"—that they were not bound, "even though they come to the place of judgment, trusting to their safe-conduct, and otherwise would not have come." Reeve, in his Ecclesiastical History, attempts a different mode of defense. He says, "The passport contained nothing more than a *recommendation* from the Emperor to the magistrates and commanders of those towns and places, through which master John Huss had to pass in his way from Bohemia to Constance, that they would let him pass unmolested, and gratuitously provide him with every thing necessary for his journey, *both in going and returning*."‡

* Debate with Breckenridge, p. 168. † Ibid., p. 167. ‡ Hist. of Ch., v. ii, p. 167.

Digitized by Google

Here, it will be perceived, Reeve, though zealously defending the council, flatly contradicts Hughes. For he states, that the safe-conduct included not only his journey to Constance, but his *return;* whilst Hughes positively declares, that it included only his journey *to* Constance, and adds—"Yet almost all Protestants, deceived by their writers and ministers, assert that the Emperor had bound himself to bring him safe back." There is another most important point in regard to which these two Rev. defenders of the council contradict each other. Hughes admits that the document granted Huss was properly a safe-conduct, securing protection on his journey to Constance; while Reeve represents it as merely a *recommendation* from the Emperor to the magistrates, &c. The former defends the Emperor and the council on the ground, that the safe-conduct had expired; the latter defends them on the ground, that although it had not expired, yet it was "nothing more than a *recommendation*," and therefore not binding! Both, however, agree to save the infallibility of the council by making them act as *simpletons.* Hughes, as already remarked, makes them gravely decide, that emperors, kings, and civil rulers, are not bound by a safe-conduct after it has expired; and Reeve makes them determine, that civil rulers are not bound to enforce a mere *recommendation.* Unfortunately for both of them, the council, as the decree proves, decided neither of these questions, but one of very different character, viz: that civil rulers, however solemnly pledged to do so, are not bound to protect from corporeal punishment persons denounced by the church as *heretics.* Evidently the council desired to have Huss put to death; and, to gain this point, they solemnly decided the principle to be correct, *that faith is not to be kept with heretics, if thereby the interests of the church of Rome are likely to suffer!*

Such are a few of the difficulties in which those persons are involved, who undertake to defend the infallibility of the erring popes and councils of the church of Rome. Other similar difficulties were pointed out, in a preceding lecture, as involved in the effort to defend the infallibility of the Fourth Council of Lateran.

Digitized by Google

Examples might be pointed out almost *ad infinitum;* but some of them will come up in the succeeding discussion.

How infinitely preferable the Protestant rule—the sacred Scriptures! Roman Catholics themselves acknowledge, that the books received by us into the sacred canon, are truly inspired. We are cumbered with no human compositions, and no traditions, "making the word of God of none effect." We go not in search of the unanimous consent of fallible men, through thousands of pages of musty folios. We come at once to the pure Word of God. No haughty priesthood are permitted to step between us and our Saviour, and forbid us to peruse the language of him who spoke as never man spoke. By that Word which is "a light to our feet and a lamp to our path," we may walk safely. By the same infallible rule adopted by the noble Bereans, we can "try the spirits, whether they be of God." Men may pervert its plain meaning, and, in the name of Christ, teach the most monstrous errors; but the sincere inquirer after truth may still "search the Scriptures daily whether these things are so." We may ourselves err, but we can re-examine the sacred volume and correct our errors. Not so with Rome. All the monstrous errors committed by an ignorant priesthood during the dark ages, are fastened upon her. She cannot renounce one of them without endangering her very existence.

Let Roman writers disparage the Bible as a "dead letter;" we know it has infinitely more life in it than the canons of general councils, which were made, and must of necessity be interpreted, by fallible men. The Holy Spirit spoke far more lucidly by "holy men of old," than ever Roman council spoke. Peter wrote with far greater simplicity and clearness, than any of his pretended successors. And Jesus, "the light of the world," suffers none who candidly and prayerfully read his heavenly instructions, to walk in darkness. If it be said, men differ widely in their interpretations of the Bible, we reply: 1. They differ as widely about the questions whether the church of Rome is the true church, and whether she is infallible. Of all the members of the church of Rome, comparatively few have ever examined

Digitized by Google

these questions at all. Born and educated in that church, they have from infancy been taught to regard it as the only true church, and to look upon their clergy as infallible guides. But of those who have given the subject a careful examination, great numbers have been convinced, that the claims of that church are utterly false. She has never been able to produce her credentials to the satisfaction of those whom she desires to have placed under her infallible tuition. If it be said the evidences in her favor are quite sufficient, and that men have erred because of their prejudices; we reply (and with far better evidence in support of our affirmation), that the Bible is sufficiently plain, and easily understood; but men, from the blinding influence of their depravity, have erred from the truth. 2. That all her proud claims have not prevented heresies and schisms shaking her very foundations. We imitate the example of the noble Bereans, and leave those whc will, to commit themselves to Rome.

Digitized by Google

LECTURE IV.

Romans xiv, 12. "So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

In this passage of Scripture we have, distinctly taught, the doctrine of individual accountability—the doctrine that every man is responsible to God for his religious faith and for his moral conduct, and must meet, each for himself, the legitimate consequences of the course he may pursue. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." This is indeed a fundamental doctrine of both natural and revealed religion—a doctrine, the denial of which would force us to the conclusion, that there is no such thing as sin or holiness in men. Its truth is so obvious, and so universally acknowledged, that further proof is unnecessary.

From this doctrine flows the inalienable right of every man to investigate, with the utmost freedom, all religious tenets and moral principles. Each individual is accountable to God, both for his faith and his conduct. If, therefore, any one blindly follow the dictation of errorists, or allow himself to be deceived by their sophistry, they, however accountable for their own sin in misleading him, cannot answer for him at the bar of God. Before that august tribunal "every one shall bear his own burden." It follows, as a necessary consequence, that to every individual belongs the right, and upon every one is devolved the solemn duty, to examine carefully the grounds of that faith, and of those moral principles, in which is involved all that is dear to him forever. And, therefore, no more impious and cruel tyranny was ever practiced on earth, than that which deprives men of this dearest of all rights, and prevents them from discharging this most important of all duties.

Digitized by Google

Religion is an affair exclusively of the *mind*—the understanding, the affections, and the conscience. Consequently, the attempt to propagate it either by civil penalties, or temporal rewards, is perfectly absurd. Neither the one nor the other can really enlighten the understanding, mould the affections, or give direction to the conscience. They may, as they often have done, fill the church with hypocrites, whilst the honest and conscientious believers become the subjects of oppression and persecution; but they never made one sincere convert, or brought to repentance one back-slider.

Besides, the power to persecute is in the majority; and since, in our erring world, the great majority have always been in the wrong, so it has happened (and so it will happen) that error and sin have been patronized, and truth and righteousness oppressed and persecuted. Civil rulers, it is well known, are not likely to be either men of eminent piety, or of correct Scriptural knowledge. With them, religion, when at all patronized, is too commonly made a mere political tool; and one party is upheld, and another oppressed, simply with reference to political ends. No wonder, then, that our Saviour and the Apostles, though strictly regardful of all other civil laws, rebelled most pertinaciously against those interfering with religious faith and practice. They were as bitterly denounced, and as sorely persecuted by the Jews and Romans, for their departure from the established faith, as their disciples have often been since, by both civil and ecclesiastical tyrants.

I propose now to prove, *that the fundamental doctrines and principles held by the church of Rome are wholly inconsistent with the Scriptural doctrine just announced; and consequently they are false in religion, and ruinous in their effects upon human freedom and happiness.* The truth of this proposition will be established with the clearness of demonstration, by a careful examination of those fundamental principles, as set forth in standard works, and as developed in the past history of that church.

I. The fundamental doctrines of the church of Rome put the mind, with all its powers, completely in the hands of her clergy.

Digitized by Google

Consequently, they dictate its principles of action, mould its affections, direct its conscience, and thus, in all things, civil, ecclesiastical, moral and religious, govern every one of their followers. That this statement is not too strong will appear conclusively by the following facts:

1st. The Council of Trent, as I proved in my first discourse, decreed, "that in matters of faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one, confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to wrest the sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which hath been held, and still is held, by holy mother church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Writ; or contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; even though such interpretation should never be published. If any disobey, let them be denounced by the ordinaries, and punished according to law." It will be remembered, too, that Bishop Trevern announces it as an established principle, "that to the bishops exclusively belongs the right of declaring what has, or has not, been revealed; that is, what is conformable or contrary to Scripture and tradition, or simply to one of the two."

Now let the audience carefully weigh these fundamental principles of the church of Rome. To her bishops, headed by the pope, belongs exclusively the right of declaring what God has revealed to men as an article of faith, and what, as a matter of duty, he requires them to do. They are to *declare;* the people, the most enlightened as well as the most ignorant, are simply to believe and obey. "Mixed from henceforth," says Bishop Trevern, "with the simple and little ones, the most learned doctors lay down their private opinions, humbly confess that they were in error, and receive the decisions of the bishops as decrees emanating from Heaven."* So much the Roman bishops require, and so much the creed of Pius IV makes every one most solemnly promise to yield. The demand is exceeding broad. Not only in the matter of doctrine and morals are the bishops to be heard and implicitly obeyed, but also in "*whatever relates to the main-*

* Amica Discuss., v. i, p. 170.

Digitized by Google

tenance of Christian doctrine;" that is, in relation to their *discipline.*

Now, when a Roman Catholic has agreed to believe, as an article of religious faith, whatever those bishops propound as such, to perform whatever they announce as a moral duty, and to aid in carrying out all their discipline, can they not constrain him to do just what they please? Is not his *soul* completely in their hands? His understanding admits as true whatever they propound; his heart is to approve whatever they pronounce morally right; his conscience constrains him to yield them ready obedience, and his will executes their command. Suppose they teach him, as an article of faith, that heresy is a greater crime than theft or murder, and that, therefore, heretics ought to be put to death; must he not believe the doctrine, and act accordingly? He must do so, or renounce his faith. A man's religious faith and moral principles make him what he is—a blessing or a curse to the society of which he forms a part; and he who has complete control over men in these matters, makes them just what he pleases.

2d. But we have not yet a complete view of the enormous power of the Roman clergy over their people. They do not stop with convincing the people that they are perfectly blind, and must submit to be led by them; but they claim a tremendous power to enforce their dictation and their commands—a power more terrible to those who admit its existence, as every Romanist does, than that wielded by the most cruel despot that ever trampled under foot the liberties of men. I mean, *the power judicially to forgive or retain sins.* One of the most prominent doctrines of the church of Rome requires every individual frequently to confess to a priest all his mortal sins, not generally, but particularly. "The universal church," says the Council of Trent, "has always understood that a full confession of sins was instituted by the Lord as a part of the sacrament of penance, now explained, and that it is necessary, by divine appointment, for all who sin after baptism: because our Lord Jesus Christ, when he was about to ascend from earth to heaven, left his priests in his

Digitized by Google

place, as presidents and judges, to whom all mortal offences into which the faithful might fall, should be submitted; that they might pronounce sentence of remission or retention of sins by the power of the keys."* Here, you observe, the priests are represented as *judges*, actually forgiving or retaining sins. This idea is made more prominent in the following chapter, where the council say, "Again: though the priest's absolution is the dispensation of a benefit which belongs to another, yet it is not to be considered as merely a ministry, whether to publish the gospel, or to declare the remission of sins, *but as of the nature of a judicial act, in which sentence is pronounced by him as a judge.*"†

I cannot pass this point without reading one or two extracts from the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which is an authorized exposition of the doctrines of Rome. I quote Donovan's translation, revised and corrected by Bishop Hughes, of New York. "The voice of the priest, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ himself, who said to the lame man, "Son be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee." Again: "Unlike the authority given to the priests of the Old Law, to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy, the power with which the priests of the New Law are invested, is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but as the ministers of God, really to absolve from sin; a power which God himself, the author and source of grace and justification, exercises through their ministry." I must read one more extract, in which it is boldly asserted, that it is impossible to enter heaven without priestly absolution. "To obtain admittance into any place, the concurrence of him to whom the keys have been committed is necessary; and therefore, as the metaphor implies, to gain admission into heaven, its gates must be opened to us by the power of the keys, confided by Almighty God to the care of his church. This power should otherwise be nugatory: if heaven can be entered without the power of the keys, in vain shall they, to whose fidelity they have been entrusted, assume the prerogative of prohibiting indiscriminate entrance within its portals."‡

* Sessio xvi, cap. v, De Con. † Cap. vi. ‡ pp. 180, 182, 192, 93.

Digitized by Google

More daring presumption than is here exhibited, the lofty pride and boundless ambition of man never perpetrated. It is true, that Jesus gave to his ministers "the keys of the kingdom of heaven;" but what means this phrase, as used in the New Testament? Let any one take the trouble to turn to the places where it occurs, and he cannot avoid the conviction, that by the kingdom of heaven our Saviour meant the Christian church under the New Dispensation. He appointed the Apostles to be ministers of his church on earth, and authorized them to preach to all, the gospel of the Kingdom, to open the door of the church to those who gave credible evidence that they were qualified to enter; and to close it against those of an opposite character. Never did the Apostles of Christ pretend to admit any one into heaven itself, or to exclude any from it. It remained for the lofty pride of the Roman clergy to put forth such impious claims! But we are now concerned simply with the fact, that they have been set forth, and admitted by all Roman Catholics, and that they must be admitted by all who may become connected with the church of Rome. How far they are authorized by the Word of God, we shall inquire in another lecture.

Let any man think for a moment, how tremendous the power exercised by the Roman clergy over all who admit their pretensions. They propound articles of faith; and he who questions one of them, is informed that the keys of heaven are in the hands of the clergy; and unless he receive implicitly the dogmas, his sins will not be forgiven, and he will be excluded from heaven. They issue their mandates; and he who refuses or hesitates to obey them, however unreasonable or even monstrous they may appear, is informed that the doors of heaven are closed against his soul, that the anathema of God is upon him. The most exciting appeals are made to his fears and his hopes. The interests of eternity depend, as every Romanist believes, upon securing priestly absolution. And not only in the enforcement of what is properly called *doctrine* and *morals* is it in the power of the clergy to withhold absolution. Even their fallible *discipline* may be enforced by the same tremendous sanctions. For

Digitized by Google

example, the Council of Trent forbid the laity to read or possess the Bible without a *written permission* from the bishop or inquisitor; and they add—"But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, *he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary.*"* If any one disobey the mandate of the clergy, even in matters of discipline, in which they do not claim infallibility, his soul is held under mortal sin, exposed to eternal torments! What proportion of Roman Catholics, suppose ye, would thus endanger their eternal salvation, rather than obey their clergy, even in matters at which all their better feelings revolt?

The truth is, the power of the pope and his clergy over their people, is absolutely *unlimited.* We have already proved that the popes, many of them at least, have claimed, as of divine right, sovereign authority over princes, and have often exercised this authority in absolving their subjects from their oath of allegiance, and deposing them from office. We will now see what power is ascribed to the pope and his clergy by the Catechism of the Council of Trent. Of the pope it employs the following language: "Sitting in that chair in which Peter, the prince of the Apostles, sat to the close of life, the Catholic church recognizes in his person *the most exalted degree of dignity, and the full amplitude of jurisdiction; a dignity and a jurisdiction not based on synodal or other human constitutions, but emanating from no less authority than God himself.* As the successor of St. Peter, and the true and legitimate vicar of Jesus Christ, he, therefore, presides over the Universal Church, the Father and Governor of all the faithful, of Bishops, also, and of all other prelates, be their station, rank, or power, what they may."† Do you see here any limitation of his power? "The most exalted degree of dignity, and the full amplitude of jurisdiction." What more could he possess or desire?

But let us see what power is ascribed, in the same Catechism, to the clergy generally. "Priests and bishops are, as it were, the

* Index of Prohibited Books. † p. 222.

Digitized by Google

interpreters and heralds of God, commissioned in his name to teach mankind the law of God, and the precepts of a Christian life—they are the representatives of God upon earth. Impossible, therefore, to conceive a more exalted dignity, or functions more sacred. *Justly, therefore, are they called not only angels, but gods, holding as they do, the place and power, and authority of God on earth.*"* Roman Catholics have often complained that they were slandered when charged with calling the pope *God;* but here we find it declared that not only the bishops, but even the priests, are justly called *gods*, because they hold the place and power, and authority of God on earth! Who will presume to limit the authority of *these Gods on earth?* Who will dare rebel against the authority of men who fill the place, and exercise the power and authority of God? Who will venture to limit their jurisdiction to spiritual things?

Who does not see, that every individual who admits these most impious claims, as every Roman Catholic does, must become a mere machine in the hands of the clergy, most blindly receiving all the principles they inculcate, and obeying all the mandates they are pleased to issue? No wonder the pope expects those who approach him to prostrate themselves, that they may enjoy the exalted privilege of kissing his great toe! No wonder the bishop expects his subjects to kneel and kiss his ring! These acts suitably indicate that blind and implicit obedience which must and will be rendered to them by every sincere Romanist.

Was it ever known, since the fall of man, that unlimited power was placed in the hands of a particular class of men, without its being used for purposes of oppression and tyranny? The history of man furnishes not a solitary example. But let it not be forgotten, that the authority of the Roman clergy is of a peculiar kind—far more potent than any other. The power of other tyrants has extended only to the bodies and estates of men; but their's lays hold of the soul, and binds its every faculty. It blinds the understanding, moulds the affections, directs the conscience,

* p. 212.

Digitized by Google

and enforces its mandates by all the hopes and fears of eternity. From the grasp of other oppressors men may escape by flight, and be safe; but the terrible anathemas of these haunt the superstitious soul wherever it wanders. Death, if nothing else, will place the oppressed beyond the grasp of all other tyrants; but these profess to hold the keys of the kingdom of glory; and the dying Papist is overwhelmed at the thought of departing without having secured from them a passport to heaven.

And is there anything in the character of the Romish clergy to render this tremendous power harmless in their hands? It is admitted, even by the most zealous defenders of Romanism, that a number of the popes, and vast numbers of the bishops, have been men of most infamous character. Rev. J. Reeve thus describes the clergy of the 11th century: (A.D. 1074,) "Simony and incontinence had struck deep root among the clergy of England, Italy, Germany, and France. The evil began under those unworthy popes who so shamefully disgraced the tiara by their immoral conduct in the tenth century; the scandal spread, and had now continued so long, that the inferior clergy pleaded custom for their irregularities. Many, even of the bishops, were equally unfaithful to their vows, and with greater guilt."* Such was the torrent of licentiousness that this writer says, it "deluged the Christian world." Yet, by this shameful immorality, the clergy, still claiming infallibility, and holding, professedly, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, lost none of their power over the superstitious multitude. Is it any wonder that such men employed their tremendous power for purposes of tyranny, and for gain of "filthy lucre?" And what is the character of the mass of the Roman clergy, now? Is it not notorious, that in every country where the restraining influence of Protestantism is not felt, they are men, to a great extent, given to wine and licentiousness? How is it in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, South America? And are these the men in whose hands the most unlimited power over the people may be safely trusted?

II. *But let us inquire into the avowed principles of the church*

* Reeve's Hist. of the Church, vol. i, p. 515.

Digitized by Google

of Rome, or, more properly, of the Roman clergy, on the subject of RELIGIOUS TOLERATION. We have already proved, by Butler, that popes have claimed and exercised temporal authority over kings and other civil rulers, deposing them from their office, and absolving their subjects from their oath of allegiance; and, by Milner, that many theologians have maintained that they have the right to exercise the power. In the 13th century, Innocent III, in accordance with the unanimous advice of the cardinals, bishops, and other members of his council, "pronounced sentence of deposition against John, the King of England, declaring the throne vacant, and his former subjects no longer bound by any oath of allegiance to him;" and in terror of the Pope's anathemas, or of their effects upon his subjects, John so far degraded himself that he, "for the remission of his sins," as he expressed himself, "resigned England and Ireland to God, to St. Peter, and St. Paul, to Pope Innocent and his successors in the Apostolic chair, and that he engaged himself and his successors to hold these dominions as feudatory to the church of Rome, by the annual payment of a thousand marks, seven hundred for England and three hundred for Ireland."* Other kings and emperors suffered in the same way. The exercise of this power, let us not forget, has never been condemned by the church of Rome, or by any general council; nor has it ever been renounced by any pope. One of the last instances in which any pope ventured to exercise it, was in the case of Elizabeth, Queen of England, who was deposed, and her subjects absolved from their oaths of allegiance, by Pope Pius V. "The popes, in some cases," says Bishop Hughes, "as that of Queen Elizabeth, did affect to release subjects from their allegiance."†

We will now inquire into the principles of the Roman clergy concerning the rights of conscience, and the proper treatment of those they call heretics. We will first hear from Cardinal Bellarmine, a nephew of one of the popes, and a writer of high authority in the church of Rome. I give the quotation as presented by Rev. Dr. J. Breckenridge, in his written discussion with

* Reeves' Hist of Ch., v. ii, pp. 77-80. † Breck. and Hughes' Dis., p. 263.

Digitized by Google

Hughes, in reply to which that gentleman could only say, "Bellarmine himself must be responsible for his opinions on this subject."

THIRD BOOK ON THE LAITY, ch. 21st.

"*That heretics condemned by the church may be punished with temporal penalties, and even with death.* We will briefly show that incorrigible heretics, and especially those who have relapsed, may and ought to be rejected by the church, and to be punished by the secular powers with temporal punishments, and even with death itself. In the first place, this is proved by the Scriptures. It is proved, secondly, by the opinions and laws of the emperors, which the church has always approved. It is proved, thirdly, by the laws of the church. Fourthly, it is proved by the testimony of the Fathers. Lastly, it is proved by natural reason. For, first, it is owned by all, that heretics may of right be excommunicated—of course they may be put to death. This consequence is proved, because excommunication is a greater punishment than temporal death. Secondly, experience proves that there is no other remedy; for the church has, step by step, tried all remedies—first, excommunication alone; then pecuniary penalties; afterwards banishment; and, lastly, has been forced to put them to death; to send them to their own place. Thirdly, all allow that forgery deserves death; but heretics are guilty of forgery of the Word of God. *Fourthly*, a breach of faith by man towards God, is a greater sin than of a wife with her husband. But the latter is punished with death; why not the former? *Fifthly*, these are the grounds on which reason shows that heretics should be put to death: the first is, lest the wicked should injure the righteous; the second is, that by the punishment of a few, many may be reformed. For many who were made torpid by impunity are roused by the fear of punishment; and this we daily see is the result where the inquisition flourishes. Finally, it is a benefit to obstinate heretics to remove them from this life; for the longer they live the more errors they invent, the more persons they mislead, and the greater damnation do they treasure up to themselves."*

* Nos. 14 and 15, pp. 110, 115, 116.

Digitized by Google

Such is the doctrine and such the logic of the Cardinal. He sustains his views, you perceive, by appealing to the "opinions and laws of the emperors, which," he affirms, "*the church has always approved.*" He also appeals to "*the laws of the church.*" Now he either knew that the church had approved the persecuting laws of the emperors, and had herself enacted such laws, or he did not. If he did not, then he was too ignorant to be a cardinal or even a bishop. If he did, the question is settled, and the deadly enmity of the church of Rome to religious liberty is conclusively proved. But Bellarmine's writings received the sanction of the pope; and therefore there can be no question whether his statements concerning the laws of the church of Rome are correct.

This is not all. Luther was opposed to persecution; and he asserted that the church had never burned a heretic. Bellarmine replies—"This argument admirably proves, not the sentiment, but the ignorance or impudence of Luther; for as almost an infinite number were either burned or otherwise put to death, Luther either did not know it, and was therefore ignorant, or if he knew it, he is convicted of impudence and falsehood—for that heretics were often burned by the church may be proved by adducing a few from many examples."* Now one of two things is certainly true, viz.: either Cardinal Bellarmine was ignorant both of the principles and the history of his church, or it is an intolerant, persecuting church. It is vain to attempt to escape from this conclusion, as Hughes does, by saying—"Bellarmine himself must be responsible for his opinions on this subject;" for Bellarmine states not *opinions* only, but FACTS—facts which exhibit in the clearest light the true principles of his church. He who has wantonly taken the life of a single man, is a murderer at heart; and the church that has killed "almost an infinite number" of those who differed from her in faith, is a bloody, persecuting church.

Peter Dens, another standard Roman writer, has, in his Theology, maintained similar sentiments; and so have the Annotators

* Ibid.

Digitized by Google

of the Rhemish New Testament. In a note on Luke ix, 55, 56, they say—"The church or Christian princes are not blamed for putting heretics to death." Note on Rev. xviii, 6—"The blood of heretics is not the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors—for the shedding of which blood by order of justice no commonwealth shall answer." Rev. ii, 6, 20, 22—"He [Christ] warneth bishops to be zealous and stout against the false Prophets of what sort soever, by alluding covertly to the example of holy Elias, that in zeal killed four hundred and fifty false Prophets."

But let us hear the bishops of Belgium on this subject. When the King of the Netherlands took possession of his dominions, and was about to grant toleration to different religious sects, they addressed to him a letter, from which I quote two or three extracts. I give them as presented by Rev. Dr. J. Breckenridge, in his oral discussion with Hughes, and admitted by that gentleman: "Sire, the existence and privileges of the Catholic church in this part of your kingdom are inconsistent with an article in the new constitution, by which equal favor and protection are promised to all religions." "Since the conversion of the Belgians to Christianity such a dangerous innovation has never been introduced into these provinces, unless by force." Again—"Sire, we do not hesitate to declare to your majesty, that the canonical laws which are sanctioned by the ancient constitutions of the country, are incompatible with the projected constitution which would give in Belgium equal favor and protection to all religions." Again—"We are bound, sire, incessantly to preserve the people intrusted to our care from the doctrines which are in opposition to the doctrines of the Catholic church. We could not release ourselves from this obligation without violating our most sacred duties; and if your majesty, by virtue of a fundamental law, protected in these provinces the public profession and spreading of these doctrines, the progress of which we are bound to oppose with the care and energy which the Catholic church expects from our office, we should be in formal opposition to the laws of the state, to the measures which your majesty might

Digitized by Google

adopt to maintain them among us, and in spite of all our endeavors to maintain union and peace, the public tranquillity might still be disturbed." * Well does Dr. Breckenridge remark, in view of these quotations from the letter of the Belgian bishops—"Here is a bold, honest position taken; without disguise they declare that wherever the laws of the state shall tolerate any other religion, there the Papal prelates and the Catholic system are necessarily opposed to those laws, and to the government that should maintain them." They appeal to the canonical laws of the church as opposed to toleration, and assert that they as bishops cannot discharge the duties of their office—cannot oppose heresy as the Catholic church expects them to oppose it—without opposing toleration and the constitution of the state by which it might be granted! If those bishops understood the principles of their religion—the doctrines of their church—then is she the deadly enemy of the liberty of conscience, and a persecuting church. If they misrepresented their church, how happens it, that they were never reproved for an error so injurious?

That both popes and general councils have passed the most persecuting and bloody laws against all whom they were pleased to denounce as heretics, has been proved in previous lectures; and indeed it is admitted by the most zealous defenders of Popery. Dr. Crotty, Romish President of Maynooth college, Ireland, thus testified before the British Commissioners of Education inquiry—"I acknowledge that in the Councils of Lateran and Constance [both general councils] laws were enacted inflicting severe temporal punishments on persons who at those periods were laboring to subvert the Catholic faith in Europe; that temporal lords who connived at, or favored the heresy, should be excommunicated; and if within a year they did not give a satisfactory account of their conduct they should, in addition, forfeit the allegiance and duty of their vassals." That Crotty made this acknowledgment Bishop Hughes admits.† But these persecuting and bloody laws, we are gravely told, are no part of Catholic *doctrine*, or of the

* pp. 102, 103. † Breck. and Hughes' Dis., pp. 99, 124.

Digitized by Google

Catholic *religion*—they are mere *opinions*, not at all binding! To this vain plea I reply— 1st. The church of Rome claims infallibility for all the decisions of her general councils on *doctrines* and *morals*. Bishop Hughes says—"Every definition of doctrine *and morals* by a general council is infallible."* Now, whether it is right—whether it is the duty of civil rulers—to inflict temporal punishment on men, because they are denounced by Rome or by any other church, as heretics, *is a great question of morals*. God has said, "Thou shalt not kill." In interpreting this commandment the question just proposed is to be settled. Is it, or is it not a violation of this precept to inflict on men corporeal punishment, simply because they are chargeable with heresy? Or is it the duty of civil rulers thus to punish those condemned by the church? This most important question the Councils of Lateran and Constance did settle. They did solemnly decide that it was the moral, the religious duty of civil rulers to inflict upon heretics corporeal punishment and even death, and that their neglect or refusal to do so was a sin to be visited, not only by excommunication, but by deposition from their offices, and the release of their vassals from their oath of allegiance! It is worse than vain for the defenders of Romanism to attempt to place this great question of morals under the head of *opinions*, concerning which God has revealed nothing distinctly! And, let it be remarked, if it be a question of morals, whether it is right, and whether it is duty, to kill men for their religious faith; then this question has been repeatedly settled both by popes and general councils, and, as every Roman Catholic must believe, settled infallibly in favor of what all but Papists call *persecution;* and therefore it is an article of faith in that church, that it is right to punish men corporeally for religious error or heresy. In a country like ours it may be deemed expedient by the clergy not to avow this doctrine, or even to deny it; but the avowal of individuals is of no weight against the repeated decisions of popes and general councils.

The establishment of the inquisition by the Roman pontiffs, and the recognition of that horrid institution by the Council of

* Con. of Breck. and Hughes, No. 7, p. 55.

Digitized by Google

Trent, afford conclusive evidence that the church of Rome is essentially a persecuting church. Of the origin of this institution DEVOTI, a standard Roman writer, gives the following account:—

"The cause of instituting the tribunal called the Inquisition, was this: At first every bishop in his own diocese, or a number of bishops assembled in a provincial council, made inquisition of those errors which arose in the diocese or province; but the more weighty matters were always referred to the Apostolic See. * * But when new errors daily sprung up, and the number of heretics was greatly increased, seeing that the legates [appointed by the pope] could not always be at hand nor apply the proper remedy, it was determined to institute a standing tribunal that should always be present, and at all times, and in every country, should devote their minds to preserving the soundness of the faith, and to restraining and expelling heresies as they arose. Thus it was that the Inquisitors were first appointed to perform the office of Vicars to the Holy See. But—as in a matter so weighty as the preservation of the faith, the Inquisitors needed that close union of mind and sentiment which is proper to the Apostolic See, as the center of unity, there was instituted at Rome, by the pope, an assembly or congregation of cardinals in which the pope presides. This congregation is the head of all the Inquisitors over the whole world, to it they all refer their more difficult matters, and its authority and judgment are final. It is rightly and wisely ordered that the pope's office and power should sustain this institution, for he is the centre of unity and head of the church; and to him Christ has committed plenary power to feed, teach, rule, and govern all Christians."*

Such is the account given by Devoti of this cruel and detestable institution, and admitted by Bishop Hughes to be correct. I cannot now undertake to give any extended account of the Inquisition, of its gloomy dungeons, its racks, its tortures, and its *Autos da fe*, by which so many thousands have suffered tortures

* Canonical Institutes, under head—Inquisitors of Heretical Purity. See Breck. and Hughes' Discuss. pp. 176, 212, 213.

Digitized by Google

the most cruel, and death in its most terrific forms. No one can read its history, as given by the Roman Catholics themselves, without being convinced that, much of cruelty as the history of our world records, yet the Romish Inquisition is incomparably the most cruel, the most horrible institution ever known among men. When, in 1814, the question was agitated before the Spanish Cortes, whether the Inquisition should be abolished in Spain, a book was written by D. Antonio Puigblanch, a Spaniard, urging its abolition. This author, who had the opportunity of making himself thoroughly acquainted with it, having had access to the records of several branches of the institution, thus remarks—"Were any one ignorant of the spirit of Christianity, to hear, that *the most terrible tribunal ever known* was under the charge of priests, calling themselves the most zealous ministers of religion, how would he be induced to believe that this same religion is pre-eminent for its meekness?"

I must not omit to give this author's account of the mode of arresting those accused of heresy—"The summary impeachment being concluded, it is laid before the Supreme Council, and its approbation being obtained, the arrest is carried into execution. This is given in charge to the high bailiff, who executes his commission by carrying with him a competent number of ministers, taking the necessary precautions to surprise the culprit, which is generally done at night. The law prescribes that the receiver and notary of sequestrations should also be present at the arrest, for in this tribunal confiscation forms an essential part of the process. The party then sets out, and dread and consternation seize on the culprit and his family. The thunderbolt launched from the black and angry cloud strikes not with such alarm as the sound of 'DELIVER YOURSELF UP A PRISONER OF THE INQUISITION.' Astonished and trembling, the unwary citizen hears the dismal voice, a thousand different affections at once seize upon his panic-struck frame—he remains perplexed and motionless. His life in danger, his deserted wife and orphan children, eternal infamy, the only patrimony that now awaits his bereft family, are all ideas which rush on his mind—he is at

Digitized by Google

once agitated by an agony of dilemma and despair. The burning tear scarcely glistens on his livid cheek, the accents of woe die on his lips, and amidst the alarm and desolation of his family, and the confusion and pity of his neighbors, he is borne away to dungeons, whose damp and bare walls can alone witness the anguish of his mind."* This is the beginning of his sorrows. The torture by the pulley, or the rack, or the fire awaits him; and if he survive this, his next public appearance may be at the *Auto da fe*, to be burned as an incorrigible heretic. The number of victims of the Inquisition will never be known till the Day of Judgment. D. J. A. Llorente, once a Secretary of the Inquisition, gives the number condemned and burnt in Spain from A. D. 1481—31,912.—Burned in effigy, 17,695.—Placed in a state of penance with rigorous punishments, 291 450.—Total 341,057.

This detestable institution, which claims popes as its Fathers, and cardinals, bishops, and priests as its principal officers, was fully recognized by the Council of Trent. In prohibiting the indiscriminate reading of the Bible by the people, they leave it "to the judgment of the bishops, OR INQUISITORS," to grant or refuse permission to those applying. And throughout their Index Expurgatorius, bishops *and inquisitors* are to superintend the publication and sale of books! Would that Council have thus recognized the office of inquisitors, and, consequently, the Inquisition itself, if they had not approved of it? If they had possessed one particle of the spirit of Christianity, would they not have abolished and anathematized it?

It is a fact—an instructive fact—that the Inquisition, expelled from all other countries by the indignant people, is still cherished at Rome! Said Bishop Hughes, in his debate with Dr. J. Breckenridge, "Now the fact is, and it argues great ignorance not to know it, that, at this day, *out of the city of Rome*, the Inquisition does not exist, either in fact or in name—either civilly or ecclesiastically—in any country under the sun."† It originated in Rome; and it is fitting that, when driven from every other coun-

* Inquisition Unmasked, v. i, ch. 4. † p. 170.

Digitized by Google

try, detested for its horrid cruelty, it should find an asylum there, and enjoy the protection of the pope and his cardinals! But why is it confined to Rome? Is it because the Roman clergy are the friends of liberty of conscience? Why then, is it still cherished there? Why is no voice raised against it? Why no demand for its final suppression?

There is one evidence of the favor the Inquisition has found among the Roman clergy, which I must not omit. The BREVIARY, it is well known, is emphatically *the clergy's book.* It has received the sanction of the church; and it is a part of the daily duty of every priest and bishop to read, or recite, some portion of it. In this book are recorded, for their edification, the virtuous deeds of departed saints. Among these is numbered Pius V, concerning whom it is related, that "for a long time he sustained the office of Inquisitor, with inviolable fortitude of mind; he preserved many cities from heresy then spreading, not without danger of his life. He was promoted by Paul IV, to whom, on account of his great virtues, he was very dear, to the Episcopal See of Nepessinum and Sutrinum, and two years afterwards he was numbered among the cardinals of the Roman Church. * * * His body is worshipped with great veneration of the faithful in the Basilic of St. Mary and Præsepe—many miracles having been obtained of God through his intercession, *Die V Maii.*" Such are the *saints* who are held up as an example to be imitated by the Roman clergy of this country—men who, in their furious persecution of heretics, have even periled their own lives! Such are the saints whom they worship, and to whom they offer daily prayers! It is by teaching of this kind they are to become the friends of religious liberty!

It is worse than vain for the Roman clergy of this country to attempt to escape the odium so justly resting upon the Inquisition, by saying as does Bishop Hughes, that the Inquisition constitutes no part of the Roman Catholic religion. It constitutes an important part of that infernal machinery by which the Roman system has sought to sustain itself against the spreading light of God's Word. No part of religion, indeed! And, pray, what

Digitized by Google

are we to think of a religion which not only permits, but even incites, its most zealous advocates to perpetrate, in the name of the Prince of Peace, the horrid cruelties by which the entire history of the Inquisition has been marked? Nay, more; that claims for the very men engaged in this fiendish work, divine inspiration!

Nor will it answer to charge the cruelties of the Inquisition upon the civil power. The pope and his cardinals, as we have seen, not only originated it, but they constitute its supreme court. Roman clergymen have ever filled its most important offices; and the civil rulers, who have given it countenance, were obedient sons of the church, who acted in accordance with her desires. Its cruelties have been as great in Italy and Rome, as elsewhere; and there it still finds support. The truth is, and it is vain to attempt to conceal it, the pope and his clergy are wholly responsible for all its blood, and torture, and death.

Concerning the Inquisition Bishop Hughes said—"It may have been a good institution—abused!!!"* The Roman clergy of this country read this language; but not one of them either reproved him, or disavowed the sentiment. What is the unavoidable inference? I leave this intelligent audience to answer.

What were the sentiments of Gregory XVI, the last Pope who has spoken on these subjects, with regard to civil and religious liberty? No longer ago than A. D. 1832, he addressed his Encyclical Letter "to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops." In this letter we find the following language concerning that dearest of all the rights God has given to man—*liberty of conscience:*

"From this polluted fountain of 'Indifference,' flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather raving, in favor and defence of 'liberty of conscience;' for which most pestilential error the course is opened by that entire and wild liberty of opinion, which is everywhere attempting the overthrow of reli-

* Breckenridge and Hughes' Con., No. xxxiv, p. 304.

Digitized by Google

gious and civil institutions; and which the unblushing impudence of some has held forth as an advantage to religion."

Again—"Hither tends that worst and never sufficiently to be execrated and detested liberty of the press, for the diffusion of all manner of writings, which some so loudly contend for and so actively promote. We shudder, venerable brethren, at the sight of the monstrous doctrines, or rather portentous errors, which crowd upon us in the shape of numberless volumes and pamphlets, small in size, but big with evils, which stalk forth in every direction; breathing a malediction we deplore, over the face of the earth. Yet there are not wanting, alas! those who carry their effrontery so far, as to persist in maintaining that this amalgamation of errors is sufficiently resisted, if in this inundation of bad books, a volume now and then issue from the press in favor of religion and truth. But is it not a crime, then, never sufficiently to be reprobated, to commit the deliberate and greater evil, merely with the hope of seeing some good arise out of it? Or is that man in his senses, who entrusts poison to every hand, exposes it at every mart, suffers it to be carried about on all occasions, aye, and to become a necessary ingredient in every cup, because an antidote may afterwards be procured which chance may render effective?"

Let it not be thought that Gregory is here giving only his private opinions. He appeals to his "predecessors of happy memory" and to the infallible church to sustain him. Hear him —"Far other has been the discipline of the church in extirpating this pest of bad books, even as far back as the times of the Apostles, who, we read, committed a great number of books publicly to the flames. It is enough to read the laws passed in the Fifth Council of Lateran on this subject, and the constitution afterward promulgated by our predecessor of happy memory, Leo X, 'that what was wholesomely invented for the increase of faith, and for the extension of useful arts, may not be diverted to a contrary purpose, and become an obstacle to the salvation of Christ's faithful.' The subject engaged the closest attention of the Fathers of the Council of Trent, and as a remedy to so great

Digitized by Google

an evil, they passed that most salutary decree for forming an index of the works in which depraved doctrine was contained. 'No means must be here omitted,' says Clement XIII, our predecessor of happy memory, in the Encyclical Letter on the proscription of bad books—'no means must be here omitted, as the extremity of the case calls for all our exertions, to exterminate the fatal pest which spreads through so many works; nor can the materials of error be otherwise destroyed than by the flames, which consume the depraved elements of the evil.' From the anxious vigilance, then, of the holy Apostolic See, through every age, in condemning and removing from men's hands suspected and profane books, becomes more than evident the falsity, the rashness, and the injury offered to the Apostolic See by that doctrine, pregnant with the most deplorable evils to the Christian world, advocated by some, condemning this censure of books as a needless burden, rejecting it as intolerable, or with infamous effrontery proclaiming it to be irreconcilable with the rights of men, or denying, in fine, the right of exercising such a power, or the existence of it in the Church."

Thus wrote Gregory XVI, the last Pope who spoke on the subjects involved in this discussion; thus did he write no longer ago than 1832. That he was an uncompromising enemy of liberty of conscience, and that he greatly desired to have the press under the censorship of the Roman clergy, and the reading of the people controled by them, is perfectly clear. This is not all. Most anxiously did he desire, what the Church of Rome has ever sought—the union of Church and State. Hear him on this subject:

"Nor can we augur more consoling consequences, to religion and to government, from the zeal of some to separate the church from the state, and to burst the bond which unites the priesthood to the empire. For it is clear, that this union is dreaded by the profane lovers of liberty, only because it has never failed to confer prosperity on both."

As already remarked, the Pope, in this letter, does not express his opinions as an individual. He appeals to his predecessors in

Digitized by Google

the chair of St. Peter, and to general councils, as having held and taught the same principles. If, therefore, he was not strangely ignorant of the true spirit and principles of the church over which he presided (and surely this will not be pretended), then the church of Rome and her clergy are most irreconcilable enemies of civil and religious liberty. Destroy the liberty of the press, take away liberty of conscience, and unite the church and state, and what, I ask, remains of the boasted liberty of the United States? Nothing—literally nothing. Yet the pope and his clergy aim at nothing short of this!

We have looked into the doctrines and principles of the Roman clergy; let us now consider, for a moment, the practical workings of the system. Is there now a country where Popery prevails, in which religious liberty is enjoyed? How is it in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Austria, South America, Mexico? In every one of these countries, church and state are united—Popery is the established religion, and no other is tolerated. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Even in our day, in the island of Madeira, a number of persons who have professed the Protestant religion, together with Dr. Kalley their faithful minister, are suffering the most violent persecution; not by means of intolerant laws, but by mobs formed by Romanists, and headed by their clergy. Those devoted people, with their minister, have been compelled to save their lives by leaving their homes and country. Such is Roman Catholic toleration!

But, it will be asked, are not the Roman clergy of this country friends of our free institutions? I reply—1st. A large proportion of them are foreigners, reared and educated in Papal countries, who, from their very birth, have imbibed despotic principles. Can it be expected that a voyage across the ocean will revolutionize their views? 2d. The clergy of this country are subject to the clergy of the church generally, the great body of whom are known to be the enemies of our free institutions. What, then, can they do, even on the supposition that they are friendly to civil and religious liberty? 3d. But every Roman Catholic is pledged to have his religion established by law, as far as possible;

Digitized by Google

for they have all made the following promise; "I acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolical Roman church, the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ. I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise, I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church." Here we find every Roman Catholic pledged to true obedience to the pope, and to hold *all things* delivered by the general councils—persecuting decrees as well as definitions of doctrine! This is not all. We have still another pledge: "This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess and truly hold, I, N., promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same, whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life; *and to procure, as far as lies in my power, that the same shall be held, taught, and preached by all who are under me, or are intrusted to my care, by virtue of my office. So help me God, and these holy gospels of God.*"* Ponder this well, and understand its obvious and only meaning! If any doubt remain, let the history of the church interpret the language.

But the Encyclical letter of Gregory XVI, as we have seen, breathes the spirit of tyranny and persecution. How was it received by the Roman clergy of the United States? It was published by the "*Catholic Diary and Register,*" *of New York*, with the following commendation:

"The Encyclical Letter of Pope Gregory XVI, which is inserted on the first page of this day's Register, will, no doubt, arrest the attention of our readers, and elicit that fervent regard to the sentiments which are there found embodied, and which are so worthy of the FATHER of the Catholic world."

And whilst the priests of New York thus commended the

* Creed of Pius IV.

Digitized by Google

sentiments of this letter, worthy of the darkest of the dark ages, not a voice was raised in the ranks of the Roman clergy of America, in opposition to any sentiment it contains! This is not all. Bishop Hughes, in his reply to Dr. Breckenridge's remarks on the Encyclical Letter, thus discourses: "Finally, he adduces the Encyclical Letter of the present Pope. Well, what does he find in it, except a praise-worthy solicitude to preserve the truth of God pure, in *books of doctrine*, as well as preaching; complaints that the world is inundated with *bad books*, to the corruption of faith and morals, and the destruction of souls. The Pope asserts that those who recognize the spiritual authority of the church [he makes no such limitation] are wicked in denying her right to exercise censorship over books," &c.* Not a sentiment in the Letter does the Bishop disapprove; although it bitterly denounces *liberty of conscience* and the *freedom of the press*, and pleads for the union of church and state! All this, in his view, is "praise-worthy!" But is he really in favor of the freedom of the press? No—for in justifying the Council of Trent in its opposition to it, he says: "But when the press became the *irresponsible agent of mischief*, in the hands of wicked men, who employed it to *corrupt* the Scriptures, to *excite the people to sedition*, to disseminate FALSEHOOD instead of truth—the natural law of self-preservation, both in church and state, dictated the necessity of restricting the freedom of the press within such limits as would render it compatible with the safety of society."† Such are the sentiments of Bishop Hughes, of New York, one of the most popular and influential bishops in the United States. Suppose these carried into practice in our country, what would be the result? Wicked men, he says, employed the press to corrupt the Scriptures; therefore, the press must be placed under the censorship of the Roman clergy. Papists charge Protestants with doing the same thing. How soon would Bishop Hughes, if he had power, stop the printing-presses that are now throwing out thousands of copies of the Bible daily. Again—he says, the press was used to disseminate FALSEHOOD instead of truth; and therefore it must be restrained,

* Breckenridge and Hughes' Discussion, p. 53. † Ibid., p 86.

Digitized by Google

and put under the censorship of the Roman clergy. How soon, had he power, would every Protestant printing press in this free country be stopped. Sentiments such as these suit Rome or Spain far better than America.

But what are the sentiments of Bishop Hughes relative to the establishment, by law, of the Roman Catholic religion? In the oral discussion, between him and Dr. J. Breckenridge, the latter gentleman put to him the following plain question: "*Had the majority in Italy, or Spain, a right to establish the Catholic religion by law?*" This is a very simple question, easily answered, one would think, by any true friend of the rights of conscience, more especially by any American citizen. The majority in those countries, being Roman Catholics, did, as a matter of fact, establish by law, their religion, and required all, under civil pains and penalties, to adopt and conform to it, regardless of their conscientious convictions. Either they had the right to do this, or they had not. If it be admitted that they had, or could have such a right; the principle is admitted and maintained, that a majority may of right, at least under some circumstances, disregard the religious convictions of a minority, and punish them civilly and corporeally for not believing as they believe. This principle is the foundation of all persecution on account of religion. Carried out in practice, it has persecuted unto death tens of thousands, of many of whom the world was not worthy, and established the most impious and odious tyranny.

What was the Bishop's reply to this plain question? Hear it, and ponder it well, ye who imagine that the Roman clergy of the United States are friends of our free institutions. "Finally, he [Breckenridge] asks *me my opinion* about the right of the majority in Spain, or Italy, TO ESTABLISH THE CATHOLIC RELIGION BY LAW. I answer that, in *my opinion*, if the majority in Italy, or Spain, by doing so, violated *no civil or religious right of the minority*, they had, *in that case*, the *right* to establish the Catholic religion by law. But if, in order to establish it, they violated *any right, sacred or civil*, of the minority, then, in that case, they

Digitized by Google

had no right to establish the Catholic religion by law."* Observe, the Bishop admits, that in those countries there were minorities opposed to the Romish religion. And although with the skill of a Jesuit he seeks to evade the question, which, had he been in favor of liberty of conscience, he would have gloried in answering in the most unequivocal manner; yet he betrays, despite of himself, the cloven foot. For he indirectly but clearly intimates, that there are cases, and that those of Spain and Italy may be such, in which a majority may *force* their religious faith upon the minority. This, I repeat, is the principle of tyranny and persecution. But why does the Bishop cumber his answer with so many *ifs*. Was he really so ignorant of the history of Italy and Spain that he could not form a judgment concerning their laws and their persecutions? Or, is it not clear to every man of common sense, that he believes Papists have the right, wherever they have the power, to establish their religion by law, and require all to conform to it, but that he fears to avow his real sentiments? Nor is he peculiar in this respect. The Roman clergy of this country never were known to condemn the persecuting laws of Spain, Italy, and other countries under Roman influence. Well did Breckenridge reply to Hughes—that "the *American* principle, and the Bible doctrine, is, that it is violating the rights of a *minority* to *establish any religion by law!* That no *majority* can, in any possible case, of *right*, do such a thing!" This American, this Scriptural principle, Bishop Hughes, when distinctly called on to avow his sentiments, refused to sanction!

In reply to all this, it may be said, Protestants, too, have persecuted. I answer—1st. We acknowledge that, in some instances, they have persecuted; and we condemn their conduct herein. Moreover, we admit that these persecutions proved them *fallible*. But the Roman clergy evade the question, when asked whether in Italy and Spain the majority had the right to establish their religion by law; and whilst constrained to admit that popes and general councils have enacted persecuting laws, and by religious rewards and penalties excited their people to murder those

* p. 165.

Digitized by Google

whose faith differed from theirs; they yet claim for these same men the extraordinary prerogative of infallibility! 2d. If there be, in this country, a Protestant denomination that has held persecuting principles, and has never as a body renounced them, I will place no confidence in them. Such a body would be justly regarded as decidedly unfriendly to the free institutions of our country. The church of Rome has enacted persecuting laws, has established the most cruel institution ever known in this world, has excited civil rulers to persecutions the most horrible. The last of the popes who spoke on the subject did most earnestly contend that those persecuting laws were right. His encyclical letter was received and *approved* by the Roman clergy of this country. They say not a word against the intolerance which now prevails universally in Roman countries. The church of Rome, therefore, having never renounced her persecuting principles, and boasting that she never changes, is justly held responsible for them—is justly regarded as a persecuting, intolerant church, and her clergy as decidedly unfriendly to the institutions of our country.

It matters not what may be the private sentiments of individual members, or even of individual bishops, of the church of Rome; the power is in the hands of the pope and the body of his clergy; and they can constrain obedience to their mandates. At this very day, every Roman bishop in the United States can cast as many votes in our elections as he has voters in his diocese. He has only to inform them that it is their religious duty—their duty to the church—to vote in a particular way. They stand solemnly pledged to obey their clergy in matters of faith and morals. The pope and his council can give secret directions which must be obeyed in this country, both by clergy and people.

I oppose the church of Rome, not only because of her soul-destroying errors in religion, but because civil and religious liberty wither wherever her influence prevails. I hold to the Protestant rule of faith—the holy Bible—not only because it is a lamp to our feet and a light to our path, to guide us safely to heaven, but because it teaches that every man is accountable to

Digitized by Google

God for his religious faith and moral conduct, and thus strikes at the very fundamental principle of all persecuting tenets; and because, wherever it is received, civil and religious liberty must and will be enjoyed.

It would be easy to show how the doctrines of the church of Rome degrade the people intellectually and morally, and destroy the prosperity of every country where they prevail. Need I do more than point this intelligent audience to the present state of every Roman Catholic country in the world? Look at Italy, the head quarters of the Romish religion. There no Protestant influence has been permitted to effect the character of the people, or the prosperity of the country. Yet the civil government is one of the worst in the world; and the people are ignorant, poor, degraded. Would you know what has become of the wealth of the country? Go to the splendid churches which everywhere are to be seen; and then look at the coffers of the clergy. Look at Spain, once one of the most powerful kingdoms in the world. Wasted and almost destroyed by one of the most ferocious and protracted civil wars ever known, she now lies in ruins. Her people miserably poor, her country overrun with innumerable *banditti*, revolutions and insurrections the order of the day, her glory is departed, and she stands before the world a most instructive example of the withering, degrading, ruinous influence of Popery. Look at Portugal. Her condition almost as hopeless as that of Spain, and for the same cause. Austria is quiet, because the people are sunk in ignorance, and bound down by the iron grasp of tyranny. Go to Mexico and South America, and there learn the character of that influence which Popery everywhere exerts. Contrast the countries where Romanism prevails with those where the Protestant religion has exerted a controlling influence. Where do you find, in the masses of the people, the greatest amount of intelligence and morality? Where do you find most of civil and religious liberty? Where do you find the greatest amount of general prosperity? I cheerfully leave this audience to answer these important questions.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

LECTURE V.

Eph. v, 23. "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church."

There are several figures by which the Scriptures illustrate the relation of Christ Jesus to his church, her dependence upon him and her obligations to him. He is the *head* of the church, as the husband is the head of the wife. He is her guide and protector, to whose commands she yields a willing and delightful obedience. He is the bridegroom—she, the bride. And as the wife can have but one *husband*, so the church can have but one *head*. The church is his *body*, united to him by a true faith, controled by him, and enjoying by virtue of that union spiritual life. "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." And as the human body cannot have two heads, so cannot the church, the body of Christ.

Again—Jesus Christ is the *foundation* of the church. The foundation of a building is that on which it stands firmly, and is supported when the rain descends, and the floods come, and the winds blow and beat upon it. So is Jesus Christ the foundation of his church, for two important reasons.

1. By his obedience unto death he laid the foundation of the hopes of his people for eternal life. Take from the gospel the one great truth, that Jesus Christ died for the sins of his people—bear them in his own body on the tree, and divine justice would sweep them all into eternal ruin. "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

2. By his infinite power Jesus Christ upholds his church, and defends it against all its enemies; so that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." To his ministers he says—"Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world;" and to his church—"No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper."

Digitized by Google

As a house can have but one foundation; so of the church Paul says—"Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

To the general statement, that Christ Jesus is the *head* and the *foundation* of his church, Roman Catholics, much as they have perverted and corrupted the doctrines of the cross, would not, perhaps, object. But they hold that the church has also another head and foundation. They believe that the Apostle Peter was made "the Prince of the Apostles," the visible head and foundation of the universal church; and that the Pope of Rome, as the legitimate successor of Peter, is the Vicar of Jesus Christ, having "full power," as Butler says, "to feed, regulate, and govern the universal church, as expressed in the general councils and holy canons." "This," says he, "is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church on the authority of the pope.' The same author represents the pope as having—"1st. A supremacy of rank; 2d. A supremacy of jurisdiction in the spiritual concerns of the Roman Catholic church; 3d. The principal authority in defining articles of faith." * According to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, he possesses "the most exalted degree of dignity, and the full amplitude of jurisdiction." † The pope is, in the view of Papists, "the centre of unity;" and to be separated from the chair of St. Peter is to be guilty of schism or rank heresy.

Let us proceed to inquire whether these claims of the Pope of Rome are valid. That we may come to a safe conclusion, I will state two or three important principles which, I think, will commend themselves to every reflecting mind, viz.:—

I. The doctrine of the pope's supremacy, if true, is of fundamental importance to the organization, and even to the existence of the church; and therefore it must be so clearly revealed as to satisfy without doubt every candid mind. In the Book of Nature there are mysteries beyond the comprehension of the most profound philosopher; and there are many truths in the discovery of which the learned may find abundant employment. But

* Book of the Church, Let. x. † p. 222.

Digitized by Google

those truths which are most important, which are essential to the preservation of life, lie, as it were, on the surface, and can be sufficiently understood by the unlearned. They, as well as the learned philosopher, can pursue the useful avocations of life, and provide for their families the necessaries and even the luxuries of life. And the same may be affirmed of the Book of Revelation, whose author is the God of Nature. The most learned theologian may spend his days and call into requisition all his powers in searching into its rich treasures, without exhausting them; but the fundamental doctrines of the gospel are so plainly revealed, and so variously illustrated, that the unlearned may read or hear, and understand, and be saved. The way of life—"the king's highway of holiness"—is made so plain, that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.

If, then, the *church* is the divinely appointed guide of God's people in religious matters, whatever is essential to her complete organization must be ascertainable by every candid and impartial inquirer. This principle is not only admitted, but contended for by Bishop Milner, in his *End of Controversy*. In attempting to establish the Roman rule of faith, he lays down the two following maxims: "*The rule of faith appointed by Christ must be* CERTAIN *and* UNERRING; that is to say, *it must be one which is not liable to lead any rational and sincere inquirer into inconsistency or error: thirdly*, this rule must be UNIVERSAL—that is to say, *it must be proportioned to the abilities and circumstances of the great bulk of mankind.*"* The rule cannot be certain and adapted to the abilities and circumstances of the great bulk of mankind, unless whatever is essential to that rule be very clearly revealed. The conclusion is unavoidable, that the doctrine of the pope's supremacy, if true, must be supported by evidence the most clear and convincing.

2d. This doctrine, if proved at all, must be proved by the Scriptures only, and by what Roman Catholics call the *private interpretation* of Scripture. In attempting to prove any fact or proposition, it is of the first importance to determine on what

* Let. viii, p. 33.

Digitized by Google

evidence we can legitimately rely. In the present inquiry the *traditions of the church* can afford us no assistance. For, since those traditions are in the keeping of the church, and their authority depends upon her infallibility, we cannot receive her testimony on any point of faith, until we are satisfied that she is prepared to speak by inspiration. But without her *head*, the pope, she is confessedly not infallible. There cannot be a general council, unless it be called by him, and either he or his representative preside over its deliberations. "No council," says Bishop Hughes, "is general or œcumenical, without the POPE's concurrence."* The church, therefore, cannot bear testimony to a matter which appertains to her organization. Her testimony is confessedly not infallible till her organization is complete. Shall we, then, ask the church whether Peter the Apostle was divinely appointed her visible head? Who shall answer the question? The church without her head, to whom, as we have seen, belongs "the chief authority in defining articles of faith," and in whom, of course, chiefly resides her infallibility? Surely not. Then her traditions are of no value in deciding the question now under consideration. And for the same reason, that is, because without the pope she is not infallible, *her interpretation of Scripture* cannot be relied on. In inquiring into the validity of the pope's claims to supremacy, therefore, we must come to the Scriptures, and examine into their teaching. No man can consistently become a Roman Catholic, except upon a careful examination of the sacred Scriptures on this point.

But here we meet an insuperable difficulty; for the Roman clergy tell us that those who rely on their own judgment to determine the meaning of the Scriptures, can never come to a certain and safe conclusion—"*cannot make an act of faith.*"† In the name of common sense, then, how shall we ascertain whether the pope is the divinely appointed head of the church? Whenever men begin to change and improve God's Word, and to build up a system of their own, they will certainly involve themselves in contradictions. This is most manifestly true of the church of

* Cath. Con., Let. vii, p. 55. † End of Con., Let. ix, p. 50.

Digitized by Google

Rome. Her bishops tell us she cannot be an infallible guide without her head, the pope; and yet they assure us that we cannot determine with any certainty, by the Scriptures, whether the pope is the divinely appointed head of the church!

We will now enter upon the inquiry whether the Scriptures afford any evidence that Peter was appointed "to feed, regulate, and govern the universal church." For if Peter had no such office as that claimed by the pope as his successor, of course the claims of the latter are false.

I. The first argument we offer against the doctrine of the pope's supremacy is, *that the qualifications necessary to the office, and the nature and extent of the powers conferred by it, are confessedly undefined and indefinable.* We may certainly affirm, without fear of successful contradiction, that if the infinitely wise Saviour had appointed in his church an office of so incalculable importance, both to the church and the world, and so capable of being abused to the great dishonor of religion, to the eternal ruin of the souls of men, and to the infinite injury of the world, he would have stated with great clearness, the qualifications to be possessed by the incumbent, and defined the kind and extent of the powers to be exercised by him. Under the Old Dispensation God appointed the Levitical priesthood; and most distinctly did he point out their qualifications and their powers. He appointed a civil government, and he gave a code of laws according to which it was to be administered. And when he permitted the people to elect a king—a new office being created which was liable to great abuse—Samuel "told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord."* And in anticipation of such an event as the appointment of a king, Moses had long before pointed out the qualifications he must possess, and the general limits of his authority.†

Now, is it true, that the qualifications to be possessed by the man who shall fill the office of pope are pointed out? Are the limits of his authority fixed? Both these questions must be answered negatively. It is a fact not denied by Romanists, that

* 1 Samuel x, 25. † Deut. xvii, 14.

Digitized by Google

there are two great parties in the church of Rome who differ widely concerning the pope's qualifications for his office. Is he, when he speaks officially, an inspired and infallible man? Yes, —say the Transalpine bishops. No—say the Cisalpines; he may err, and may be deposed for schism or heresy. This is a wide difference; a difference not merely theoretical, but practical. Is the pope above a general council? Yes—says one large party. No—says the other; he is inferior to a general council, and may be deposed by such a council. Has the pope temporal power? Yes—say all Papists—in his own dominions he has. Though Jesus Christ said, "my kingdom is not of this world," his pretended vicar has a kingdom on earth, enters into the intrigues of civil courts, and declares war, and concludes peace! This is strange. But has the pope the right to depose temporal princes, and absolve their subjects from their oath of allegiance? Yes—say the Transalpine bishops, and a great number of eminent Roman theologians. No—says the other party."*

But cannot the infallible church settle these troublesome differences? No; eighteen hundred years have passed since Peter, it is said, was appointed visible head of the church, and they remain undetermined. The Council of Florence decided, that the pope has "full power to feed, regulate, and govern the universal church;" but this language is sufficiently comprehensive to embrace all that is claimed by the most ardent advocates of the pope's prerogatives. Still, however, the difference exists. In the meantime, the popes have claimed and exercised all that may be comprehended in the language of the Catechism of Trent—"*the full amplitude of jurisdiction.*"

Innocent III, with the advice of his council, deposed John, King of England; who, by his degrading humiliation, made himself contemptible in the eyes of all men. Reeve, the Roman historian says, "For these reasons the cardinals, the bishops, and other members of the council, unanimously agreed, that where pressing evils called for redress, the most efficacious means ought to be adopted. Guided by this principle, and unfortunately biased

* Butler's Book of the Church, Let. x, pp. 106-108.

Digitized by Google

by that current opinion of the age, which attributed to the sovereign pontiff a presumptive power over the temporal rights of kings, they gave their advice, and upon that advice Innocent pronounced sentence of deposition against John, King of England—declaring the throne vacant, and his former subjects no longer bound by any oath of allegiance. He notified this sentence to Philip Augustus by letter; in which he exhorts his Gallic majesty to avenge the insults done by John to religion, to drive the enemy of Christ out of England, and to unite that kingdom to the kingdom of France."*

Jesus Christ when upon earth refused to settle a difficulty between two brothers about a single estate, saying, "Man, who made me a divider over you?" and he reproved his disciples who, indignant that their master was not received by a certain Samaritan village, would have called down fire from heaven to consume them. But Pope Innocent, his pretended vicar, as if determined to prove himself anti-christ, and thus give the lie to his own claims, first undertakes to depose a king, and then exhorts another king to make war upon him, and to avenge the insults he had offered to religion! Avenge the insults offered to religion by a bloody war!! And to this men were exhorted by one who claims to be the vicar of "the Prince of Peace!!!"

John, forsaken by his subjects, to save himself from utter ruin, agreed to become a vassal of the Pope. "The King," says Reeve, "by his own free choice, and not at the requisition of Pandolf [the Pope's legate], as Mr. Hume says, had prepared an authentic charter, in which he solemnly declares, that not constrained by fear, but of his own free will, and by the advice and consent of his barons, he had for the remission of his sins resigned England and Ireland to God, to St. Peter and St. Paul, to Pope Innocent and his successors in the Apostolic chair, and that he engaged himself and his successors to hold these dominions as feudatory of the church of Rome, by the annual payment of a thousand marks for England, and three hundred for Ireland. This charter, duly signed and sealed with wax, he delivered to

* Hist. of Church, vol. ii, pp. 77-78.

Digitized by Google

Pandolf, in the presence of his nobles, and then did homage to him, as the pope's representative, with all the humiliating ceremonies which the feudal law required of vassals before their liege lord and superior."* We cannot but wonder that Reeve was not ashamed to say, what no one ever believed or can believe, that John submitted to such degradation "of his own free choice." Nor can we fail to see in the degradation of John the true spirit of popery.

Otho, Emperor of Germany, was excommunicated and deposed by Pope Innocent, because he refused to give him certain lands to which he laid claim. "Excommunication," says Reeve, "had no effect upon a man who was obstinately wrong. The Pope then declared that he had forfeited his title to the imperial crown, and forbade his subjects to acknowledge him any longer for their sovereign. Otho immediately sunk into contempt, was neglected and abandoned by all the world."† Many other kings and princes met with similar treatment at the hands of the pretended successors of Peter. The last attempt to exercise this impious power, if my memory is correct, was directed against Elizabeth, Queen of England. It proved a failure; and the haughty Pontiff was obliged to see that the power of Rome was fast declining.

Many of my hearers may not be aware that Pope Alexander VI made a present of America to the Kings of Spain and Portugal. Reeve says—"To this Pope the two kings of Spain and Portugal, Ferdinand and Emmanuel, applied for a grant to hold all the lands they might discover and conquer in any part of the globe not yet explored." Did the Pope grant their request? Yes—the same historian says "Alexander, in a pompous bull, authorized the two royal petitioners to hold all the territory they might gain possession of in the new world, with a view of propagating the Christian religion among the savages by the ministry of the gospel." This Pope, it seems, in the height of his towering ambition, claimed as his own the whole world. But were such claims generally acknowledged? Yes—Reeve says, "They

* Hist. of Church, p. 80. † Ibid. v. ii, p. 84.

Digitized by Google

[the two kings] knew the papal grant would be respected, and would give them a colored title which would not be disputed." *

Now let me ask, is it reasonable to believe that Jesus Christ would establish in his church an office of so much importance, and so capable of being abused to the incalculable injury of his church and the world, and yet leave the kind of authority and the limits of the authority to be exercised in that office, undefined and indefinable? It is an admitted fact, that not a few of the popes have been men of unbounded ambition and of infamous character. Yet we are to believe that our Saviour entrusted to the hands of such men the most unlimited power!

II. *The titles and honors claimed by the pope and given by the church of Rome, prove his apostacy.* Peter was called an *Apostle* and an *Elder;* but his pretended successors claim and receive such titles as "His Holiness," "Our Lord," "Vicar of Christ," &c. Our Saviour said to one who regarded him as a mere *man*, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good, but one, that is God." But the pope—a poor sinful creature—not content with being called *good*, claims and receives the title due only to God, "His Holiness!" When was Peter called, as is Pius IX, in connection with his late Encyclical Letter, "Our Lord?" When was he called "the Vicar of Christ?" Such titles, pleasing only those whose pride and ambition have passed all ordinary limits, prove conclusively, that the office is not of Christ's appointment, or that those who fill it are apostates and rebels against him.

But the pope claims something more than empty titles. They who venture to approach "His Holiness," must prostrate themselves; and possibly they may enjoy the privilege *of kissing his foot!* On the 15th of March, 1836, as we learn from the Catholic Herald, the pope "was pleased to honor with his presence the Irish College at Rome." He was received at the gate by "the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Cardinal J. F. Fransoni, robed in purple." He first prayed before the relics of St. Patrick. "After that, he ascended the throne which had been

* Hist. of Church, v. ii, pp. 203-4.

Digitized by Google

prepared in one of the halls, *and admitted all to kiss the foot!*" What a condescention in "His Holiness," and what a privilege to the inmates of the Irish College! So distinguished a favor must be made known to posterity; and therefore directions were given to have the following inscription on marble:

"To Gregory XVI, Pope—because on the 15th of the calends of March, 1836, he distinguished, with the splendor of his majesty, the Irish College, restored and endowed under his special care, by Leo XI, and added that public token of benevolence to singular favors, conferred upon Ireland—the President of the College caused this monument of a grateful mind to be erected."

Now contrast with all this the conduct of Peter, whose successor Gregory pretended to be. Peter was directed to go and preach the gospel to Cornelius the centurion, and his family. "And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man."* Peter was a *man;* and therefore he refused to allow Cornelius to prostrate himself before him. The pope claims what Peter refused, and what he refused because he was a *man!* What is the unavoidable conclusion from such facts?

III. Let us now proceed to the examination of those passages of Scripture relied upon to sustain the claims of the pope.

The first, and one of the weakest arguments in support of Peter's supremacy, is the fact that in numbering the Apostles the inspired writers placed the name of Peter first—"The first, Simon, who is called Peter." Let us look at the premises and the conclusion, that we may determine whether there is any connection between them. In giving the names of the Apostles, the inspired writers placed Peter's name first; therefore Peter was appointed to be the visible head of the church, the vicar of Jesus Christ; and his successors inherit his office and his authority! Is the mere relative location of Peter's name a fact of sufficient importance to warrant such a conclusion? Peter was one of the first chosen to be an Apostle, was perhaps older than any one of the

* Acts x, 25, 26.

Digitized by Google

twelve, and was forward, on all occasions, to confess Christ; and therefore it was, perhaps, that his name is first in the list. Nothing more can be proved from the fact, than that Peter, for these or such reasons, had peculiar respect shown him. Nor can anything more be inferred from the fact that he preached on the day of Pentecost, and was directed to introduce the first Gentile family, that of Cornelius, into the church. The doctrine of the pope's supremacy is too important and too prominent to be proved by far-fetched *inferences.* If it is true, it must be distinctly taught in the Scriptures. It is a doctrine to which there must have been frequent and distinct reference in the discourses and epistles of the Apostles, and in the inspired history of the church, contained in the Acts of the Apostles. The very fact that Roman writers feel constrained to attach great importance to circumstances so unimportant, proves that they are conscious of the scantiness of their evidence.

The first Scripture, and that which is most relied on, is Math. xvi, 18. "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The Saviour had asked his disciples—"Whom say you that I am?" Peter answered—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The Saviour replied in the language just read. Now the question between Protestants and Papists is, whether Peter, or Christ whom Peter had just acknowledged, is the rock on which the church was to be built? We deny that Peter was the rock, for reasons which I will now assign.

1. The language of our Saviour, in this passage, is very similar to that used by him with reference to the temple, misunderstood by the Jews, just as this has been by Papists. The Jews demanded of him a sign. "Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and on the third day I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou raise it up in three days? But," adds the inspired writer, "he spoke of the temple of his body." * By

* John ii, 19-21.

Digitized by Google

the phrase, "this temple," the Jews understood the temple near which they were standing; but Jesus meant *his body*. By "this rock," the Papists understand Peter; but Christ meant himself whom Peter had just acknowledged to be the Son of the living God.

2. The language employed by the Saviour seems evidently intended to prevent the very mistake into which Papists have fallen; for he said: "Thou art *Petros*—a stone, a bold and firm believer—and upon this *petra* [*rock*] will I build my church." If he had intended to build the church on Peter, he must have said, on this *petrō* (the dative case of *Petros*) will I build my church. Why did he employ another word—*petra*, which means properly a *rock?* The use of another word to signify the foundation of the church, excludes the idea that Peter was that foundation.

3. There is not another passage in the Bible which represents Peter, or any other man, as the foundation of the church of Christ. On the contrary, Jesus Christ himself is everywhere represented as *the only* foundation on which the church is erected. There is, therefore, not another passage to support the Romish interpretation of the one under consideration; whilst there are many to confirm the interpretation I have just given. Isaiah says: "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a true stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste."* This foundation, as Peter informs us, is Christ.† Paul says: "Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."‡ Again he speaks of the foundation laid, by the Apostles and Prophets, "Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;"§ But he does not distinguish Peter from the other Apostles. Since, therefore, the Romish interpretation of the passage before us is not sustained by any other Scripture, but is inconsistent with the language uniformly employed on the same subject, we are forced to the conclusion that it is false.

4. There is no conceivable sense in which Peter could be the

* Ch. xxviii, 16. † 1 Pet. ii, 6. ‡ 1 Cor. iii, 11. § Eph. ii, 20.

Digitized by Google

foundation of the church. Christ is the foundation, as I have shown, because by his death and intercession he saves the church from the curse of the broken law. In this sense Peter could not be the foundation. Again, Christ is the foundation of the church because by his omnipotent power he defends it from all enemies, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. In this respect Peter could not be the foundation. What could his feeble arm do for the church in the hour of peril? Were it even true that Peter was appointed the chief *pastor* of the church, there would be no propriety in representing him as its *foundation.*

But Romanists contend that their interpretation is confirmed by the gift of the keys of the kingdom to Peter. "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."* This might strengthen the claims set up for Peter, if Christ had not given precisely the same authority to the other Apostles. By the power of the keys Peter was to *bind and loose;* but precisely this power was given to all the Apostles: "Verily I say unto *you*, Whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."† Inasmuch as the same authority was granted to all the Apostles, we are obliged to understand the language of Christ to Peter as addressed not *exclusively* to him; or, at least, as not designed to confer on him any superior authority.

5. The contentions among the Apostles, after the keys had been given to Peter, which of them should be greatest, and the Saviour's reply to them, prove that Peter was not appointed to be "the prince of the Apostles." It was after this that the mother of Zebedee's children asked that her two sons might enjoy the highest place in the kingdom. At this request the other ten disciples were much displeased. Did Christ remind her or them, that Peter had already been appointed to the first place? No, he said, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercised dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority

* Math. xvi, 19. † Math. xviii, 18.

Digitized by Google

upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your servant," &c.* The kingdom of Christ, he told them, was to be unlike the kingdoms of the Gentiles. In his kingdom the greatest man would be the most humble. But is not the church of Rome organized as the governments of earth? Does not the pope exercise even temporal authority over the people? Is he not a temporal prince? What is the difference between the pope, cardinals, archbishops, and bishops, and the king, his cabinet, his lords, &c.? Would any one, on witnessing the pomp and parade of Rome, dream that the pope and his cardinals had ever read this language of Jesus? Certainly, if Peter had received any such appointment as is claimed for him, the other Apostles knew it not; and it does not appear that in those contentions he claimed anything of the kind. Moreover, is it not unaccountable, if Peter had received such an appointment, that the Saviour did not remind the Apostles of that fact, and thus put an end to those painful contentions? The truth is, no such appointment had been, or was to be made.

IV. My fourth argument against this doctrine is the fact, that *Peter neither claimed nor exercised any superiority over the other Apostles.* On the contrary, the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles, do afford conclusive evidence that no superior authority had been conferred upon him.

1st. Peter wrote two general epistles, in neither of which does he intimate that he had been appointed the visible head of the whole church. The first epistle begins thus: "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers," &c. And in the fifth chapter he thus addresses the elders, or ministers of the gospel, "The elders which are among you I exhort, *who am also an elder*, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, &c.,—feed the flock of God." His second epistle, written a short time before his death, thus commences: "Simon Peter, a servant and Apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us," &c. Not a word is found in these epistles from which it can be inferred that Peter claimed the least authority beyond that

* Math. xx, 20-26. See also Luke xxii, 24-27

Digitized by Google

possessed by every other Apostle. Indeed, Romanists never appeal to his epistles—the very documents to which they ought to appeal—in proof of his supremacy. How shall we account for Peter's silence on this most important point? The church was then in its infancy under the New Dispensation, and was being fully organized for the great work to which she was called. How important, then, that Peter's supremacy should be universally known and acknowledged. How important, while he was guarding the churches against false teachers, "who privily should bring in damnable heresies," and whose pernicious ways many should follow, to have directed them to himself and his successors, as "the center of unity." Why did he not then say as Gregory XVI, in his Encylical letter—"Let all remember that the principles of sound doctrine with which the people are to be imbued, must emanate from, and that the rule and the administration of the universal church belongs to, the Roman Pontiff, to whom was delivered the 'full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal church,' by Christ, our Lord?" Ah, these high claims were for a later day in the history of the church! In vain do you look for them in the Epistles of Peter, just where, if they had existed, we must have found them clearly set forth.

2d. Let us turn to the Acts of the Apostles, which contain a brief history of the church for about thirty years. If the doctrine of Peter's supremacy is true, it must be found there.

The first occasion for the exercise of his authority occurs in the appointment of an Apostle in the place of Judas Iscariot. Peter suggested the necessity of such an appointment; but did he exercise any superior authority in the case? Did he either nominate or ordain him? No. "*They* (the Apostles) appointed two, Joseph called Barnabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And they prayed and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two men thou hast chosen, &c. And *they* gave forth their lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven Apostles."* Peter's supremacy is not found here.

* Acts i, 23-26.

Digitized by Google

The next occasion for the exercise of his authority is recorded in the eighth chapter of the Acts. Philip had gone to Samaria and there preached the gospel with great success; insomuch, that "the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spoke, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did." The Apostles, who were at Jerusalem, heard of this wonderful work, and it was deemed proper to send some of their number, who might pray for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Did Peter send them? If he was pope certainly he did. But no; "*They* (the Apostles) sent unto them Peter and John." The Apostles sent Peter! Then Peter was subject to his brethren, just as John and the other Apostles were. Who ever heard of the Pope of Rome being *sent* on such business?

Another occasion when, if Peter had been pope, he must have exercised his prerogative, is recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts. There we have an account of the first Christian council ever held; which, of course, would be regarded as the model for all succeeding councils. Certain Judaizing teachers preached at Antioch that the disciples of Christ must be circumcised in order to salvation. Paul and Barnabas opposed them; and it was finally determined that they and certain others "should go to Jerusalem, unto the Apostles and elders, about the question." Nothing is said about going to *Peter*. When they reached Jerusalem, "the Apostles and elders came together for to consider this matter." Did Peter preside in this council, and give the final decision? If he was pope, certainly he did. But no; when the matter had been considerably discussed, Peter rose and gave his views; which, since he was inspired, were of course correct. Did this terminate the matter? No; Barnabas and Paul were then heard, "declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." After they were heard, James arose, and after giving his views and reasons, said, "Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God; but that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication,

Digitized by Google

and from things strangled, and from blood." In this decision the council acquiesced, and wrote to the churches accordingly. Now it appears evident that James, not Peter, presided in this council; and if there was a pope, it was James. Had Peter done just what James did, all Romish writers would have appealed to the council, and the part he acted in it, as evidence conclusive of his supremacy.

According to the doctrine of the church of Rome, a council cannot be œcumenical, nor its decrees binding on the church, unless it be called by the pope, and its acts be confirmed by him. In the history of the council at Jerusalem there is not found the slightest intimation that Peter had any superiority over the other Apostles. It was neither called by him, nor were its decisions confirmed by him. And from the fifteenth chapter to the end of the Acts, the name of Peter is not once mentioned. From the only inspired history we have of the first thirty years of the existence of the church under the New Dispensation, we are constrained to conclude, that the doctrine of Peter's supremacy was then unknown. This doctrine belongs to a later period.

The inspired epistles greatly strengthen the evidence in support of this conclusion. Paul addressed an epistle to the church of Rome, containing what may be properly regarded as a complete system of theology, doctrinal and practical; but in that epistle Peter's name is not once mentioned. He did, however, give to that church a warning which, had it been regarded, would have saved her from corruption and ruin. "For," said he, "if God spared not the natural branches [the Jews], take heed lest he also spare not thee."*

The same Apostle addressed two epistles to the church of Corinth. In the second of these, Peter is not once mentioned. In the first he is several times mentioned, but in such connection that even Papists do not appeal to that epistle as sustaining his supremacy. In the first chapter the Apostle reproves the church for the divisions which existed among them. "Now this I say, that every one of you saith—I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and

* Ch. xi, 21.

Digitized by Google

I of Cephas, and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" Evidently the Corinthian Christians did not know anything of the supremacy of Peter. If they had, contentions such as existed among them could not have now arisen. Or if they had sprung up, how suitable the opportunity, whilst they were thus contending, for Paul to have directed their attention to the "Prince of the Apostles," and to have impressed upon their minds the truth that he was "the center of unity." But he did not; he simply exhorted them not to glory in men, because all things were theirs, "whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas," &c.*

The next time Peter is mentioned he is spoken of as leading about a *wife*—a singular business, truly, for a pope! "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and *Cephas*?" † The author of the notes in the Doway Bible, indeed, assures us that the Apostle "only speaks of such devout women as, according to the custom of the Jewish nation, waited upon the preachers of the gospel, and supplied them with necessaries." But we shall be slow to believe, without very clear evidence, that the Apostles were in the habit of leading about women who were not their wives, to wait upon them. That is a practice of much later days, and seems to be peculiar to the Roman clergy. It is certain that Peter had a wife, since we read of his "wife's mother;" and there is, of course, nothing impossible in the intimation of Paul, that she often went with him in his journeys.

In the second epistle to the Corinthians, I have said Peter is not mentioned; and I may now add, that in this Paul employs language concerning himself which is utterly irreconcilable with the doctrine of Peter's supremacy. "For, I suppose," says he, "I was not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles;" and, as if he had been careful to employ the very strongest possible language in opposition to Popery, he says again—"For IN NOTHING am I behind the very chiefest Apostles, though I be nothing." ‡ Now if Peter was "the Prince of the Apostles," the

* Ch., iii, 21. † Ch. ix, 5. ‡ Ch. xii, 1, 2.

Digitized by Google

visible head of the church, how could Paul say with truth, that *in nothing* he was behind or inferior to the very chiefest Apostle? There is no way to sustain the claim set up for Peter, without condemning Paul as guilty of great presumption and rebellion! For if the doctrine of Rome is true, he certainly was greatly inferior to Peter in some things, at least in *authority*.

In the epistle to the Galatians we find Peter again mentioned, but in a manner wholly inconsistent with his pretended supremacy. Paul, it is true, says, he went to Jerusalem to see Peter; but it was after he had been filling the office of an Apostle *three years*. When appointed to the Apostleship he says—"Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them who were Apostles before me," &c.; and he is careful to say that the other Apostles added nothing to him.*

This is not all. Paul states distinctly that the gospel *of the circumcision*, the preaching of the gospel to the Jews—not the care of *the whole church*—was committed to Peter; as that of *the uncircumcision* was to him. "But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the circumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter ("For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles); &c. Now if Peter had been appointed visible head of the whole church, how could Paul say, with truth, that he was sent specially to the Jews, as he himself was to the Gentiles? Would it not sound strangely now to hear a Roman bishop representing the Pope of Rome as having in charge the ministry to a particular nation of people.

But Paul goes even further in contradiction of the doctrine of Rome; for he represents Peter, not as the *foundation* of the church, but as *one of its pillars*, and places him on a perfect equality with James and John. "And when James, *Cephas*, and John who seemed to be PILLARS, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellow-

* Chapters i ii.

Digitized by Google

ship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." Peter was but a *pillar;* and James and John were no less. Peter gave Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; but James and John did the same thing. Peter, therefore, exercised no superior authority. He like James and John, was going to preach the gospel to the Jews; as Paul and Barnabas to the Gentiles. Can you make a foundation of a *pillar?* or can you build a house on a pillar? If not, neither is the church built on Peter. He and James, and John, were *pillars* in the church—each of them sustaining the same relation to it.

From this epistle to the close of the New Testament, we do not find Peter again mentioned, except in the epistles which he himself wrote. The churches are warned against schism, against error, and against false teachers; but they are never once directed to Peter as the supreme visible head of the church, or as "the center of unity." John the Apostle lived to a great age, and wrote his epistles and the Apocalypse after the death of Peter, and when false teachers in great numbers were abroad in the earth. He exhorts Christians not to "believe every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God;" and he gives them certain tests by which they might ascertain who were true ministers of Christ, and who were false teachers; but in not a single instance does he allude to Peter or to any visible head of the church. Not an intimation is dropped that the supremacy of Peter and his successors had even been heard of. This is wholly unaccountable on the supposition that the doctrine of Rome is true, but perfectly consistent on the supposition that the great Protestant doctrine of Christ's headship is true.

V. Peter, we have said, was a *married man*, and, therefore, wholly disqualified for being Pope. Celibacy is regarded by Romanists as a state so much holier than marriage, that no married man is permitted to be a priest, or to fill any ecclesiastical office in the church of Rome. Deposition and excommunication would be visited upon the priest who should venture to be "the husband of one wife." Bishop Purcell, in his burning zeal for the *holy* state of celibacy, exclaims—"I glory in this feature of

Digitized by Google

our discipline. Death before dishonor to a virginal priesthood!"* Yet this same Bishop also glories in defending the doctrine that a married man, who must of course have dishonored the "virginal priesthood," was selected by our Lord himself as his vicar on earth—as the visible head of his church! One is almost tempted to think, that the Romish clergy glory in nothing, more than in being inconsistent! If Peter was visible head of the church, they who make it a crime of the first magnitude for a priest to marry, are not his ligitimate successors.

VI. Since the doctrine of Peter's supremacy is evidently contrary to the Scriptures, it is not very important that we trouble ourselves by referring to the uninspired history of the church. It is sufficient to state the fact, that the most learned men who are not Papists, are unable to find any trace of the doctrine of the pope's supremacy in the primitive ages of Christianity; that they even doubt whether Peter was ever at Rome. It is true that much deference was shown to those churches planted by the Apostles, and to Rome amongst others; but for the supremacy of the Roman Bishop we look in vain for several centuries after the death of Christ.

VII. *The practical working of this doctrine proves it of man's devising.* The office of the Pope has been shamefully used for the purposes of avarice, ambition, and lust, as the history of the church too clearly proves. At one time we find a Pope (Liberius) or a Bishop of Rome, signing the Arian creed; and again the pretended chair of Peter is filled by abominable debauchees, through whom the most dissolute women governed Rome and the church. That Pope Liberius did sign the Arian creed, thus denying the Lord that bought him, is not denied by Bishop Hughes; but he says, "Pope Liberius did not sign the Arian creed *in the Arian sense or meaning.*"† And, pray, what other sense had the Arian creed? Or could the Bishop inform us what is the *orthodox meaning* of an Arian creed? He attempts to save the orthodoxy of the Pope, by representing him as practicing a hypocritical and Jesuitical trick—signing a creed he

* Debate with Campbell, p. 191. † Cath. Con., Let. xxxi, p. 258.

Digitized by Google

did not believe, and attaching to it an orthodox meaning! The Bishop gives no evidence, however, that Liberius was guilty of such dishonesty.

Concerning the gross immorality of some of the popes we have the testimony of standard writers in the church of Rome. Bishop Hughes quotes Baronius as saying—"Who, considering these things, would not be scandalized, and think in amazement, that God had forgotten his church, which he permitted to be disgraced at the will (or caprice) of strumpets?"* Reeve tells of "the infamous Cardinal Borgia, who reigned eleven years, under the name of Alexander VI;" as also of "those unworthy popes, who so shamefully disgraced the tiara by their immoral conduct in the tenth century."† But the time would fail us to relate the hundredth part of the iniquity practiced by the pretended successors of St. Peter, who yet were neither censured or deposed for their shameful conduct.

In view of this discussion, we are brought to the following conclusions, viz.:

1st. That the Scriptures afford no evidence that it was the purpose of our Saviour to have his church united under the presidency of one visible head, or even of a general council. That he has but *one* church is certainly true; and Paul tells us distinctly in what the unity of the church consists, viz.: "*in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God.*‡" It is not union under a visible head, pope, or council, but holding the same faith, entertaining the same views of the character and work of the Son of God. Wherever, on the earth, we find a body of people holding the great doctrines of the gospel, observing its ordinances, and obeying its laws, there we find part of the family of Christ; and those Christians we acknowledge as brethren. And although Papists have, to so great extent, allowed the pope to dictate their faith, it is yet true that Protestants have a far better claim to Scriptural unity than they; because it is unity in the belief of revealed truth, received not on the testimony of fallible men, but on the authority of God. Romanists believe cer-

* Cath. Con., Let. xxxiii, p. 280. † Ch. Hist., v. i, p. 515. ‡ Eph., iv. 13.

Digitized by Google

tain doctrines and tenets because their clergy say they are true; Protestants "search the Scriptures daily whether these things are so." Moreover, it is a fact, which has been proved in preceding lectures, that the Roman clergy differ from each other on several most important points of faith, which they have never been able to determine, and which, therefore, they choose to call *opinions*.

The truth is, the doctrines of the pope's supremacy and church infallibility have failed to prevent frequent and terrible schisms, and the spread of heresy. Who has not heard of the great schism which divided the Greek and Latin church into two bodies, between which to this day there is no fellowship? Who has not read of the Great Western Schism in the fourteenth century, when there were at the same time three or four rival popes, each sustained by his party, and each fulminating excommunications and anathemas at the others, to the unspeakable dishonor of the Christian name?—which schism agitated and divided the western church for half a century, and was terminated only by the deposition of all the popes and the election of a new one by the Council of Constance, which was effected after the See of Rome had been vacant, and the church had been without a head, *two years!* And whether the Council had the right to adopt this high-handed measure is not yet determined among the theologians of Rome; since some of them contend that the pope is above a general council. Who has not read of the Arian heresy, which had its rise in the fourth century, and which for a time overran the church, when Liberius, Bishop of Rome, signed the Arian creed? Now if the doctrine of Papists be true, the supremacy of the pope was then universally acknowledged; and yet it was perfectly powerless to stop the spread of that ruinous heresy, which was not checked without the aid of the civil arm. And who does not know how completely the pope and his clergy failed to stay the progress of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, even when they had all the civil rulers in Christendom under their ghostly authority? And so far as it was checked, it was done, not by the *spiritual power* of Rome, but by the sword of persecution and the tortures of the Inquisition! Who has not

Digitized by Google

heard of the recent religious revolution in Germany, under the ministry of Ronge and Czerski, which is still extending, and is affecting the German population of our own country.

The truth is, these schisms and revolutions, at least some of the most important, owe their origin to the tyranny and corruption of Rome. The shameful sale of indulgences by Tetzel and his coadjutors, was the immediate occasion of the glorious Reformation; and the impositions and gross superstitions connected with the famous coat of Treves, produced the revolution now in progress. Such facts as these, and they might be greatly multiplied, show with how much reason the Roman clergy declaim concerning the divisions among Protestants, and boast of the unity of their own church. The difference between Protestants and Papists, so far as this matter is concerned, is simply this: Papists *excommunicate* and *anathematize* all who presume to differ from them in the smallest point of what they call *faith;* while Protestants acknowledge as brethren all who hold the fundamental doctrines of the cross, and who give evidence, by their conduct, that they are the true followers of Christ. The Roman clergy shall be welcome to all the credit due their church on this score.

2d. We are now prepared to answer the question so often boastingly, asked by Romanists—"Where was your church before Luther and Calvin?" In the New Testament we find a church organized, which, in all essential points, is identical with the Presbyterian and other evangelical Protestant churches. Whether we can trace the church in every step of its progress, from the Apostles down to the present day, is not important; though we believe we can do it. We have no inspired or perfect history of the Christian church. So far as we have history, it has been written by fallible men, whose particular prejudices give coloring to what they wrote. The Christian church like the Jewish, however, has had its beauty greatly marred, and its strength impaired, by error and superstition. As the Book of the Law was for a time buried under the rubbish in the Jewish temple, so, during the dark ages, was the Bible almost lost amid the immense multitude

Digitized by Google

of human traditions. And as the Book of the Law, when found, wrought a most important reformation in the Jewish church, so the Scriptures, when restored to their place, as the lamp to the feet, and the light to the path of men, in the 16th century, wrought a glorious reformation—the results of which shall be seen and felt to the end of time, and throughout eternity.

But the church whose faith contradicts the Word of God cannot be right; and the church whose faith is sustained by that Word, cannot be wrong. To this test we appeal; and by it we are willing to stand or fall.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

LECTURE VI.

LUKE xxiv, 47. "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Jesus Christ had risen from the dead. He had appeared to two of his disciples as they were going to Emmaus, a village near to Jerusalem—and, beginning at Moses and the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself. He then manifested himself to the Apostles in Jerusalem, and in his discourse said—"Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." The commission which he gave the Apostles was, to go and preach *the gospel* to every creature; and in discharging this duty they would preach repentance and remission of sins in his name.

Observe, they were to call upon men to perform a duty—to repent; and they were to offer them, on condition of repentance, the remission of their sins; and this remission would be granted in the name, and through the merits of Christ.

The particular truth to which your attention is invited, is—*that full remission of sins is granted to every one who* REPENTS, *and to no others.* This doctrine is abundantly taught in the Scriptures, as in such passages as the following: "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise."* "But to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word."† "And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner. I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other." ‡

* Ps. li, 17. † Isaiah lxvi, 2. ‡ Luke xviii, 13, 14.

Digitized by Google

What, then, is *repentance*? Literally it is a *change of mind*—such a change of views and feelings as leads to hatred of all sin, and deep, ingenuous sorrow for sin. Such was the change in the mind of the publican, when, ashamed and distressed, he cried—"God be merciful to me a sinner." Such repentance leads necessarily to reformation; for he who hates sin must love holiness; and he who mourns his past transgressions will turn from them to "the obedience of the faith."

But the Roman clergy teach that men must *do penance;* and they even affirm that *penance* is a SACRAMENT appointed by Jesus Christ. It was instituted, they tell us, when "he breathed on his disciples, saying, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." As a sacrament it is designed, according to them, for those only *who sin after baptism.* The Council of Trent says—"If, in all the regenerate, there were such gratitude, that they always kept the righteousness received by his goodness and grace in baptism, there would have been no need to institute another sacrament for the remission of sins besides baptism. But since God, who is rich in mercy, knoweth our frame, he hath provided a saving remedy for those who yield themselves again to the slavery of sin and the power of the devil, namely, the sacrament of penance, whereby the benefits of the death of Christ are applied to those who sin *after baptism.*"

The sacrament of *penance*, we are told, consists, as to the matter of it, of three acts or parts, viz.: contrition, confession, and satisfaction. "Moreover," says the Council of Trent, "the acts of the penitent, namely, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, are the matter, as it were, of this sacrament, which, inasmuch as they are required by divine appointment, in order to the completeness of the sacrament, and the full and perfect remission of sins, are for this reason called the parts of penance."

The minister of this sacrament, we are taught by Rome, is a regularly ordained priest; and "the form of the sacrament of penance, in which its power chiefly lies, resides in the words of

Digitized by Google

the minister—'I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'"*

Such is the doctrine of the Roman clergy, guarded, as are all their tenets, by *anathemas* against all who venture to deny its infallible truth. Disregarding their anathemas, I proceed to assign the reasons why we protest against it.

I. *The command to* DO PENANCE *is not found in the Scriptures.* It is found in the Doway Bible; but the words translated *penance* and *do penance*, never have any such meaning. The words are *metanoia* and *matnoeo.* The first of these words signifies literally *a change of mind*, and the second, *to change the mind.* These words are derived from *noos*, the mind, and *meta*, which signifies a change, as in the English words *metamorphosis*, *metaphor*, &c. I need not go into the proof of these statements, because they will scarcely be called in question by any one. These words, then, let it be remarked, express simply and exclusively *mental exercises*—a change of views and a consequent change of feelings, terminating in sorrow for sin, and reformation of life. But the word *penance* is derived from the Latin word *poena*, which signifies, not a change of mind, but *punishment;* and one of the most important parts of what is called the sacrament of penance is *satisfaction*, made to divine justice, by punishment inflicted and voluntarily or patiently endured. Every intelligent mind perceives at once the radical difference between punishment inflicted on the body or the mind, in order to satisfy the claims of divine justice, and that "godly sorrow" which arises from hatred of sin, and leads to reformation. Indeed there could not be a grosser mistranslation, a more unjustifiable perversion of Scripture, than the rendering of the word *metanoeo*, *do penance.* It is not only an incorrect translation; it is really no translation at all. The words in question have no such meaning as that assigned to them in the Doway Bible. The Latin Vulgate, which is of highest authority with Papists, translates the word *metanoeite* (repent) by the Latin words *agite pœnitentiam*, but the word *pœnitentia*, as every Latin scholar knows, does not mean

* Ch. i and iii—on Penance.

Digitized by Google

penance, but *penitence*, or sorrow for sin. So that the Doway translation is not even a correct rendering of the Vulgate. For the correctness of these statements I appeal to all respectable Greek and Latin Lexicons, and to every scholar of any reputation.

A brief quotation from the Catechism of the Council of Trent will obviate the necessity of adducing further proof of the correctness of my statements concerning the meaning of the words translated *repent* and *repentance*. "The pastor, therefore, will teach that the word (pœnitentia) has a variety of meanings. In the first place, it is used to express *a change of mind;* as when, without taking into account the nature of the object, whether good or bad, what was before pleasing, is now become displeasing to us. * * * In the second place, it is used to express that sorrow which the sinner conceives for sin, not however for sake of God, but for his own sake. A third meaning is when we experience interior sorrow of heart, or give exterior indication of such sorrow, not only on account of the sins which we have committed, but also for sake of God alone whom they offend. To all these sorts of sorrow the word (pœnitentia) properly applies." p. 177. Even according to the Roman exposition of the word, you perceive, it expresses nothing more than *a change of mind resulting in sorrow for sin.* It does not express what the Roman clergy mean by *penance.*

II. *But even if we admit the correctness of the translation, the Scriptures give no countenance to the doctrine of Rome.* The Council of Trent teaches that the sacrament of penance was instituted "for the benefit of the *faithful*, to reconcile them to God; as often as they shall fall into sin *after baptism;*" but the passages of Scripture in which the command is contained, require *penance* (if we allow the translation) *before baptism* and *in order to it.* John the Baptist preached to the Jews, saying, "Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."* And on the day of Penticost Peter said, "Do penance, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins."† The Council of Trent acknowledge, that "in order to obtain grace

* Math. iii, 2. † Acts ii, 38.

Digitized by Google

and righteousness, penance was always necessary for all men who had defiled themselves with mortal sin, even for those who sought to be washed in the sacrament of baptism;"* but they make a great difference between penance as required before baptism, and penance as a sacrement after baptism. That is, when God commands *unbaptized* persons to do penance, they understand him as meaning one thing; and when he commands *baptized* persons to do penance, though precisely the same language is employed, they understand something radically different! Is not this a singular mode of interpreting language?

Where in the Bible shall we find penance as a *sacrament?* We are told that our Lord instituted the sacrament of penance, when after his resurrection he said to the Apostles—"Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them," &c.† But unfortunately the word translated *penance* is not here used; nor is there anything either about penance or any sacrament. Whatever the passage may mean, therefore, it gives no countenance to the doctrine of penance as a sacrament.

Since, then, the command to do penance is not found in the Word of God; and since, even if we admit the grossly false translation of the Doway Bible, penance is required before baptism and in order to it, and is never spoken of as a sacrament; the conclusion is inevitable, that the doctrine of the church of Rome is false. It is a corruption of the Scriptural doctrine of *repentance.*

III. The third argument we urge against the doctrine of penance, is, *that two of the three parts of which it is said to consist, are palpably contrary to the Word of God,* viz., CONFESSION *and* SATISFACTION. We believe in the necessity of *contrition*—of "godly sorrow" for sin—but against the other two parts of this pretended sacrament we enter our protest. Let us examine those points carefully.

1st. We believe in the necessity of confession of sin, but not in the kind of confession required by the Roman clergy. We believe in the necessity of confession *to God.* Such was the con-

* Ch. i, on Penance. † John xx, 22, 23.

Digitized by Google

fession of David: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight," &c.* Such was the confession of the publican, "God, be merciful to me, a sinner."† Such is the confession spoken of by John the Apostle, "If we confess our sins, he [God] is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."‡

We believe in confession *to the officers and church of Christ*, when persons desire to be admitted to membership. This is necessary, that they to whom "the keys of the kingdom" are committed, may have evidence that the applicants for membership are truly converted to God. Of such confession we have a remarkable example in Acts xix, 18, 19: "And many that believed came and *confessed*, and showed their deeds. Many also, of them which used curious arts, brought their books together, and burned them before all men." This was a *public confession, before baptism*, which justified the church in receiving the persons as members of the church of Christ. It was not such confession as the church of Rome requires.

We believe in confession to the *church*, when a member has been guilty of unchristian conduct, that the reproach thus thrown upon the cause of Christ may be removed, and that the church may have such evidence of the repentance of the sinning member, as will justify his being restored to their confidence and fellowship. The church may then forgive the offense, *so far as it has been committed against her*. Of such confession we have an example in 2 Cor. ii, 7, "So that contrarywise, ye ought rather to forgive him [the incestuous but deeply penitent member], lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow," The individual had greatly sinned, and had been excluded from the fellowship of the church; but, having given satisfactory evidence of true repentance, he was, by the direction of the Apostle, restored.

We believe in confession to *individuals*, when we have done them an injury [see Matthew v, 23, 24], that we may make the

* Psalms li, 4. † Luke xviii, 13. ‡ 1 John i, 9.

Digitized by Google

best reparation in our power, and enable them again to place confidence in us.

We believe that Christians should confess their faults *one to another*, that they may the more fervently pray for each other. James the Apostle says, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another that ye may be healed."*

In confessions such as these Protestants believe; but we most decidedly protest against *auricular confession to a priest, in order to receive absolution or pardon.*

The Roman clergy do not require *all* sins to be confessed to priests, but only *mortal* sins. The Council of Trent says, "For venial offenses, by which we are not excluded from the grace of God, and into which we so frequently fall, may be concealed without fault, and expiated in many other ways; although, as the pious custom of many demonstrates, they may be mentioned in confession, very properly and usefully, and without any presumption. But seeing that all mortal sins, even of thought, make men children of wrath, and enemies of God, it is necessary to seek from him pardon of every one of them, with open and humble confession." Mortal sins, we are told, are to be confessed to the priests, not generally, but in minute detail, with all the attendant circumstances which may aggravate or palliate the offense. "For," says the Council, "it is plain that the priests cannot sustain the office of judge, if the cause be unknown to them; or inflict equitable punishments, if sins are only confessed in general, and not minutely and individually described. For this reason it follows that penitents are bound to rehearse in confession all mortal sins, of which, after diligent examination of themselves, they are conscious, even though they be of the most secret kind, and only committed against the two last precepts of the decalogue, &c. * * * * Moreover, it follows, that even those circumstances which alter the species of sin are to be explained in confession, since otherwise the penitents cannot fully confess their sins, nor the judge know them," &c.†

The priest who hears confession is represented as setting in

* Ch. v, 16. † Ch. v, of Confession.

Digitized by Google

the tribunal of penance, as Christ himself, and forgiving sins and inflicting punishment, as a *judge*. "Though," says the Council of Trent, "the priest's absolution is the dispensation of a benefit which belongs to another, yet it is not to be considered as merely a ministry, whether to publish the gospel, or to declare the remission of sins, *but as of the nature of a judicial act, in which sentence is pronounced by him as a* JUDGE," &c.* We often hear of Romanists denying that the priests profess to forgive sins as judges; but look at the language of their infallible council. The language of the Catechism of Trent is, if possible, still more explicit. "Unlike the authority given to the priests of the Old Law, to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy, the power with which the priests of the New Law are invested is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but, as the ministers of God, *really to absolve from sin;* a power which God himself, the author and source of grace and justification, exercises through their ministry." Again: "The voice of the priest, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, *is to be heard as that of Christ himself*, who said to the lame man, 'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.' "†

We oppose this doctrine for the following reasons:—

1. It is founded on an unscriptural and grossly absurd division of sins into *mortal* and *venial*—the former deserving eternal punishment, and the latter only temporal punishment. What is a *mortal sin?* The Doway Catechism says—"Any great offense against the law of God; and is so called because it kills the soul, and robs it of the spiritual life of grace."‡ The language, you perceive, is perfectly indefinite—"any great offense." *How great* must it be before it becomes mortal, and deserves eternal punishment? How are we to ascertain precisely how great an offense must be, to make it mortal sin? This is not a mere speculative matter. On the contrary, it is one of the utmost importance. Men, we are told, must confess to the priest all their mortal sins, because every such sin "kills the soul, and robs it of the spiritual life of grace." How unspeakably important, then, that they

* Ch. vi, of the Minister. † pp. 182, 180. ‡ p. 110.

Digitized by Google

be able to ascertain with infallible certainty when they are guilty of mortal sin. But when we ask the clergy, who profess to be our guides, what is mortal sin? they tell us, it is "any great offense against the law of God"—using language perfectly indefinite, and therefore, for all practical purposes, unmeaning!

But here we have an effort to answer the question. "How shall we be able to know when any sin is mortal, and when it is but venial?" Answer—"Because to any mortal sin it is required both that it be deliberate, and perfectly voluntary; and that it be a matter of weight against the law of God; one or both of which conditions are always wanting in a venial sin."* We will say nothing of the expressions, "deliberate and perfectly voluntary;" but what are we to understand definitely by "a *matter of weight* against the law of God?" How much of *weight* must there be? The language is again perfectly indefinite, and therefore, for practical purposes, unmeaning. Let any man take this definition, and determine, if he can, when he is guilty of mortal sin, and what sins he must confess. He cannot do it; and, which is worse, his priest or his bishop cannot help him out of his perplexity; for each of them is fallible, and therefore cannot give a better definition of mortal sin than his brethren have given. They may express an *opinion;* but they can say nothing with certainty.

Where does the venial sin become mortal, and the finite pass the line beyond which it is infinite? A venial sin, we are told, is "a small and very pardonable offense against God, or our neighbor." † But *how* small? All is indefinite again. The truth is, it is impossible for any Romanist to know when he sins mortally, and therefore it is impossible for any to be assured that they have confessed all their mortal sins.

But let us look a little further into the Doway Catechism. It teaches us that there are *seven deadly sins*, viz.: "Pride, covetousness, lechery, anger, gluttony, envy, and sloth." ‡ How the Roman clergy ascertained that precisely these seven and no more were deadly sins, I know not; such, however, is their assertion.

* Dow. Cat., p. 111. † Ibid. ‡ p. 112.

Digitized by Google

But here we are met by the same difficulty just noticed. *Pride*, for example, is a deadly sin. Is *every degree* of pride deadly or mortal sin? If so, it follows, that every individual who is not perfect in humility is constantly living in deadly sin. If this be true, how many of the clergy themselves would be free from deadly sin, even for an hour? Would even the man claiming the proud title—"His Holiness"—escape? But if every degree of pride is not mortal sin, in what degree must it exist, before it becomes deadly? Where, precisely, does it pass the line—that invisible line—which separates the venial from the mortal, the finite from the infinite? Here we are perfectly in the dark; all is indefinite and wholly unsatisfactory.

Again—*Covetousness* is a deadly sin. Is every degree of it so? If not, what degree is? The same questions may be asked concerning the whole seven; and no answer can be given. The division of sins into mortal and venial is perfectly absurd.

But we may well doubt whether the list of mortal sins, even if we admit the distinction, is quite complete. It is truly surprising that in this list we do not find *lying* and *stealing*—sins which have been almost universally regarded as mortal, if any are so. But lying, we are told, is not always mortal sin. The Doway Catechism has the following question and answer:—"When is a lie a mortal sin? Answer. When it is any great dishonor to God or notable prejudice to our neighbor; otherwise, if it be merely officious, or trifling, it is but a venial sin."* Here again the language is perfectly indefinite. A lie is a mortal sin, we are informed, when it is any *great* dishonor to God. *How great* must be the dishonor before the venial sin becomes mortal? A man may tell lies which are a dishonor to God; but unless the dishonor be *great*, they are only venial sins! A lie is a mortal sin, the Catechism says, when it is a "*notable* prejudice to our neighbor." *How notable* must it be? What does the word *notable* mean in this connection? Does it convey any definite idea?

A man may *steal* as well as *lie*, it seems, without being chargeable with mortal sin. The same Catechism already quoted has

* p. 69

Digitized by Google

the following question and answer: "When is theft a mortal sin? A. When the thing stolen is of a considerable value, or causeth a considerable hurt to our neighbor."* Theft, we are here taught, is not mortal sin, unless the thing stolen is of a *considerable* value. What does the word *considerable* here mean? Would one dollar, or five, or ten, or twenty, be of considerable value? The clergy cannot inform us. What if a Romanist should conclude that *fifty* dollars is not of a considerable value, and, therefore, having stolen that amount, and regarding himself as guilty of only venial sin, should conceal the crime from his confessor, would he violate any law of the Roman church? But if the theft causeth "a *considerable hurt* to our neighbor," then it is mortal sin. Here again we have the same vague, indefinite language. What is meant by *considerable hurt?* How great must the injury be, before the hurt becomes considerable? No answer. Now we know the loss of a single dollar would be a considerable hurt to a very poor person, whilst the loss of five hundred dollars would not be seriously felt by a man worth a hundred thousand. Suppose, then, a Romanist should steal one hundred or five hundred dollars from such a man; would this theft be a mortal sin? In view of the immense riches of the man from whom the amount is stolen, would it be "a considerable value?" Or, since the loss of this sum would not cause any very serious injury to the wealthy neighbor, would it amount to "considerable hurt?" No answer—all is perfectly indefinite.

The truth forces itself upon us, in view of these wretched principles, that the moral code of Rome is rotten to the very core. Who ever before thought of measuring the moral guilt of theft simply or chiefly by the quantity stolen? Who does not know that the man who will steal one dollar, is destitute of the principle of honesty—is a thief in heart? Who does not know that such a man will steal a larger sum, whenever the temptation and the opportunity present themselves? Paul the Apostle has taught us that "*thieves*," whether they actually steal much or little, shall not inherit the kingdom of God;† but according to the

* p. 66. † 1 Cor. vi, 10.

Digitized by Google

teaching of the Roman clergy, men may be in heart and in fact thieves, and may yet inherit the kingdom of God, because they may be guilty of only venial sin! In other words, a man may be a true Christian, and yet be a thief and a liar!

I have said that the morality of Rome is rotten to the very core. It is admirably adapted to make thieves and liars; for they teach children that they may lie and steal, and yet be guilty only of venial sin, which it is wholly unnecessary to confess, since it is remitted "by all the sacraments, by holy water, devout prayer, alms-deeds, and the like good works."* What multitudes of children have become confirmed liars by telling, at first, those *venial* lies! And how many have gone to the penitentiary and the gallows, who commenced their downward career by pilfering articles of trifling value! Only teach them that a little "holy water," "devout prayer," and the like, will secure the remission of such sins; and the way is fairly open for them to become *religious liars and thieves!* And of all liars and thieves these are the worst; because they have the means, which others have not, and to which their infallible guides have helped them, of quieting their consciences.

I am aware that Roman writers boast of the efficacy of "the tribunal of penance," particularly in securing the restoration of stolen property. The *Catholic Herald*, of July 21, 1836, contains a letter from an Irish priest, addressed to a gentleman who had charged him with having used the confessional for political purposes. By way of proving the utility of the confessional in restraining immorality, he mentions the following, amongst other instances, of the restoration of stolen property by Roman priests:

"The following persons, whose published receipts are now lying before me, acknowledge that they have received the sums opposite to their names, as restitution money, through the hands of Catholic priests:

Mr. Thos. North, Drogheda, - - - - - -	£20
Alexander Carew, Hymenstown, - - - - -	105
Richard Jeffares, - - - - - - - - - - -	12

* Dow. Cat., p. 111.

Digitized by Google

Lord Rathdowne, - - - - - - - - - - 10
John Dumie, Ballinakill, - - - - - - - 30
Rev. C. Stewart, Dublin, - - - - - - - - 20
James Walsh, Dame street, - - - - - - - 10
The Teller of the Exchequer, - - - - - - 100"

One of these gentlemen, Mr. Dumie, in his published letter, addressed to the Rev. Mr. Kehoe, after acknowledging the receipt of £30, adds, "The numerous instances that have come to my knowledge of the restitution made through you, and for sums of very considerable amount—in one instance of 700 guineas—are, in my humble judgment, among the unquestionable proofs of the purity of that faith which you profess and teach."

The writer of this letter mentions but "a few instances," but says, "I could mention *thousands*." Truly, these statements, so boastingly made, are instructive. For evidently, when there is so much restitution of stolen property, there must be a great deal stolen; and if one priest could mention *thousands* of cases, and if we may suppose that others could mention as many, there must have been an immense number of thieves amongst the Roman Catholics of Ireland. How shall we account for this? Doubtless, it may be traced, in part, to the very division of sins into venial and mortal, of which we are now speaking. Protestants read in their Bible: "Let him that stole, steal no more;" and they learn that thieves and liars will find their portion in the lake of fire. But Romanists are taught that they can both lie and steal without committing mortal sin, and that venial sin is easily remitted by a little "holy water," &c.

The truth is, notwithstanding all the boasting about restitution, a great deal of what is stolen by Papists is never restored to the owners. I beg leave to read a few extracts from St. Ligori's Moral Theology—a standard work among Romanists. He says: "Concerning the seventh commandment [the eighth in our Bible] let him [the confessor] ask, whether he [the penitent] has stolen anything from another, and from whom, and whether from one or more, whether alone or with others, and whether once or often: because if he has stolen a valuable material at any one

Digitized by Google

time, he has sinned mortally at that time. But if he has stolen a small amount at different times, then he has not sinned mortally, unless it amount to a valuable quantity; provided that from the beginning he had not the intention of reaching a valuable amount; but since that amount has now become considerable (*gravis*) although he has not sinned mortally, yet he is bound *sub-gravi*—under mortal sin, to restitution, *at least of that last quantity which constituted the amount considerable.*" Here, you observe, we are informed, that a man may steal small quantities without being chargeable with mortal sin; and when the goods or money stolen amount to a considerable sum—(the language is perfectly indefinite)—he is bound to restore *the last quantity stolen!* Of course, he may retain all the remainder without being chargeable with anything worse than venial sin, which is "a small and very pardonable offense."

Again he says: "But probably those who have eaten fruit in the vineyards of others, provided they be not rare, or of great price, may be excused at least from mortal sin, if they do not carry it away in large qantities. [The language still perfectly indefinite.] For in things of this kind, which are too little expounded, a greater quantity is required to constitute a valuable amount. And in this way men-servants and maid-servants may be easily excused, who take from their master's tables; provided they be not in large quantities, or extraordinary. Neither ought those to be regarded as guilty of mortal sin who cut wood, or take their flocks to feed in the fields of the community, though it be prohibited, because such prohibitions are supposed to be penal."

Again: "When thefts are committed by children, or by wives, a much greater quantity is required to constitute the sin mortal; and rarely are these held under strong obligation (gravi obligatione) to restore."

Once more: "If he [the thief] cannot make restitution without reducing himself to severe want, that is, without falling from that state which he has justly acquired, then he may defer restitution, provided the loser be not in severe want. Nay, though the loser be in severe want, probably even then the

Digitized by Google

debtor is not bound to restitution, when he is likewise in severe want, and by restitution would be placed, as it were, in extreme necessity. This, however, is understood, provided the thing stolen does not exist in species, and provided the loser was not reduced particularly by that theft to that severe necessity." Here it is observable, that *circumstances* are to determine whether stolen property must be restored.

Again—"If the theft is uncertain, that is, if the person injured is uncertain, the penitent is bound to restore, either by causing masses to be said, or giving alms to the poor, or giving it to pious places; and if he is poor, he may apply it to himself or his family. But if the person is certain, restitution should be made to him: wherefore it is indeed wonderful that there are found so many confessors so unskilful, who, when it is known who the loser is, impose on their penitents, that for the thing to be restored they should give alms, or cause masses to be celebrated."

I said this division of sins into mortal and venial, is grossly absurd. It is more; it is grossly immoral in its tendency. And this very division accounts, to a considerable extent, for the prevalence of all kinds of immorality in Roman countries, and amongst Romanists in Protestant countries. Who wonders that the morality of which I have given a specimen, leads men to dishonesty? Need I undertake to prove this division of sins unscriptural? Where in the Bible do you read of *venial sins?* "The wages of sin is death," says Paul.* But according to the doctrine of Rome, he should have said—The wages of *mortal* sin is death. "The soul that sinneth it shall die," says Ezekiel.† Why did he not say, The soul that sinneth *mortally?* The Apostle John speaks of a sin unto death, for the forgiveness of which we are not to pray; this is probably the unpardonable sin, but is certainly not what Papists call mortal sin. So they themselves acknowledge. The passage is as follows: "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it."

* Rom. vi, 23. † Ch. xviii, 20.

Digitized by Google

1 Epis. v, 16. A note in the Doway Bible on this passage, says —"It is hard to determine what St. John here calls a sin, *which is not unto death*, and a sin which is *unto death*. The difference cannot be the same as betwixt sins that are called *venial* and *mortal*. * * * *By a sin*, therefore, *which is unto death*, interpreters commonly understand a wilful apostacy from the faith, and from the known truth," &c.

In the Doway Catechism we are referred, for proof that some sins are venial, to 1 John i, 8. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." We are likewise referred to James iii, 2. "In many things we all offend;" and to Math. xii, 36. "But I say unto you, That for every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." But in these passages not a word is said about venial sins, nor about the Roman division of sins into mortal and venial. The Roman clergy *assume* what they cannot prove—that what they call mortal sin robs the soul of spiritual life, and makes him who commits it, an enemy of God; and thence they infer, that any sin which a true believer may commit without losing spiritual life, is venial, not mortal. The premises are not true, and therefore the conclusion is false. But the same Catechism refers to Prov. xxiv, 16. "The just man falleth seven times," &c. "Not mortally," say the authors, "for then he were no longer just, therefore, venially." This, however, is a gross misapplication of the text, as the preceding verse proves conclusively—"Lay not wait, O wicked man, against the dwelling of the righteous; spoil not his resting-place: for a just man falleth seven times, and riseth up again." In what way does a just man fall? Into sin? No—lay not in wait, O wicked man, to injure the righteous; for God is his protector; and though he be prostrated seven times, he shall rise and prosper again. Such is the obvious meaning of the passage.

It is by such assumptions and perversions of Scripture, that a division is made of sins into mortal and venial. But since this division is absurd, immoral in its tendancy, and unscriptural, it follows, that the doctrine that all *mortal sins* must be confessed to

Digitized by Google

Roman priests, is false. The doctrine of auricular confession cannot stand without this division; for we know that no one can confess in detail all the sins with which he is chargeable; and if this were possible, the clergy could never hear the confessions of their followers. But by classing much the larger portion of all their sins under the head of *venial sins*, which need not be confessed, the thing becomes more practicable. The truth is, the distinction is one of the many inventions of the clergy to suit, and enable them to carry out in practice, their dogmas. The corruption of a single prominent doctrine of Scripture makes other alterations and corruptions equally necessary; just as he who tells one falsehood, must tell several more to avoid contradiction or inconsistency.

2. In the Old Testament we read of nothing like auricular confession or priestly absolution. In the Temple of Solomon there were no *confessionals*. Indeed it is worthy of remark, that even the proud Pharisees, in the height of their presumption, never dreamed of claiming authority to forgive sin. When our Lord forgave the sins of a man in their presence, they, regarding him merely as a man, exclaimed—"Why doth this man speak blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God only?"* Evidently they had never heard of the doctrine of priestly absolution. And yet, so far as we can judge, there was quite as much necessity for such confession and absolution under the old dispensation, as under the new.

3. In the New Testament there is no command to Christians to confess to the ministers of Christ, with a view of obtaining absolution; nor is there one example of confession heard and absolution granted by any one of the Apostles or other Christian ministers. Strange as it may seem, Roman writers rely for the doctrine of auricular confession upon James v, 16—"Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." But does the Apostle require Christians to confess to a *priest?* No—but "*one to another.*" Does he require them to do this, that they may be absolved by "a judicial act?" No—

* Mark ii, 7.

Digitized by Google

but that they may *pray* one for another. And why should all this be done? Because Christ gave to his ministers the keys of the kingdom, that they might forgive sin? No—but because "the effectual fervent prayer of the righteous availeth much with God." This is proved by reference to the remarkable manner which the prayers of the Prophet Elias were heard. What has all this to do with auricular confession and priestly absolution? How hardly pressed must the Roman clergy be, when they seek to sustain their doctrines by perversions of Scripture so glaring!

It is true, Jesus Christ gave to his ministers "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and authorized them to forgive and retain sins. But have they the keys of the *kingdom of glory*, so that no man can enter *heaven* but by their permission? So affirms the Catechism of the Council of Trent. "To gain admission into heaven, its gates must be opened to us by the power of the keys conferred by Almighty God to the care of his church." "For," say the Tridentine Fathers, "if heaven can be entered without the keys, in vain shall they to whose fidelity they have been intrusted assume the prerogative of prohibiting indiscriminate *entrance* within its portals."* The Roman clergy, presumptuously claiming that Christ has given them the keys of the kingdom of glory, pretend to say who shall, and who shall not, go to heaven!

What are we to understand by "the keys of the kingdom of heaven?" To answer this question we must ascertain the meaning of the phrase—"kingdom of heaven." John the Baptist preached, saying, "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."† Did he mean the kingdom of glory? No—but the new, spiritual dispensation under which the church was about to be placed. So in parables our Lord said, "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field; but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat." Again—"The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed"—"is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal"—"is like unto a net,"

* p. 193. † Math. iii, 2.

Digitized by Google

&c. The Disciples came to Jesus and asked—"Who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" "And from the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." * In these and other passages it is evident that "the kingdom of heaven" is the church under the new dispensation. The design of "the keys" is to unlock the door and admit those who ought to enter, and to close it against the unworthy. The Apostles of Christ were ministers of *the church on earth*, not of the church triumphant in heaven; and therefore the keys of the church on earth were given to them. They consequently were authorized not only to preach the gospel to every creature, but to exercise discipline for the purpose of preserving the purity of the church. They were authorized to open the door to those who gave evidence of piety, and to exclude others; and the legitimate exercise of this authority was sanctioned and confirmed in heaven. Beyond this the Apostles never exercised authority, unless, as in case of Ananias and Sapphira, they were divinely directed to inflict miraculous punishment on bold offenders. This ecclesiastical authority the officers of the church still have. But is there in the New Testament one command to Christians to confess their sins to any man, for the purpose of obtaining absolution? There is not. Is there one example of a minister of Christ hearing confession, and granting absolution? Not one. When Simon Magus, after he had been baptized, proposed to purchase the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, Peter said to him—"Repent, therefore, of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee." † Peter did not direct Simon to confess to him, and obtain from him absolution, though his sin was committed *after baptism*, when, according to Rome, the sacrament of penance must be resorted to? Far from it. Such powers he never thought of claiming. The claim of the pope and his clergy to forgive sins *judicially* is one of the many things which fix the meaning and application of that remarkable passage of

* Math. xiii and xi, 12. † Acts viii, 22.

Digitized by Google

Scripture—"Who opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God, or that is worshipped." *

VI. The doctrine of auricular confession is not only unauthorized and unscriptural, *but its tendency and uniform effects are deeply injurious to morality.* God has wisely so constituted the human mind that its thoughts and feelings can be known to others only by its voluntary act. Into this sanctuary the Roman clergy claim the right to enter. The most secret thoughts and feelings must be revealed to them, however female modesty may shrink from the recital. Some of the questions contained in standard Roman works, such as LIGORI, to be propounded to penitents, are such as I dare not mention before this audience. Priests are men of like passions with others. Indeed it is too notorious to be denied, that multitudes of them are men of corrupt minds and of immoral habits. Can it be otherwise, so long as human nature is what it ever has been, than that gross immorality must result, in many cases, from auricular confession? Priests are not only imperfect, and many of them corrupt men, but they are *unmarried* men, to whom, therefore, it is particularly improper that females should be required to confess.

That I do not exaggerate the danger from this source, is evident from the acknowledgment of eminent Roman writers. Take, for example, the following from St. LIGORI: "The confessor," says he, "should be extremely cautious in hearing the confessions of women." And, after giving a number of cautions, he exclaims—"And truly, O how many priests, who once were innocent, in consequence of similar attachment [to female penitents] which had commenced in spirit, have lost both God and the soul." Again—"In hearing the confessions of women, and in holding communications with them, let him [the confessor] exercise that austerity which is proper, according to prudence, and, therefore, let him refuse small presents; let him avoid familiarity, and all other things which can be the cause of adhesion (*adhesionis*). O how many confessors, on account of some negligence about this, have ruined (*perdiderunt*) their own souls, and

* 2 Thess. ii, 4.

Digitized by Google

the souls of their penitents." This Roman saint would not slander the clergy. Are we not justifiable, then, in view of his testimony, given in language so unequivocal and so strong, in pronouncing the confessional dangerous to virtue, and of immoral tendency? Have not husbands, fathers, and brothers strong reasons for objecting to their wives, daughters, and sisters confessing privately to the Roman priests? I must here introduce the testimony of Rev. Joseph Blanco White, for a number of years a priest of high standing in Spain, afterwards a clergyman of the church of England. I quote from a work published by this gentleman in 1825, the title of which is—"*Practical and Internal Evidences against Catholicism*," &c.

"That my feelings are painfully vehement when I dwell upon this subject; that neither the freedom I have enjoyed so many years, nor the last repose of the victims, the remembrance of whom still wrings tears from my eyes, can allay the bitter pangs of my youth; are proofs that my views arise from a real, painful, and protracted experience. Of monks and friars I know comparatively little; because the vague suspicions, of which the most pious Spanish parents cannot divest themselves, prevented my frequenting the interior of monasteries during my boyhood. * * * * But of the secular clergy, and the amiable life-prisoners of the church of Rome, few, if any, can possess a more intimate knowledge than myself. Devoted to the ecclesiastical profession since the age of fifteen, when I received the minor orders, I lived in constant friendship with the most distinguished youths who, in my town, were preparing for the priesthood. Men of the first eminence in the church were the old friends of my family—my parents' and my own spiritual directors. Thus I grew up, thus I continued in manhood, till, at the age of five-and-thirty, religion, and religion alone, tore me away from kindred and country. The intimacy of friendship, the undisguised converse of sacramental confession, opened to me the hearts of many, whose exterior conduct might have deceived a common observer. The coarse frankness of associate dissoluteness, left no secrets among the spiritual slaves, who, unable to separate the

Digitized by Google

laws of God from those of their tyrannical church, trampled both under foot in riotous despair. Such are the sources of the knowledge I possess. God, sorrow, and remorse, are my witnesses. A more blameless, ingenuous, religious set of youths than that in the enjoyment of whose friendship I passed the best years of my life, the world cannot boast of. Eight of us, all nearly of the same age, lived in the closest bond of affection from sixteen to one-and-twenty; and four, at least, continued in the same intimacy till that of about thirty-five. Of this knot of friends, not one was tainted by the breath of gross vice, till the church had doomed them to a life of celibacy, and turned the best affections of their hearts into crime."

After giving a brief account of the fall and ruin of some of his friends, our author proceeds: "Such, more or less, has been the fate of my early friends, whose minds and hearts were much above the common standard of the Spanish clergy. What, then, need I say of the vulgar crowd of priests, who, coming, as the Spanish phrase has it, from *coarse swaddling clothes*, and raised by ordination to a rank of life for which they have not been prepared, mingle vice and superstition, grossness of feeling and pride of office in their character? I have known the best among them; I have heard their confessions; I have heard the confessions of young persons of both sexes, who fell under the influence of their suggestions and example; and I do declare, that nothing can be more dangerous to youthful virtue than their company. How many souls would be saved from crime, but for the vain display of pretended superior virtue which Rome demands of her clergy!"

Such is the testimony of a man who most evidently speaks that which he does know. I could wish that the work I have just quoted, were in the hands of every one who is willing to know the truth concerning Romanism. It is one of the best works I have seen on this controversy.

I beg leave here, also, to adduce the testimony of Waddy Thompson, Esq., late Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Mexico, concerning the character of the clergy of that country. He is a gentleman of intelligence and standing, not a

Digitized by Google

member, I believe, of any church, and not chargeable, so far as I know, with any prejudice against the Roman clergy. He says:

"I do not think that the clergy of Mexico, with very few exceptions, are men of as much learning as the Catholic clergy generally in other countries. The lower orders of the priests and friars are generally entirely uneducated, and I regret to add, as generally licentious. There is no night in the year that the most revolting spectacles of vice and immorality, on the part of the priests and friars, are not to be seen in the streets of Mexico. I have never seen any class of men who so generally have such a "roue" appearance as the priests and friars whom one constantly meets in the streets. Of the higher orders and more respectable members of the priesthood, I cannot speak with the same confidence; if they are vicious, they are not publicly and indecently so. Very many of them have several nephews and nieces in their houses, or, at least, those who *call them uncle.* The reason given for the injunction of celibacy, that those who are dedicated to the priesthood should not be encumbered with the care of a family, is, I think, in Mexico, much more theoretical than practical."

Such is the character of the priesthood in Roman countries; and I have, in preceding lectures, proved even by Roman writers, that in former times even the popes were far more immoral, than Thompson represents the clergy of Mexico. Are those of the United States much better? There is a public sentiment in our Protestant country, that compels them to walk circumspectly; but the facilities for secret vice, afforded by the confessional and nunneries, are such that they cannot be easily detected. Many of them, moreover, are foreigners, whose characters have been formed in Roman countries, where the clergy are generally of loose morals; and they certainly have the appearance, generally, of men not given to a great deal of abstinence—men who give no evidence of extraordinary sanctity.

When *such* men hold "the keys of the kingdom," hear the confessions of the young and the old, male and female, what must be the inevitable effect upon morals? Will men be deterred from

Digitized by Google

sinning when they know that such men are their confessors? Do they not know how easy it is to obtain absolution from men as deeply involved in guilt as themselves?

2. Let us now examine the third part of penance—*Satisfaction.*

The doctrine of Protestants is, that Jesus Christ made full and complete satisfaction for the sins of his people, and therefore those who believe in him do enjoy the remission of all their sins, and are in a state of justification. The Romish clergy teach —1. That although the *eternal* punishment due to sin is pardoned for the sake of Christ, there remains a certain *temporal* punishment which every believer must endure, either here or in purgatory.—2. This satisfaction, we are told, consists of punishments voluntarily inflicted or prescribed by a priest, or afflictions patiently borne.—3. Works of satisfaction are alms, fasts, prayers, inflictions of corporeal sufferings, visits to churches, &c. "Whoever," says the Council of Trent, "shall affirm that the entire punishment is always remitted by God, together with the fault, and therefore that penitents need no other satisfaction than faith, whereby they apprehend Christ, who has made satisfaction for them: let them be accursed. Whoever shall affirm that we can by no means make satisfaction to God for our sins, through the merits of Christ, as far as the temporal penalty is concerned, either by punishment inflicted on us by him, and patiently borne, or enjoined by the priest, though not undertaken of our own accord, such as fastings, prayers, alms, or other works of piety, and therefore that the best penance is nothing more than a new life: let him be accursed."

This doctrine of Rome we reject for the following reasons.

I. *There remains no temporal punishment due to sin, after it is forgiven.* To prove that there is, Dr. Milner quotes Exod. xxxii, 34: "Therefore now go, lead the people unto the place of which I have spoken unto them—nevertheless in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them." This is the language of God to Moses, when the Israelites had worshipped the golden calf. The Bishop assumes, without the slightest evidence, that the eternal punishment due to their sin was forgiven. This cannot

Digitized by Google

be proved; and therefore the argument is worthless. Besides, the doctrine of Rome is, that punishments voluntarily endured or prescribed by a priest, constitute satisfaction; but here we find no penances enjoined, no intimation that by any such means they could escape the threatened punishment. God threatens to punish the idolatrous Israelites; and this fact is plead by the Roman clergy to prove that they have the right to prescribe penances, and that such penances constitute a real satisfaction for sin! What possible connection is there between the premises and conclusion?

Another passage confidently relied on is that in which Nathan reproved David for having Uriah slain—"And Nathan said unto David, the Lord hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die. Howbeit, because of this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme. The child also that is born unto thee shall die." 2 Samuel xii, 13, 14. Here we are told, the eternal punishment due to David's sin was forgiven, but a certain degree of temporal punishment remained to be endured by David. We reply—1st. There is no evidence that the death of David's child and the suffering it caused him were designed *as a satisfaction to Divine justice.* He had given occasion to the wicked to blaspheme; and now for the vindication of God's character, and for the purpose of humbling David, he is chastised. The Apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, explains the nature and design of such sufferings. "For if ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not?"* What affectionate father ever thought of chastising his child as a satisfaction to his justice? He may do so to bring him to obedience, and for an example to deter his other children from disobedience, but never as *satisfaction.* So God deals with his people as a father with his children. 2d. But if we admit that the sufferings of David were a satisfaction to divine justice, they were inflicted by God himself, not by David or the Prophet. Do the Roman clergy really propose to take the providence of God out of his hands? If Nathan had prescribed

* Ch. xii.

Digitized by Google

certain penances to be endured by David as satisfaction to the justice of God, they might have had some show of reason for their doctrine; but as the case is stated the argument they deduce from it is most ridiculous, if not impious. And these remarks apply equally to all those passages in which God is said to chastise his people. He has not committed the affairs of his providence to the hands of his ministers.

Bishop Trevern refers to the incestuous man, 1 Cor. v, 1.—But unfortunately the eternal punishment due his sin was not pardoned. He is excommunicated for his shameful conduct; but no penances are prescribed as satisfaction to divine justice. In the 2d epistle, ch. ii, we are informed that the man had become penitent; and therefore the church is directed to restore him to his standing in the church; but no satisfaction to divine justice is mentioned directly or indirectly. The Apostle simply says (according to the Doway Bible), "To him who is such a one this rebuke is sufficient which is given by many." The discipline of the church has had the desired effect in bringing the offender to repentance and reformation.

The same writer quotes, in favor of the doctrine of Rome, Col. i, 24. "I (Paul) now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh for his body, which is the church." If this passage has anything to do with the doctrine, it teaches that Paul was making satisfaction to divine justice for the sins of *the whole church!* True, the Roman clergy tell us, that one man may satisfy for the sins of another, though of this they can give no evidence; but even they would scarcely believe that Paul was making satisfaction for the sins of all the church. Paul was filling up those things that are wanting of *the sufferings of Christ.* What are we to understand by the sufferings of Christ? I understand sufferings *for the sake of Christ*, just as "the reproach of Christ" means reproach borne for the sake of Christ.* Accordingly the Saviour said concerning Paul,—"For I will show him how great things he must suffer *for my name's sake.*"† Paul suffered for the church, not

* Heb. xi, 26. † Acts xix, 16.

Digitized by Google

to make satisfaction to divine justice for her sins, but that as a faithful minister, braving reproach and persecution while discharging the duties of his office, he might build up Christians in the faith, and turn sinners to God. But neither in this passage is there the slightest intimation that Paul or any one ever suffered in order to make satisfaction to divine justice for the sins of others.

II. *There is not an instance on record, in the Old Testament or in the New, in which any Priest, Prophet, or Apostle prescribed penances as a satisfaction for sin; nor did our Saviour, when on earth he forgave sins, ever prescribe anything of the kind.* I deem it sufficient simply to state the fact, and to challenge successful contradiction. Since, therefore, the Scriptures no where teach that there remains a temporal punishment to be endured after the eternal punishment of sin is remitted, and since we have neither precept nor example to support the Romish doctrine of satisfaction for sin, we are fully justified in pronouncing it false.

III. But we have clear and positive evidence that it is false; *for it contradicts all those portions of Scripture in which Jesus Christ is represented as atoning for all our sins, and thus securing to us complete justification.* Bishop Trevern says expressly, that Jesus Christ did *not* design to include in his sufferings that part of the penalty of God's law which we are able to endure. "The temporal punishment of sin," says he, "was therefore wanting, to fill up afterwards; and Jesus Christ did not intend to include them in his own sufferings, or consequently to exempt from them his mystical body, which is his church."* But the Apostle Peter says, in plain contradiction of this assertion, "Who (Christ) his own self bear our sins [not a *part* of them] in his own body on the tree."† Now according to the doctrine of Rome, he should have said, Christ bear *the eternal punishment* of our *mortal sins* in his own body! John says, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth from *all sin*."‡ Now if any man be cleansed from *all sin*, what more does he need in the way of satisfaction? Isaiah said—"All we like sheep have gone astray,

* Am. Discuss., v. ii, p. 145. † 1 Peter ii. 24. ‡ 1 John i, 7

Digitized by Google

and God hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,"* not a *part* of the iniquity. All believers are represented as "justified by faith;" and to them it is declared, "there is no condemnation;"† of course they cannot be condemned to satisfy for part of their sins, or to endure a part of the punishment due to them. Why, if the doctrine of Rome is true, Jesus Christ is only a Saviour *in part*, and man is partly his own saviour. And so teaches a certain cardinal quoted by Bishop Trevern: "Without the sufferings of our divine Saviour your sufferings would be unfruitful; without *yours, his would be of no service.*"‡ Now in opposition to this we record the language of inspiration—"For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."§ Verily, it seems one of the prominent objects of Rome to rob Christ of the glory due his name, as the Saviour of sinners, and to give that glory, at least in part, to man, to degrade the Saviour and exalt the sinner.

IV. But if there is a certain temporal punishment due to sins forgiven, which Jesus Christ did not include in his atonement—*satisfaction must be made for sins committed* BEFORE BAPTISM. As we have already proved, if the Scriptures teach the doctrine of penance at all, they require that penance be done—satisfaction made, for sins committed *before baptism* as well as after it. This, however, does not suit the doctrine of Rome. She holds the unscriptural doctrine that baptism is sufficiently efficacious to cleanse from all the sin, original and actual, existing before it is administered. Consequently Christ, it would seem, included in his atonement *all* the punishment due to sins committed before baptism, but only the *eternal punishment* due to sins committed after baptism. Where do the Scriptures teach that in the atonement a difference of this kind was made? Verily, this is one of the many inventions of the Roman clergy.

V. But this doctrine of satisfaction involves another monstrous absurdity, viz., *that a man can do more than God requires of him.* Here, for example, is a Roman Catholic who, having sinned after baptism, is undergoing the prescribed penances, making the neces-

* Isaiah liii, 6. † Rom. viii, 1. ‡ Amica. Discuss., v. ii. p. 152.
§ Heb. x, 14

Digitized by Google

sary satisfaction, paying up the claims of divine justice. He must, of course, at the same time, be performing present duty. For if he is neglecting the duties of *to-day*, in order to make satisfaction for the delinquencies of yesterday, what advantage is gained? Must he not, then, do penance to-morrow for his failure in the duties of to-day? But if he can perform the duties of to-day, and at the same time pay up for the sins of yesterday, it is clear that he can do more than present duty—more than God requires! And this, too, must be done by those who do not pretend to be perfectly holy; so that we have the absurdity of an imperfect man, who, because he is imperfect, must do his duty imperfectly—performing the entire duty of to-day, and more—making satisfaction for the sins of yesterday! A greater absurdity could not be imagined. Now, what is the present duty of every man? "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself."* "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever you do, do all to the glory of God."† This is *present* duty. Can any man, even if perfectly holy, do more? If not, then it is clear that no one can make satisfaction for past sins. The doctrine of Rome is, therefore, both unscriptural and perfectly absurd.

VI. *After all, of what advantage is this doctrine?* A man confesses his sins to a priest, and receives absolution. Can the priest look into his heart, and see whether he is sincere, or whether he is deceiving himself? He cannot. Neither can he determine anything concerning the degree of contrition he may feel. Suppose, then, he should grant absolution to one who ought not to be absolved; is his absolution worth anything? Surely not. What, then, must be the effect of the pretended absolution? It will deceive multitudes, saying to them "peace, peace, when there is no peace;" while it can be of no possible advantage to any. The Roman clergy have wickedly thrust themselves into the seat of Jesus Christ, and undertaken to do that to which He only is adequate, who searches the heart, and tries

* Mark xii, 30-31. † 1 Cor. x, 31.

Digitized by Google

the reins, and who knows all things. The pious Protestant knows that every true penitent will be forgiven; and, like the penitent publican, he goes to Him before whom his heart lies open—not to a poor erring mortal.

VII. This doctrine, while it deludes the souls of men, promotes immorality, and dishonors Christ, also *gives tremendous power to the clergy!* They hold, we are told, the keys, not of the visible church simply, but of heaven itself; and in vain may men seek to enter there, unless *they* open the door. All must come and confess to them, even their most secret thoughts; and the very fact that the priest knows his penitents so perfectly, gives him almost unlimited power over them. But he may grant absolution or refuse it—open the door of heaven or close it against them. All their hopes of happiness forever are suspended upon his determination to absolve or retain sins. Will not the superstitious Papist move at the bidding of his confessor? Will he not do at his command things, from which his feelings, if he were left to himself, would revolt? Ah! how truly descriptive of the pope and his clergy, the language of Paul—"So that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."* Such power in the hands of any class of men, especially such men as the great majority of the Roman clergy, must work incalculable mischief to individuals and to society. Look at this power, and tell me whether there is anything surprising in the gross immorality of Roman countries, or in the absolute sway of the clergy. Who has not heard of the riots along the canals and public works, in our own country—riots among the members of the only true church!—riots which the civil authorities could not quell—riots, which a Roman priest, when sent for and paid well, could quell in a moment, as by a charm? Behold men, who boldly trample under foot the laws of God and man, become harmless as lambs, at the bidding of a priest! *And remember, too, that the power that can quell the raging storm, can raise a storm, when anything is to be gained by it.* There can be no safety where such power is possessed by any class of men.

* Thessalonians ii.

Digitized by Google

LECTURE VII.

Rom. viii, 1. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

The phrase, "in Christ Jesus," is employed in the Scriptures to express the union which exists between all true believers and Jesus Christ. Faith forms the connecting link between the soul and Christ; and therefore every believer is in Christ. The first epistle to the Corinthians is addressed "to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints;" and the Apostle says, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away, and all things are become new." * It will not be denied that all believers or true Christians are in Christ Jesus.

Now to such, the Apostle declares, there is *no condemnation.* He had proved, in the preceding part of the epistle, that all men are sinful and are sinners; and that, therefore, "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." With equal clearness he had shown how a sinner, penitent and believing, might be justified. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the Prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by the grace of God through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," &c. Every believer in Christ, according to the Apostle's doctrine, is justified, and enjoys peace with God. "Being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." † To such there is no condemnation; their sins are all pardoned, and they are treated as being righteous for the sake of Christ. They are adopted, and made heirs of eternal life. Their sufferings in this life are not a satisfaction to divine

* 2 Cor. v, 17. † Rom. v, 1.

Digitized by Google

justice, but parental chastisements intended as a means of their preparation for future glory. "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth," * &c. When they die there is no condemnation to them, but being freely justified and adopted they ascend to heaven. "And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them."† But unbelievers, those who are not in Christ, are condemned, are under the curse of God's broken law; and, if they die in this state, are lost forever.

The conclusion to which we are authorized to come, is, that since, as the Apostle teaches, all believers are justified, and since, consequently, there is to them no condemnation, the doctrines of *Indulgences* and *Purgatory*, as held and taught by the Romish clergy, are not true. That we may see distinctly how legitimate this conclusion is, we proceed to state, first, the doctrine of indulgences, and afterwards, the doctrine of purgatory.

An indulgence, says the Doway Catechism, is "not a pardon for sins to come, or leave to commit sin (as Protestants do falsely and slanderously teach), but a releasing only of such temporal punishments, as remain due to those sins which have already been forgiven us by penance and confession." ‡ Since we quote the precise language of the Catechism, we shall not surely be charged with slandering our Roman neighbors.

The same Catechism informs us concerning the ground on which indulgences are granted—the source from whence they are drawn. "Q. How doth an indulgence release those punishments?" A. By the superabundant merits of Christ and his saints, which it applies to our souls by the special grant of the church." It likewise informs us when the Saviour gave his church power to grant indulgences, viz.: "When he said to St. Peter, 'To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in hea-

* Heb. xii, 6. † Rev. xiv, 13. ‡ 1 p. 94.

Digitized by Google

ven.' Math. xvi, 19." And, finally, we are enlightened concerning the conditions required for gaining an indulgence, viz.: "That we perform the works enjoined us, and that the last part of them be done in a state of grace." These works are "fasting, prayer, and alms deeds; as also confession and communion." *

Against this doctrine we enter our solemn protest, for reasons which I now proceed to assign.

I. *It is never mentioned or alluded to in the Scriptures.* The Roman clergy tell us that the right to grant indulgences was given to the church, when our Saviour said to Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," &c. I reply—

1. That the phrase, "kingdom of heaven," signifies, not the kingdom of glory, but the church as it exists in the world under the New Dispensation. In this sense it is constantly employed by our Saviour in his parables and discourses. "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." † "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way." "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind." ‡ These and many similar passages confirm the interpretation I have just given of the phrase in question. The Apostles of Christ were appointed as officers in the church of Christ *on earth;* and to them he gave the keys of that church. By the keys they could open the doors of the church to those who gave evidence of being worthy to enter, and close them against those of an opposite character. Such being the meaning of the passage under consideration, it is clear that it gives not the least support to the doctrine of indulgences.

But if we should even admit the Romish exposition of this passage of Scripture, and acknowledge that Christ gave Peter power literally to remit sin, and open heaven to men and close it against them, still it gives no support to the doctrine of indulgences.

* pp. 94, 95. † Math. iv, 17. ‡ Math. xiii.

Digitized by Google

An indulgence, we are told, is "a releasing only of such temporal punishment as remains due to those sins which have already been forgiven us by penance and confession." But in the passage mainly relied on to prove the doctrine, not a word is said about *temporal punishment* due to sins forgiven, or about indulgences. The Roman clergy seem to regard themselves as authorized by the power of the keys to resort to all manner of inventions —to forgive sins, not on the conditions mentioned in the gospel, but on any which they may choose to prescribe!

The case of the incestuous man mentioned in 1 Cor. v, and 2 Cor. ii, is relied on to support this doctrine. But unfortunately for the argument, there is not a word in the whole history of that case about temporal punishment due to sins forgiven; nor are any works mentioned which were to be performed in order to gain an indulgence; nor an indulgence once named. The man had been excluded from the church for his sins; and when he repented he was forgiven and restored to his standing in the church. There is not in the passage one idea that belongs to the doctrine of indulgences. The fact that it is appealed to in support of the doctrine, shows how hardly its advocates are pressed.

II. *There is no such distinction as that made by the church of Rome, between mortal and venial sins, and no temporal punishment due to sins which have been forgiven;* and therefore the doctrine of indulgences, which pretends to remit the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven, cannot be true. In the preceding discourse I proved, I think, conclusively, that these distinctions, invented by the Roman clergy, are both absurd and unscriptural; that when the sins of believers are forgiven through Christ, the entire punishment due to divine justice is remitted. And in the text the Apostle declares in the most unqualified terms, that there is *no condemnation* (either to suffer temporal or eternal punishment) to them that are in Christ Jesus.

III. "*The superabundant merits of the saints,*" *from which, as a common treasury, indulgences are said to be obtained, have no existence in truth.* Some of the saints, according to the Roman clergy, have not only a sufficient amount of merits to secure their

Digitized by Google

own salvation, but even more than they need; and these superabundant merits form a kind of common stock, in the keeping of the Roman Pontiffs, out of which indulgences are granted to the less devout Papists! A more absurd and presumptuous doctrine never was taught. What is the duty of every individual of Adam's race? "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; and thy neighbor as thyself."* Can any one, even though perfectly holy, do more than this? Certainly not; and therefore, even the perfectly holy, if such persons could be found on earth, could do no more than their duty, and could have no "superabundant merits." "So likewise ye," said our Lord, "when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do."† Is there any room here for superabundant merits or works of supererogation?

But the Roman clergy tell us there are certain *counsels* of Christ, the observance of which is meritorious, such as voluntary poverty, perpetual chastity or celibacy, and obedience or voluntary submission to another's will.‡ These, we are told, are not commands, positively obligatory on all, but counsels or advice which may be followed by those aiming at a high degree of perfection. But it is not true that Jesus Christ ever counseled all men to be poor. When a certain man asked him, "Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" and when the Saviour saw that he idolized his wealth, he tested his disposition to serve God by directing him, "If thou wilt be perfect (i. e. sincerely pious) go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me."§ This direction the Roman clergy have construed into a *counsel* to all men to voluntary poverty. But it was a *command*, not a counsel or matter of advice; for obedience to it was made a condition of salvation. The man asked, not how he might do works of *supererogation* or have a superabundance

* Math. xxii, 37—39. † Luke xvii, 10. ‡ Doway Cat., pp. 74—76.
§ Math. xix. 16—26.

Digitized by Google

of merits, but how he might secure eternal life; and when the condition was mentioned, the young man "went away sorrowful;" for he had great possessions. "Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Neither is it true that our Lord counseled all to live in a state of celibacy. On the contrary, when his disciples said, "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry," he replied, "All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."* And Paul, though in the peculiar state of the church in his day, when persecutions raged, he desired all to be as himself, said, "But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that."†

Nor is it true that our Saviour ever advised or counseled men to be obedient to the will of others. He *commanded* children to obey their parents, wives to obey their husbands, subjects to obey the powers that be, and Christians to obey them that rule over them; but he gave no counsel or mere advice on this subject. Nay, it would be sin to be subject to the will of another, except in those things embraced in the law of Christ.

What is the *duty* of every Christian to God his Saviour? "Whether, therefore, ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."‡ If by poverty, or by celibacy, a Christian can do more to the glory of God than by being rich or entering into married life, he is solemnly bound to do it; and he commits sin if he refuse. "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's."§ Is it possible for the most eminent Christian to do more than is here required, as a matter, not of counsel or advice, but of *obligation?* It is not; and therefore the counsels of which the Roman clergy speak—the following of which is supposed to secure "the superabundant merits" from which indulgences are drawn—have no existence; they are among the "many inventions" of the church of Rome.

* Math. xix, 10-12. † 1 Cor. vii, 7. ‡ 1 Cor. x, 30. § 1 Cor. vi, 19-20.

Digitized by Google

The argument against the existence of "the superabundant merits of the saints" is still stronger; for we have thus far proceeded upon the supposition that *some* Christians may have done all that is commanded in the Scriptures; but this is not true. For, in the first place, before they were converted, they were like others, *sinners*, condemned and exposed to the just penalty of God's law. And when converted they were converted by the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit, and "justified freely by the grace of God through the redemption that is in Christ." It would be easy to prove this; but it will not be denied, even by the Romish clergy. So far, then, from having any merits, either to apply to others or to save themselves, they must say, with Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, "By the grace of God I am what I am." They are debtors for the grace bestowed; God is not their debtor for the works performed by the aid of that grace. "But I labored more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me."*

Nor is this all. For the most devoted Christian, so far from perfectly serving God, even by the aid of the grace imparted, daily fails in the discharge of his duty, and commits sin. James the Apostle, in his general Epistle, says, "In many things we offend all;"† and Paul regarded himself as not "already perfect." When inspired Apostles confess that they are chargeable with sin, and affirm that the same is true of *all* believers, what are we to think of the Romish doctrine of the superabundant merits of the saints? Who are the saints, but sinners saved by grace? "For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast."‡ And in the erection of the spiritual temple the "headstone of the corner shall be brought forth with shoutings—grace, grace unto it."§

The Scriptures tell us of the *sins* of the saints, and of the *grace* of God abounding in their salvation; but they say nothing of their *merits*, far less of their *superabundant merits!* This is the language and the doctrine of proud, pharisaical Rome; a doctrine

* 1 Cor. xv, 10. † Ch. iii, 2. ‡ Eph. ii, 8-10. § Zech. iv, 7.

Digitized by Google

which, one would have thought, human pride, even in its greatest folly, could not embrace; a doctrine which cannot stand for one moment, in the clear light of God's Word.

IV. The merits of Jesus Christ, it is true, are infinite, and therefore there can be no need for the merits of the saints, even if they had any; *but the merits of Christ are not at the disposal of the Pope of Rome, or of the church.* Where, in the Scriptures, are we told that his merits are placed in the hands of the clergy, to be distributed, according to their wisdom or folly, amongst men for the remission of sins?

Let it be remembered, that indulgences remit only *temporal punishment* due to sins already forgiven. Now either our Saviour did, by his sufferings, make satisfaction for the sins of his people, both as regards the temporal and eternal punishment, or he did not. Bishop Trevern says, he did not. "What," says he, "did St. Paul fill up in his flesh? Temporal punishments. Now, what he filled up, was wanting, as he expresses it, of the sufferings of Christ. The temporal punishment of sin was therefore wanting, to fill up afterwards; *and Jesus Christ did not intend to include them in his sufferings, or consequently to exempt from them his mystical body, which is his church.*" * Now in view of this statement of the Bishop, we have a question to ask, viz.: If Jesus Christ did not intend to include in his sufferings the temporal punishment due to the sins of his people, by what right do the pope and his clergy now apply his merits, in the way of *indulgences*, to the remission of that temporal punishment, which he did not include in his sufferings? How can they so include that temporal punishment, which he did not include in his sufferings, as to grant the remission of it, through his merits? In a word, how can they include in his atonement what he did not include, and apply his merits, as he did not intend they should be applied? Can the clergy answer?

But perhaps it will be said, Jesus Christ did make satisfaction for all the punishment due the sins of his people. Then, we ask, how can it be true, as the Roman clergy teach, that there

* Amica. Discuss. of Ch. of Eng., v. ii, p. 145

Digitized by Google

remains due to their sins, after they are forgiven through Christ, a certain temporal punishment which they must bear? Or, in other words, if the debt has been fully paid, how is it that a part of it remains yet to be paid? If our glorious substitute has paid it all, how is it that we must yet pay a part of it?

Take either view of the matter, and the doctrine of Rome is proved false. If Jesus Christ did not make satisfaction for the *whole* punishment due the sins of his people, then his merits cannot be applied, in the way of *indulgences*, to the remission of the temporal punishment still due to sins forgiven. If he did, then it is not true that his people must endure a temporal punishment, and there is no need of *indulgences*.

V. *The conditions on which indulgences are granted, and the use made of the doctrine, prove it false and injurious.* "An indulgence," we are told, "may be either plenary or partial. A plenary indulgence, includes all the punishments to be undergone by him to whom the indulgence is applied, after he has obtained the remission of his sins. A partial indulgence remits but a part of the same punishment." * I will now read a few extracts in addition to the one just read, from a devotional book of the Papists, entitled *True Piety*, published by authority of Bishop David, late of Bardstown, Ky., showing on what conditions plenary or partial indulgences may be gained. On page 431, we read as follows:

"INDULGENCES of the Crowns, or Beads of the Blessed Virgin Mary, commonly called St. Bridget, when blessed by a priest specially authorized for this purpose. Whoever has these beads and says devoutly on the five decades, at least once a week, may gain a plenary indulgence, on each of the solemn feasts of Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary: also, on those of St. John the Baptist, of St. Joseph, of the holy Apostles, and at the article of death; besides many partial indulgences, as often as he recites the Beads, or does other pious works mentioned in the next article. They who recite them daily, may obtain the plenary indulgences once a month, on whatever day they may choose."

* True Piety, p. 427

Digitized by Google

"INDULGENCES annexed to Crosses and holy Medals duly blessed by a specially empowered priest, are granted to whoever piously wears those Crosses or Medals, or devoutly prays before them, whether he recites the divine office, or that of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or the Seven Penitential Psalms, or is used to teach Catechism, or performs other works of piety; he gains partial indulgences, and may gain also a plenary indulgence on the great festivals of our Lord, and of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Pius VI confirmed this concession in 1775."

"INDULGENCES of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. Whoever is duly admitted into it, by spending one hour at least in a year, in devout prayer before the Blessed Sacrament, on the day which he may choose on that day, on the first Thursday of every month, and at the article of Death, he may gain the plenary indulgence."

These may serve as a specimen of plenary indulgences. We read a few of the partial indulgences.

"1. Five years and five times forty days indulgence, for those who piously accompany the Blessed Sacrament to the houses of the sick; and one hundred days to those who, not being able to do so, will say the Lord's Prayer and the Angelical Salutation for the sick person."

"One hundred days indulgence to those who salute each other, the one saying, *Praised be Jesus Christ;* and the other answering. *Amen*, or *always*, or *forever*. To those who have generally used this form of salutation during their life, a plenary indulgence is granted at the article of death. The like indulgences are imparted to those who teach others this holy practice."

"Three hundred days indulgence to those who recite with devotion the Litany of the holy name of Jesus; also an indulgence of two hundred days to those who devoutly say the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, commonly called *Loretto*."

Let these serve as a specimen of the indulgences granted by the pope and his clergy. Each of them is granted on conditions not only *perfectly arbitrary*, but evidently *unscriptural*. They are perfectly *arbitrary*. No human being can see why the con-

Digitized by Google

ditions which secure an indulgence of *three hundred days*, might not secure one of *five hundred* or a *thousand;* or why they should secure more than *fifty* or even *ten.* Nor can any one give a reason why the conditions which secure an indulgence of a hundred days, might not as well secure a plenary indulgence; or why those which secure plenary indulgence, should gain one of more than three or four hundred days. The whole thing is supremely arbitrary; and no possible reason can be assigned for any particular indulgence, either as to its conditions or duration, except the sovereign pleasure of the pope and his clergy; and there is no evidence whatever, that the indulgences granted by them are of any efficacy, save *their unsupported assertion.*

The conditions are unscriptural. Look, for example, at the first plenary indulgence we mentioned, viz: "Indulgences of the crowns or beads of the blessed Virgin Mary." There are several singularly absurd and unscriptural things here, viz: 1. We are not informed in the Scriptures that Mary had any beads, or that she at all regards such toys. If it has been *revealed* to the pope and his clergy, that she does regard them, when and where was the revelation received? and what is the evidence? 2. The beads are to be "blessed by a priest specially authorized for this purpose." No other priest, it seems, can bless them aright. Now so far as we can learn from the Scriptures or from any other source, the Saviour and his Apostles never blessed beads, nor authorized any one else to do so. What evidence have we, that the priest's blessing imparts any efficacy or sacredness to beads? Have the pope and his clergy received a revelation on this subject? When and where? If they have not (and I believe they do not pretend that they have), what evidence is there that saying prayers on the blessed beads will be of any service? 3. Moreover, this thing of praying on beads is an *invention* of the Roman clergy. We read of nothing of the kind in either the Old or the New Testament. 4. Nor do we there learn that the repetition of the same prayer again and again, is acceptable to God. The Scriptures do teach us, "that men ought always to pray;" but the Saviour guards us against "vain repetitions." as offensive to

Digitized by Google

God.* Yet the Roman clergy encourage such repetitions, as pleasing to God, and as particularly efficacious in securing the remission of sins! Prayer is not, with them, the asking of our Heavenly Father for blessings needed by them or others, so much as a kind of *penance* performed for the purpose of gaining an indulgence! What a perversion of the sacred privilege and duty of prayer! 5. In order to gain the offered indulgence particular forms of prayer are prescribed; or particular words are to be repeated. Now since the Saviour and the Apostles did not confine Christians to any particular forms of prayer, nor attach the least efficacy to one form more than another, it is evident that in requiring particular forms of words to be used in order to gain an indulgence, the Roman clergy have departed from the word of God. 6. And then those prayers are to be repeated on *particular days*, of which we read nothing in the Word of God, such as the feasts of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, of John the Baptist, &c. Where is the evidence that our Lord approves of the appointment of those days, or that prayers said at such times are more efficacious, than if offered on other days? In the Scriptures we read of "the Lord's day," the holy Sabbath; but no other day is there recognized as sacred.

But the various *uses* made of the doctrine of indulgences prove, even more clearly, if possible, than the conditions of granting them, its falsity. They are most dishonoring to God and deeply injurious to men.

1. Indulgences were used by the popes for the purpose of exciting their followers to engage in the Crusades—one of the most unscriptural and fanatical enterprizes which history records. It was an attempt to recover from the Turks Jerusalem and the land of Judea, called "the Holy Land." "It appears," says Bishop Trevern, "that Turpin, Archbishop of Rhemes (an. 963) granted plenary indulgences to those who should follow Charlmagne into Spain against the Saracens, and that Phocas Nicephorus II, not only wished them to be granted to those who made war with him against the same barbarians, but that those who

* Math. vi, 7.

Digitized by Google

fell in the expiditions might be declared martyrs. It was not therefore Urban III (an. 1095), as it is commonly asserted, who first employed the expression *plenary*, in the indulgences which he granted to such as should take up arms to deliver the Holy Land from the Turks. For the rest, if we consider how much it must have cost the Crusaders to leave their affairs, their customs, their country, their home, their friends and families, to expose themselves to fatigues, dangers, hazards of land and sea, climates and battles, we shall find in these expeditions a continuance of satisfactory works, which certainly deserve the indulgences which Urban II and other pontiffs after him attached to them, provided that they were undertaken and finished in a spirit of penance, and with a pure zeal for religion."*

The fact is here admitted (and the thing is justified) that the popes did excite men to engage in the wars of the Crusades by promising them plenary indulgences, and that by the same means they were encouraged to enlist in wars against the Saracens. Only think of it! The professed vicars of Jesus Christ, the representatives of "the Prince of Peace," hiring men to engage in war and bloodshed by dealing out to them the merits of Christ and his saints! And this shameful *traffic* (I know not what other word to use) justified by an eminent bishop in a book designed to be a vindication of his church! That there have been justifiable wars, we admit; but that the Crusades were such, no man in his sober senses will pretend. But even in justifiable war, who authorized the popes of Rome, or any body else, to excite men to the bloody work by offering them the merits of Christ and his saints? Whence have the popes derived their authority to use the merits of Christ in this way?

By the same means the popes and councils excited their followers to the work of *exterminating heretics*. And all were regarded as heretics who differed from them in faith. The Fourth General Council of Lateran, held at Rome under Innocent III, A. D. 1215, decreed, that "the Catholics that taking the badge of the cross, shall gird themselves for the extermination of here-

* Amica. Discuss., Vol. II, p. 165.

Digitized by Google

tics, shall enjoy that indulgence and be fortified with that holy privilege which is granted to them that go to the help of the Holy Land." * Our Saviour and the Apostles labored to convert errorists by argument and reason; but Pope Innocent and his council hire men to kill them by offering them the merits of Christ and his saints, in the form of *indulgences*, as a reward!

Indulgences were also used for the purpose of *raising money* for the popes and their clergy, and especially for erecting that stupendous monument of anti-christian folly—St. Peter's church at Rome. This is admitted and justified by the Romish clergy. Bishop Trevern says—"If the abuses in collecting alms [money for indulgences] in Luther's time are to be condemned, where is the man of sense and good taste who could blame the intention of those alms? Surely none of those who have visited and admired that church, the most worthy monument which men ever erected with their feeble hands to the supreme Majesty of God." † Dr. Spaulding, in his review of D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, says, "About the beginning of the sixteenth century Leo X conceived the purpose of erecting in Rome a temple, which should far surpass, in dimensions and magnificence, anything that the world had ever yet seen. The origination of the plan of St. Peter's church was an idea worthy the mind of that magnificent Pontiff; and its erection, which he commenced, is the noblest monument to his fame. To promote an object so splendid, he promulgated a bull, in which he promised ample indulgences to all who would contribute to so laudable an undertaking. And, if there were no other proof of the utility of indulgences, the erection of that splendid temple, mainly due to them, is a monument which would alone suffice to remove every cavil on the subject. No one can enter that church without being forcibly impressed with the majesty of God and the grandeur of the Christian religion. His soul becomes as colossal as the building itself." ‡ Both Bishop Trevern and Spaulding, you perceive, admit and even affirm the fact, that St. Peter's church was erected mainly by the sale of indulgences; and both justify

* Breck. and Hughes' Dis., p. 81. † Amica. Dis., vii, p. 165. ‡ p. 79.

Digitized by Google

in the strongest terms the use of the doctrine. Spaulding even contends that if there were no other evidence of the utility of indulgences, the erection of St. Peter's by means of them, would be abundantly sufficient! That is, the fact that the popes of Rome could sell a sufficient quantity of the merits of Christ and his saints to build a large and splendid house, is sufficient to prove the doctrine of indulgences eminently *useful*, if not *true!* I am confident that every man whose feelings have not been strangely perverted and corrupted by the errors of Popery, will be shocked at the idea of selling the merits of Jesus—his groans, tears, sweat, and blood—for the purpose of building a splendid church! Who has required at the hands of the popes the erection of such a house? Is Christianity a system of religion of such character that its "grandeur" can be seen only in such splendid edifices? Is it indeed a thing so pompous, so like the world it came to reform? But if it was proper or necessary to erect such a building, was there no other means of raising the money than the sale of the sufferings of Christ? Was ever anything like this heard of in the Christian church, or even in the Jewish, till the popes of Rome ventured upon it?

The sale of Indulgences indeed was a most certain and efficacious means of replenishing the pope's treasury, as often as it became overdrawn, or as he desired greater wealth and splendor. For this purpose regular *collectors* were appointed by the popes, who carried on a profitable business in the traffic in indulgences, and who, to increase the amount of their sales, did not hesitate to ascribe to them the most unbounded efficacy in securing the remission of sins, and the deliverance of those suffering in the flames of purgatory. "The General Council of Lateran," says Bishop Trevern (anno 1215, under Innocent III), "to obviate abuses introduced by gatherers or receivers of alms [money for indulgences] ordained that in future they should be nominated by the Holy See, or by the diocesan bishops."* The same writer quotes from the Council of Vienna (anno 1311, under Clement V) the following decree: "It having come to our knowledge

* Amica. Discuss., vol. ii, p. 163.

Digitized by Google

that several of that kind of collectors, by rash boldness, and to the seduction and ruin of souls, take upon them to grant, of their own pleasure, indulgences to the people, to dispense with vows, to absolve in confession from perjury, murder, and other sins, to calm the consciences of the possessors of goods unjustly acquired, for a sum of money to remit a third or fourth part of enjoined penances, to deliver from purgatory, as they boast of doing by a scandalous lie, and to transport to the joys of paradise the souls of the friends or relations of those who deposit alms in their hands, to give full remission of sins to the benefactors of those places where they collect, and further, to absolve, as they express it, from the *punishment* and the *guilt:* we, desirous of abolishing such abuses, which degrade ecclesiastical censures, and bring contempt upon the keys, forbid most strictly the commission in future, of any and all such unworthy practices. * * * We understand and direct that all collectors abusing their commission in these, or any other ways, shall be immediately punished by the bishops of the several places where they are found."* I quote these decrees of the counsels to show, that, while they condemned certain things done by the collectors of money in the sale of indulgences, they sanctioned the abominable principle, that the merits of Christ may be disposed of, and the appointment of *collectors* to sell them and raise money for the pope and his clergy. No wonder that such decrees, admitting and approving all that is detestable in the matter, failed to correct what they called *abuses.* If men are appointed to sell the merits of the Son of God in the form of indulgences, who will wonder that they, after the manner of other traders, make the best bargains they can? When men have so far lost all correct sense of religion that they may encourage or engage in such traffic, they are prepared to do and say almost anything for money. Amongst the most celebrated dealers in indulgences in the beginning of the sixteenth century, was Tetzel, who passed through Germany as if in a triumphal procession, and extolled in the most extravagant terms the efficacy of indulgences. "The very moment," said he, "that the money

* Ibid., p. 164.

Digitized by Google

clinks against the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from purgatory and flies free to heaven." "Indulgences are the most precious and sublime of God's gifts." "O senseless people, and almost like to beasts, who do not comprehend the grace so richly offered! This day heaven is on all sides open, and you now refuse to enter. When then do you intend to come in? This day you may redeem many souls. Dull and heedless man, with ten groschen you can deliver your father from purgatory, and you are so ungrateful that you will not rescue him."*

It is a part of the design of Infinite Wisdom to bring good out of evil. "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee." The extravagance and impiety of Tetzel shocked the feelings of many who were yet sincere Papists. Some rays of light had penetrated the darkened mind of MARTIN LUTHER, then a devoted Papist. He lifted his voice against the *abuses*, as they are called, of the sale; but in examining the subject more fully, he came clearly to the conclusion that the doctrine is false, and therefore ought to be opposed. Bishop Trevern admits that at that time a disgraceful traffic in indulgences was carried on by ignorant and degraded men. "If," says he "Luther had only risen up against the ignorance of the preachers in his time, and the disgraceful traffic which was made of indulgences, he would have merited the applause of the church, and of all succeeding ages."† Luther did this; but he was constrained to see, as he looked more deeply into the subject, that the doctrine itself was false, and that so long as it was believed and taught, and the traffic sanctioned, nothing but unmitigated evil could arise from it. In the all-wise providence of God the glorious Reformation of the sixteenth century grew out of the doctrine of indulgences as held and practiced by the Roman clergy.

The Council of Trent, seeing the immense injury done to Rome by the disgraceful traffic in indulgences, suppressed the office of *collector*, and ordained, that in future, indulgences should be published by the bishops, assisted by two canons of their respective chapters. So says Bishop Trevern.‡ That Council,

* D'Aubigne's Hist., v. i, p. 212. † Amic. Discuss., v. ii, p. 165. ‡ Ibid.

Digitized by Google

however, did not condemn the practice, so abhorrent to every pious mind, of *selling indulgences;* and so long as this may be done, it matters little whether the traffic be in the hands of the bishops and their agents, or in hands of men employed by the pope."

One thing is clear, viz., that the doctrine of indulgences has been, and doubtless still is, a source of immense pecuniary gain to the pope and his clergy. Whatever other advantages or disadvantages may attend the creed of Rome, the clergy seem never for a moment to have lost sight of the "filthy lucre." The various evil uses, therefore, to which the doctrine has ever been put, and put *legitimately*, as the pope and his clergy affirm, prove conclusively that it is not of heavenly origin.

VI. *This doctrine has been, and is, a source of immense* POWER, *as well as wealth, to the Roman clergy.* They hold, as they pretend, the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and they can, at their pleasure, unlock its abundant treasures, to release their votaries from the temporal, as well as the eternal pains due their sins. The confessional is resorted to for deliverance from the latter, and indulgences to save them from the former. The dread of the fires of purgatory, and regard for departed friends, represented as now enduring the terrible tortures of that middle state, impel the superstitious Papist to venerate the fearful power of the clergy, and to tremble at the thought of giving them offense. Nor do the priesthood fail, on all occasions, to impress it on the minds of the people, that the opening to them of "the celestial treasures" in indulgences, depends upon their *liberality.* Pope Pius IX, has recently announced "to the Catholic universe" an indulgence in the form of jubilee, in doing which he claims to exercise "*Apostolic liberality* to the faithful in Jesus Christ!" How tremendous the power over the people, secured to the clergy by the doctrines of priestly absolution and Papal indulgences! The very fact that these doctrines place power so unlimited and so easily abused in the hands of poor, imperfect men, proves them to be the invention of ambitious priests. The gospel elevates Jesus Christ, and humbles men; but Popery elevates the priest-hood.

Digitized by Google

We now turn to the inquiry whether there is such a place as purgatory. In regard to it the Council of Trent gives us very limited information, simply affirming that "there is a purgatory, and the souls detained there, are helped by the prayers of the faithful, and particularly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar." The Catechism of Trent says, "Amongst them [the places of departed spirits] also is the fire of purgatory, in which the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment in order to be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing defiled entereth."*

We deny the existence of any such place as purgatory, and proceed to assign our reasons.

I. *Of* HEAVEN *and* HELL *we constantly read in the Scriptures, but such a place as* PURGATORY *is not once mentioned.* This is not denied. Roman writers do not pretend to find the name of that middle place in either the Old or the New Testament. How shall we account for the fact? If there had been a purgatory, to which believers dying in venial sin go, and where they endure terrible sufferings by way of preparation for heaven, would not some one of the inspired writers have named it? Was there not as good reason for mentioning it by name, as heaven or hell? In reading the writings of Papists we constantly meet with purgatory; why do we never find it named by inspired writers? Simply because they knew of no such place. It is true they pretend that the word *hades*, translated *hell*, sometimes means or includes what they call purgatory; but of this they give no evidence whatever.

II. Purgatory, we are told, is a place where true believers, dying in venial sin, or charged with the temporal punishment due to mortal sin, make satisfaction to divine justice, and are purified from remaining defilement; but, as we have already proved, there is no such thing as venial sin, and no temporal punishment for sins forgiven to be endured by believers. To them "there is no condemnation." Consequently, there can be no such place as a purgatory for inflicting such punishment. All the arguments we

* p. 51.

Digitized by Google

have advanced against the Romish division of sins into *mortal* and *venial*, and against the doctrine of a temporal punishment still due to sins forgiven, lie in full force against the existence of purgatory; for, if these distinctions of sins and punishments be not true, there can be no middle state of punishment for believers.

III. *The Holy Spirit shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ, completely sanctifies the souls of believers; and therefore they are not purified, as Rome teaches, in the fires of purgatory.* Jesus Christ is made to his people "wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption."* His instructions are to them a perfect guide; his righteousness secures a perfect justification from all the punishment due their sins; his Spirit imparts to them *perfect sanctification*—preparing them for the happiness of heaven; and his entire work as mediator, is to them a complete redemption from all the evils of sin. Nothing, therefore, is left to be accomplished by the sufferings of a middle state. And in further and complete confirmation of this truth, the Apostle Paul teaches that "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."† How could the Apostle have taught in clearer language that Jesus Christ, by the means of grace he has appointed, and by the agency of his Spirit, of which *water*—mentioned in the passage just quoted—is the emblem, and not by purgatorial fires, will perfectly sanctify his church?

The same truth is beautifully expressed in the language of "one of the elders," who said of those whom John saw clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands. "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."‡ Not one of that happy throng had made his garments white, even in part, either by his great tribulations on earth, or his sufferings in

* 1 Cor. i, 30. † Eph. v, 25-27. ‡ Rev. viii, 14.

Digitized by Google

purgatory. All had washed their robes and made them white, spotlessly white, in the blood of Jesus. To his atonement, simply and exclusively, they owed all their purity. John, and the "elder" who addressed him, knew nothing of satisfaction rendered by man to divine justice, or of purity obtained in purgatorial flames.

To enable men to pay a part of the price of their salvation, and to claim the merit and the praise, Rome greatly detracts from the honor due to Christ and to the Holy Spirit—as if the work of each of the persons in the Trinity were imperfect. Every system of religious error dishonors God, and exalts man. Rome does these things in a higher degree than any other church under the sun.

IV. *Neither the burning of fire, nor any other kind of punishment inflicted, can produce or perfect holiness in the human heart.* Divine judgments may bring men to pause and reflect, but the Holy Spirit only can impart holiness to the heart. Where, in the Scriptures, are we taught the absurd doctrine that material fire can operate on spirit, or that punishment of any kind can sanctify? We shall presently examine the passage in 1 Corinthians, referred to in support of this doctrine.

V. I now proceed to examine the passages of Scripture relied on to prove the existence of purgatory. The first we notice is 2 Maccabees xii, 43–46. Certain Jews had been slain in battle, and their friends found concealed under their garments some of the votive offerings of the idols, and concluded hence that they had been slain because of their sin. And Judas, after making a collection, sent to Jerusalem twelve thousand drachms of silver "for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead." The writer adds, "It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins." To this I reply:

1st. That the books of Maccabees are not a part of the inspired Scriptures; were never admitted into the canon of the Jewish church (which church, Papists say, was infallible); were not quoted by the Saviour and his Apostles; and were rejected by many of the most eminent of the Christian Fathers. This I

Digitized by Google

proved in a preceding lecture. This book, therefore, being uninspired, cannot prove the truth of any doctrine; especially since we know it was written in a very corrupt period of the Jewish church's history.

2d. But it is a fact, which is conclusive on this subject, that in the law of Moses, where special directions are found concerning all the sacrifices to be offered, and the particular design of each, none are appointed to be offered for the dead. How shall we account for this? Nor is this all; for there is not in the Old Testament the most distant intimation that any such sacrifices were ever offered; though we have accounts of the death and burial of multitudes slain in battle, as well as of those who died a natural death. It is evident, therefore, that this is one of the many corruptions which about that time were introduced into the worship of God, and which were severely condemned by our Saviour, when he condemned the *traditions* of the Jews.

3d. It is likewise a fact, which puts the matter beyond controversy, that although we have in the Old Testament, as well as in the New, many prayers of holy men left on record, there is not one petition offered for the dead. If inspired men had regarded it as "a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead," would they not have prayed for them? And in the Psalms, where we find so many prayers recorded, prayers offered up on so many and so various occasions, would there not have been so much as one petition for the pious dead? These considerations are abundantly sufficient to set aside for ever, the argument founded on the language now under consideration.

The next passage of Scripture relied on is Luke xii, 58, 59. "When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he should hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence till thou hast paid the very last mite." Compare Math. v, 25, 26. But here we find not a word about *temporal punishment* due to sins forgiven, or about *venial sins*, or about *purifying the soul* from sin—the only things

Digitized by Google

for which purgatory is required. Moreover, it is not intimated that those cast into prison will ever be able to pay the last farthing of the debt. If a man be imprisoned for debt, and the sentence of the law be that he remain in prison till he pay it all; does this sentence imply that he will ever be able to pay? Certainly not. So that, if we admit the language under consideration to refer to a future state, the prison may be *hell*, and the punishment *eternal*.

In connection with this let us notice the argument founded on Mark iii, 29. "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." Or, as it is expressed in Math. xii, 32, "it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come." Here, say the Roman clergy, it is evidently implied that some sins are forgiven in the world to come. This cannot be in heaven or in hell; therefore it must be in purgatory. I answer, when men so interpret Scripture as to make it flatly contradict itself, they are evidently in error. In the passage just now under review they make the Saviour declare that no man who goes to purgatory shall escape thence until he have paid the uttermost farthing, i. e., have suffered all that is due from him to divine justice; but here they make him teach that *some part* of the debt shall be remitted; some sins for which he deserved to suffer shall be forgiven. Now if he pay the uttermost farthing, either by his own sufferings, or by the offerings of friends on earth, how can anything be forgiven? And if any part of the debt be forgiven, how can he pay the uttermost farthing? Those wise interpreters, who claim the exclusive right of expounding God's Word, make the Saviour flatly contradict himself, and therefore their interpretation of his language is false.

The truth is, his language does not imply that some sins of men are forgiven in the future world. It simply asserts, in a very emphatic manner, that the sin against the Holy Ghost is unpardonable; and so precisely Mark has it—"hath never forgiveness."

Strangely enough, Bishop Milner appeals, in support of this doctrine, to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, in Luke

Digitized by Google

xvi, 19–31. Lazarus, it is said, died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died and went to hell; and, seeing Lazarus afar off in Abraham's bosom, he cried, "Father Abraham, have mercy on me," &c. But whatever this passage may mean, it certainly proves nothing in favor of purgatory; for it is said of Lazarus, "he is *comforted*;" and purgatory is certainly not a place where departed spirits are comforted. But Milner thinks it at least proves the existence of a middle state—the *Limbo Patrum*, as it has been called—where, it is supposed, pious men who died before the death of Christ, were detained in a happy state until his resurrection. The place where Abraham and Lazarus were, was not heaven, he contends; "otherwise Dives would have addressed himself to God instead of Abraham." * This is truly singular logic to come from a Roman Bishop. If Abraham and Lazarus had been in heaven, the rich man, says Milner, would have prayed to God, not to Abraham; and yet this same Bishop, in another part of his book, contends strongly for the propriety of praying to the saints who are in heaven! So that, according to his reasoning, the rich man had too much sense to do precisely what the Roman clergy teach all their followers to do! But suppose Abraham was in limbo, was not God present there as well as in heaven? and might not the rich man, therefore, have addressed his prayer to God? "If I make my bed in hell; behold, thou art there." This passage proves nothing in favor of *limbo*, much less in favor of purgatory.

The next passage confidently appealed to in proof of the existence of purgatory is 1 Cor. iii, 10–15. "According to the grace of God which is given to me as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire;

* End of Con., Let. xliii.

Digitized by Google

and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

Now let us examine this passage carefully. Does it say anything about *venial sins*, to be punished in purgatory? Not a word. Does it say anything about *temporal punishment* due to sins already forgiven? It does not. Then it says nothing favorable to the existence of purgatory. The Apostle represents the church as "God's building," and himself as "a wise master-builder"—a skilful architect; and he warns other ministers of the gospel not only to be careful to build on the right foundation, but to build with *the right kind of materials*, such as gold, silver, and precious stones, not wood, hay, and stubble. If they should teach error, and thus introduce unworthy persons into the church, they would injure the church and themselves; but if by preaching the truth, they were the means of bringing true converts into the church, they would both contribute to the erection of the building of God, and increase their own happiness. For every man's work would, on the day of judgment, be subjected to a scrutiny as severe as that to which metals are subjected, when tried by fire. And as wood, hay, and stubble would be at once consumed by fire, so would the false teaching and bad works of men be rejected by God. This is evidently the general meaning of the passage.

But let us look a little more closely at it. Does the Apostle say that *men* shall be punished by fire for the sins committed before death? He does not. Does he say their *souls* shall be purified by fire from remaining pollution? Nothing of the kind. What does he say? Why, he says every man's *work* shall be made manifest; and the fire shall try every man's *work of what sort it is.* But Papists say the fire of purgatory shall punish and purify his *soul.* Again he says, "If any man's *work* abide"—stand the test—[not if his *soul* be punished or purified] "he shall receive a reward." "If any man's *work* [not his *soul*] shall be burned,"—if it stands not the test, but is proved bad—"he shall

Digitized by Google

suffer loss," i. e., he shall lose the reward he would have received; "but he himself shall be saved," because though his work was defective, he built on the right foundation, was a true Christian; "yet so as by fire." Observe, the Apostle does not say he shall be *saved by fire*, but *so as*, or *as if* by fire. That is, he shall undergo a most strict scrutiny, and will "scarcely be saved." The fact that such a passage as this is appealed to in proof of the existence of purgatory, proves most clearly how little there is in the Scriptures that can be tortured into an argument favorable to the doctrine.

The last passage I shall examine is 1 Peter iii, 18–20. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." This passage is perhaps more confidently relied on, to prove the existence of purgatory, than any other. Christ went and preached to the spirits in prison. He did not preach to those in heaven, nor to those in hell; and therefore he must have preached to some in a middle state—in purgatory. Thus the Roman clergy reason. To this I reply:

1st. That those to whom Christ preached were not in prison *at the time he preached to them;* though they are in prison *now.* The Apostle says he preached to *the spirits in prison*—that is, the spirits *now* in the prison of despair. The Doway Bible, it is true, has it—"he came and preached to those spirits *who were* in prison;" but here, as in several other places, the Roman clergy have corrupted the Word of God to make it sustain their corrupt faith. In the original Greek there are no words answering to the words "*who were*" in the Doway Bible. Peter simply said, Christ preached *tois enphulake pneumasi*—to the spirits in prison. Those two words, therefore (*who were*), are an interpolation, a corruption of the Scriptures, materially altering the sense.

2d. According to the doctrine of Rome, only *the righteous* who

Digitized by Google

die in *venial sin*, or have temporal punishment due to forgiven transgressions yet to endure, go to purgatory. It is a place, according to the Catechism of Trent, "where the souls of *just men* are cleansed by a temporary punishment." But those to whom the Saviour preached were the ungodly who were disobedient, who exhausted the long-suffering patience of God, so that in his wrath he swept them from the earth by the most terrific judgment ever known to our race! Of them, Peter in his second epistle, speaks thus, "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, &c.—and spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, &c.—the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished."* The spirits to whom Christ preached are here put with the fallen angels and the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, as of similar character and destiny; are represented as *ungodly*, reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished. And yet this abominably wicked generation is represented by the Roman clergy as a generation of *just men* who went to purgatory to be "cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing defiled entereth!" So sorely are they pressed for proof of the existence of purgatory.

3d. But why should the Saviour *preach* to souls in purgatory? The design of preaching is either to instruct and urge men to the discharge of their duty, or to comfort them in their afflictions. The Apostles were directed to go and teach all nations to observe all the commands of Jesus; and Isaiah was bidden to comfort God's people—"Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God." But there would be no propriety in urging those suffering in purgatory to the *discharge of duty;* for Bishop Trevern says—"Whatever may be the kind of torments with which souls are there afflicted, we know, and it ought to satisfy us to know, that they are in a state of suffering, unhappy and unable to help them-

* 2 Peter ii, 4-9.

Digitized by Google

selves. For them the time of probation is past. * * * No more good works can they pursue; there are no more alms to be distributed, no more satisfaction to be offered to heaven; only one method remains of making satisfaction—that of suffering."* There surely would be no propriety in urging persons so perfectly helpless to the discharge of duty. And if the Saviour preached in order to *comfort* them, he would only detain them longer in purgatory; for they must suffer just as much as their remaining sins deserve, and be purified by suffering from all their remaining pollutions. In the name of reason, then, what would be the use of preaching to souls in purgatory?

4th. Why, if preaching were necessary for souls in purgatory, has there been no such preaching since the Saviour is said to have preached there? Roman priests, bishops, and cardinals, and even popes, it is true, are supposed to go to purgatory; but they go, not to preach to others, but to suffer for their own sins, and to be purified from their own corruptions; and their brethren who remain on earth say masses, perhaps great numbers of them, for the repose of their souls, to deliver them from the flames of purgatory! It has not been long since Gregory XVI was remembered in this way!

5th. But the meaning of the passage under consideration is sufficiently plain to those who have no false doctrine to support by perverting it. Jesus Christ was quickened by the Spirit, by which Spirit, and not in his own person, he preached to the antediluvians; for Noah, as Peter says, was "a preacher of righteousness"—preached to them under the inspiration of the Spirit. He was one of the "holy men of God, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

VI. *The doctrine of a purgatory, true or false, is a source of great power and wealth to the Roman clergy.* They sit in "the tribunal of penance," and, with the authority of God himself, claim to remit or retain the eternal punishment due to sin. They hold the keys by which the treasures of the merits of Christ and his saints are unlocked, and distributed in the form of indul-

* Amica. Discuss, v. ii, pp. 171-172.

Digitized by Google

gences; and they only can say masses for the souls in the flames of purgatory. And the Council of Trent were careful to teach that those unhappy spirits "are helped by the prayers of the faithful, and particularly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar;" and the Council further made provision for the payment of money for masses. "Let the bishops," say they, "take care that the suffrages of the living faithful, viz., masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety which the faithful have been accustomed to perform for departed believers, be piously and religiously rendered, according to the institutes of the church; and whatever services are due to the dead, through the endowments of deceased persons, or in any other way, let them not be performed slightly, but diligently and carefully, by the priests and ministers of the church, and all others to whom the duty belongs."

As death approaches, the devout Papist, instead of being filled with joy and triumph in the prospect of speedily entering into his heavenly rest, is filled with terrible fears of the tormenting flames of purgatory, in which he may suffer during an indefinite period. He has learned from his priest that nothing is so efficacious in relieving him from those pains, as the sacrifice of the mass. He is, therefore, extremely anxious to secure the largest possible number of masses for the repose of his soul. If he is rich, especially if he has lived a life of pleasure and not of penance, he deems it necessary to leave a very large sum to the clergy to pay for them. Perhaps he will establish a monastery, or donate a large amount of real estate. How much better to do so, than to burn from year to year in purgatorial flames? If the man be poor, yet it is most desirable that his soul be delivered from purgatory at the earliest possible period. He has, therefore, the strongest possible inducement to take from his widow and fatherless children that which is absolutely necessary to their comfort, if not to their very existence, to pay for masses for the repose of his soul. But friends may, by paying money, have masses said for departed friends. The poor wife, scarcely able by her daily toil, to keep her children from starving, is tormented with the reflection that her beloved and lamented husband is now

Digitized by Google

writhing in the flames of purgatory. She increases her toil, and takes every farthing that can possibly be spared without starving herself and children, to hire the priest to say masses for his soul. Thus, by this doctrine of man's invention, not only are the clergy greatly enriched, but the poor are yet more impoverished, and made doubly wretched.

The doctrine is not only false, but cruel. It robs the dying believer of the peace bequeathed him by his Saviour, and robs his family of the comforts, and often of the necessaries, of life. Who would have believed that the glorious gospel, whose benevolent office it is to bind up the broken-hearted, and to comfort the mourner, would ever have become, in the hands of its professed ministers, the most terrible instrument of oppression and cruelty?

But the clergy are enriched; and this, with them, seems to be regarded as the *one thing needful.* By means of this doctrine, more than any other, they have got possession of a very large proportion of the real estate in every country in which Popery has prevailed. Nor is it possible, by any system of legislation, to prevent them doing the same thing in every country on the globe, where their system shall gain an extensive footing.

Digitized by Google

LECTURE VIII.

1 Cor. xi, 26. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

We have here an inspired account of the institution of the the Lord's supper. The Saviour had now finished the work his Father gave him to do. He had confirmed his claims to be the Son of God by multiplied miracles, had preached the gospel from city to city, in Judea, and had gathered out of the world those who were the chosen instruments to introduce the New Dispensation. It remained for him, by offering himself as a victim, to meet the claims of divine justice against his people, that God might be just and the justifier of those who believe in him. Before he suffered he chose to partake of the Passover with his disciples for the last time, and then to appoint in its stead an ordinance commemorative of his death, to be observed till the end of the world. "The same night on which he was betrayed," having partaken of the Passover, "he took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, Take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

There is no difficulty in understanding the nature and design of this simple, yet deeply impressive institution. The broken bread and the wine poured out represent the crucifixion of the Son of God, by which his body was broken and his blood shed for the remission of the sins of many. These emblems are to be received as a *memorial* of his sufferings. "This is my body which is given for you: this do *in remembrance of me*."* "This

* Luke xxii, 19.

Digitized by Google

do ye, as oft as ye drink it, *in remembrance of me.*"* Even Christians are too prone to forget the love and sufferings of their Saviour. He therefore appointed in his church a sacrament to be observed by his people, in which, by means of significant emblems, the solemn scenes of Calvary should be often brought vividly before their minds, and impressed deeply on their hearts; that they might affectionately remember him "who loved them and gave himself for them." But this sacrament is designed not only to preserve, in the minds of the people of God, a lively recollection of the sufferings of their Saviour, but also "*to show* (or proclaim to others) the Lord's death till he come." This object is distinctly stated in the text. The all-important doctrine of salvation by faith in Jesus Christ is by it preached to others, as well as impressed more deeply on the minds of believers. And there, as the children of God sit together and partake of the sacred loaf, the ordinance proclaims the *unity of the church.* "For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread." And as they form one body, so they hold fellowship with Christ the head, and with each other. "The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"† In partaking of the emblems of the body and blood of our Lord we do, in the most solemn manner, profess our allegiance to him, and bind ourselves to serve him faithfully; and therefore it may be termed, in the strict sense of the word, a *sacrament*—a word which originally signified a military oath, taken by Roman soldiers to be faithful to their country. And as in keeping the commandments of God "there is great reward"; so in the observance of this ordinance—the most simple, solemn, and impressive of any ever appointed for the edification of the church—rich blessings are secured.

Widely different from the view now presented of the Lord's supper, is the doctrine of Rome. So wonderfully has the Lord's supper been changed and corrupted by the Roman clergy, that its

* 1 Cor. xi, 25. † 1 Cor. x, 17.

Digitized by Google

identity is completely lost. The faith of Rome is embraced in the following particulars:

1. "That by the consecration of the bread and wine, the whole substance of the bread is converted into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; which conversion," says the Council of Trent, "is by the Catholic church fitly and properly called transubstantiation." In the canon passed on this point, the Council use the following language. "Whosoever shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and consequently Christ entire; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign or figure, or by his power; let him be accursed."

2. That "Christ, whole and entire, exists under the species of bread, and in every particle thereof, and under the species of wine, and in all its parts."

3. That inasmuch as the consecrated bread and wine are, each of them, the Lord Jesus Christ, whole and entire, therefore they are to receive divine worhip which is due only to God, and are to be carried in processions through the streets and public places to be adored by the people. "Whoever," says the Council of Trent, "shall affirm that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy eucharist with the external signs of that worship which is due to God; and therefore that the eucharist is not to be honored with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rites and customs of holy church, nor publicly presented to the people for their adoration; and that those who worship the same are idolators: let him be accursed."

Against this doctrine we enter our solemn protest, and proceed to prove it untrue.

I. The first reason we assign for rejecting the doctrine of transubstantiation, is—*that it necessarily involves absurdities and contradictions the most glaring.* I cheerfully admit that we are, in expounding the Sacred Scriptures, to understand them according

Digitized by Google

to their literal meaning, unless the nature of the subject, or the context, forbid it, or the literal interpretation involve palpable absurdities or contradictions. That the subject and context forbid the literal interpretation of the words, "This is my body," and that such an interpretation is absurd and contradictory, I am prepared to demonstrate.

1. In the first place, then, according to this doctrine, our Lord changed bread and wine, not simply into flesh and blood, but into *himself!* The consecrated wafer is declared to be no longer *bread*, but really and truly Jesus Christ himself; and the same thing is affirmed of the consecrated wine. Now I cheerfully admit that Christ could change bread into flesh, and wine into blood, as easily as in Cana of Galilee he converted water into wine; but I do most positively deny that he could change either bread or wine *into himself.* He could change the water into wine at the wedding; but he could not have changed either water or wine *into the governor of the feast.* The very statement is so grossly absurd, so outrages the common sense of every man, that it neither requires nor admits of refutation. That I am myself, and that nothing else can be myself, body and mind, are propositions that do not require to be proved to any sane man. That Jesus Christ, administering his supper to his disciples in an upper chamber in Jerusalem, was himself, and that no other substance could become Jesus Christ, cannot be proved, simply because it is self-evident. Christ is indeed omnipotent; but omnipotence does not perform absurdities.

2. According to the doctrine I am opposing, Jesus Christ held himself in his hands, broke himself, and distributed himself to the Apostles! For by the consecration, we are told, the bread was so *transubstantiated* that it was no longer bread, but Christ himself. And it is a fact that after the consecration (if there was any such thing), he broke the bread (that is, himself), and distributed it to his disciples. By what mode of argumentation shall I attempt to prove such a thing absurd and impossible? Is anything more necessary, than simply to state the thing?

3. If this doctrine be true, then each of the Apostles received

Digitized by Google

and eat Jesus Christ, whole and entire, *twice*, before his death, and while yet he was standing before them conversing with them! For we are told that Christ, whole and entire, exists under the species of bread and every particle of it, and under the species of wine and every particle of it. So that our Saviour was taken and eaten *twenty-four times* before he suffered, and whilst he was yet before his disciples! Shall I adduce argument to prove to any man of common sense that this is a monstrous and impious absurdity?

4. This doctrine requires us to believe the human body and soul of Christ to be in heaven, and, at the same time, in ten thousand places on earth! Or rather, that he has ten thousand, yea, ten thousand times ten thousand souls and bodies—all which are one and the same soul and body! That he rose from the dead and ascended to heaven, where he is at the right hand of the Father, the Roman clergy teach; and yet they require us to believe that his human body and soul are present wherever on earth there is a consecrated wafer or consecrated cup of wine; and that this same soul and body are daily taken and eaten by a real "manducation," by multitudes of Romanists! Was there ever a human being, left to the exercise of his own faculties, who could be induced to credit these monstrous absurdities and impieties?

It is vain to attempt to escape from the difficulty by calling the doctrine a great *mystery*. A mystery is something above our comprehension; but it involves no contradiction of universally admitted truths, no palpable absurdities. The doctrine of the Trinity, for example, is mysterious; but no candid man can say that there is either absurdity or contradiction in the statement, that there is a sense in which God is *one*, and another sense in which he is *three*. Whilst all admit the mode of the divine existence to be incomprehensible, none can pretend that the doctrine of the Trinity contradicts any known truth. These remarks apply equally to the human and divine natures of Christ.

II. *The doctrine of transubstantiation contradicts the testimony of our senses.* The bread, after the consecration, *looks* like bread,

Digitized by Google

tastes like bread, and *feels* like bread; and the wine *looks* and *tastes* like wine. We have, therefore, in relation to the bread, the testimony of *three* of our senses, and in relation to the wine, the testimony of *two* of them, against the doctrine. Now what evidence had the Apostles that Jesus Christ existed on the earth? They had the testimony of *two* of their senses, viz: sight and feeling. We have, therefore, more evidence that the consecrated bread and wine are nothing but bread and wine, than the Apostles had of the incarnation of Christ. And what evidence have we that our Lord said—"This is my body?" We have the testimony of *one* of our senses; but we have the testimony of *three* of them that the bread has undergone no change by the consecration, and consequently that he did not design to be understood literally.

God has so constituted our minds that we cannot doubt the testimony of our senses in regard to things of which they are competent to take cognizance. It will not answer to call the doctrine of transubstantiation a great *miracle*. For in the Scriptures it is never so represented; and, besides, all the miracles of which we read in the Bible were obvious to the senses, and did not, in a single instance, contradict their testimony. *There is not on record a solitary instance in which God ever required any one to discredit the testimony of his senses.* Aside from the monstrous absurdity of the doctrine, therefore, it is far more likely that the Roman clergy have greatly erred, and corrupted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, than that such a requisition has been made in this particular instance.

III. But, it will be said, the Saviour has taught the doctrine, and required his disciples to believe it; and, therefore, however contradictory or absurd it may appear to us, we must believe it or renounce Christianity. I reply, that his language, so far from teaching it, plainly teaches just the opposite. It is, by the way, not a little remarkable that the Roman clergy, who insist that the Bible is a very obscure book, which can be understood only by an infallible interpreter, do yet with equal positiveness assert that it plainly teaches the particular tenets of their church! That the doctrine of Rome is wholly unsustained by the Scriptures,

Digitized by Google

will appear evident to the candid and impartial, from the following considerations:

1. The Protestant interpretation is sustained by the usage of Scripture phraseology, as well as by general usage. What is more common than to say of a portrait of Washington—"there is George Washington?" It was perfectly in accordance with common usage that Joseph, in interpreting the dreams of Pharoah, said—"The seven good kine *are* seven years; and the seven good ears *are* seven years—and the seven empty ears blasted with the east wind *shall be* seven years of famine."* And therefore it was, that Daniel, when explaining to Nebuchadnezzar the meaning of the great image he had seen in a dream, said, "Thou *art* the head of gold."† Hence, too, our Saviour said to John the Apostle—"The seven stars *are* the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest *are* the seven churches."‡ So universal, indeed, is this mode of speaking, it is a wonder that any one should ever have thought of insisting on a literal interpretation of our Saviour's language, especially since such an interpretation carries with it such absurdities as I have mentioned.

2. But let not the audience suppose that the Roman clergy insist upon interpreting *literally* ALL our Saviour's language about his Supper. They go only so far as they feel constrained to go, in order to sustain their favorite doctrine. When he says, "This is my body;" they interpret his language literally, and add to it "soul and divinity;" but when he says—"This cup is the New Testament in my blood," they are as far as Protestants from adopting a literal interpretation. They do not believe that the *cup* is literally a *new testament;* and yet the Saviour says, it is, just as plainly as he says of the bread, "it is my body." They do not even believe that the *contents* of the cup are a *testament.* Why do they insist on a literal interpretation of a *part* of our Saviour's language, and adopt a different interpretation of another part on the same subject?

3. The bread and wine are still called bread and wine, after what the Papists consider the consecration of them. "The cup

* Gen. xli, 26, 27. † Dan. ii, 38. ‡ Rev. i, 20.

Digitized by Google

of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The *bread* which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"—"For we are all partakers of that one *bread*."* Here it may be important to remark, that in this passage the cup is declared to be "the communion of the blood of Christ." Will the Roman clergy contend that the *cup* is literally a *communion?* Surely not. Let them, then, give up their literal interpretation, and adopt the common sense view of the subject. But the fact to which I wish to direct your particular attention, is, that the partaking of the Lord's supper is here represented as the breaking of *bread*. So also in the succeeding chapter the Apostle says—"For as often as ye eat this *bread*, and drink this *cup*," &c. "Wherefore whoever shall eat this *bread*, and drink this *cup* of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord;" that is, such persons are guilty of dishonoring the body and blood of the Lord by disregarding the sacramental emblems of his sufferings. Again "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that *bread* and drink of that *cup*." If Paul believed that the consecrated bread was really the body of Christ, why did he still call it *bread?* If he believed that it had been changed into Christ himself, why was he so profoundly silent about the divine worship to be given to him in the sacrament? Similar language is found in Acts ii, 42, where the disciples are represented as continuing "in breaking of *bread;*" for Roman writers affirm that this *breaking of bread* was partaking of the Lord's supper. If they are right in this, they are surely in serious error when they teach that the bread, after consecration, is not bread; for if it was not, how could the disciples continue in *breaking* BREAD? The doctrine of transubstantiation, therefore, is wholly inconsistent with our Saviour's teaching —is the grossest possible perversion of his language.

But there remains one portion of Scripture, as yet unnoticed, to which the Roman clergy appeal with much apparent confidence, in support of transubstantiation, viz.: the sixth chapter of the gospel by John. The doctrine, they contend, is fully proved by

* 1 Cor. x.

Digitized by Google

such language as the following: "And the bread that I will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," &c. This language they insist on understanding literally, and as relating to the sacrament of the Supper. To this interpretation we object—1st. That the discourse of our Lord, from which I have quoted, was delivered, not to his disciples, but to the unbelieving Jews, some time before the Supper was instituted. I say, the discourse was delivered *to the unbelieving Jews.* Of this any one can satisfy himself by reading the chapter in question. This is an important fact; for Bishop Trevern urges, as a conclusive argument in favor of transubstantiation, what he calls "*the discipline of secresy.*" He says—"Every person who will pay any attention to the history of the first ages of the church will be struck with a point of discipline which I propose here to investigate with you, and which regards the inviolable secresy observed by all the faithful on the sacraments, and especially on that of the altar. Jesus Christ gave it as a precept to his disciples, when he commanded them, under figurative expressions, not to give that which is holy to dogs, nor to cast pearls before swine. When he instituted his august sacrament, he would have none but his Apostles for witnesses; and we see that after his example the Apostles never celebrated but in secresy."* Yet this same Bishop labors to prove that our Saviour, instead of concealing this sacrament from the profane, did fully and plainly teach it to "the Jewish multitude," in the discourse now under consideration! † "The conversation between Jesus and the Jewish multitude, which cannot be sufficiently meditated upon, commences at the 25th verse. * * * The secret hitherto concealed is now divulged: the great mystery is declared: it has been heard; it has been understood to signify a real presence; but will this real presence be believed?" &c. Here is a palpable contradiction.

* Amica. Discuss., vol. i, pp. 260, 261. † Ibid., v. i, pp. 195, 196.

Digitized by Google

For if Jesus Christ did conceal the nature of the sacrament of the Supper from the unconverted, it is certain that he did not teach it to the unbelieving Jews; and if he did teach it to them, there was no such secret discipline as he pretends, and upon which he founds a lengthy argument for his doctrine.

2d. We are certainly to suppose that our Saviour, when he addressed the Jews concerning the conditions of salvation, and urged them to comply with those conditions, intended to make himself understood. But if, in the discourse in the sixth chapter of John, he had reference to the Lord's Supper, his hearers could not possibly have understood him; for that sacrament was not instituted until the evening on which he was betrayed. His language, therefore, could have conveyed no instruction to their minds.

3d. If this discourse has reference to the Supper, it flatly contradicts the doctrine of Rome; for the Saviour said—"Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, *hath* eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Again—"He that eateth of this bread shall live forever." Now if the Saviour, by the words *flesh* and *blood*, means the transubstantiated bread and wine, he teaches that whoever takes the consecrated wafer and wine will certainly live forever. This, however, the Roman clergy do not believe, for even Luther and Calvin, while Papists, did receive them. Moreover, the final perseverance of the saints is not one of the doctrines of Rome. On the contrary, Papists believe that they do fall from grace as often as they commit mortal sin.

4th. But the occasion of delivering the discourse and the explanations given by our Lord, prove conclusively that he had not the remotest allusion to transubstantiation. He had miraculously fed the multitude; and when, the next day, they resorted to him again, he said to them, "ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled." And from this circumstance he took the opportunity of impressing on their minds some important religious truths. "Labor not," said he, "for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall

Digitized by Google

give unto you." The Jews, on hearing this language, inquired anxiously, "What shall we do that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." They demanded a sign, and referred to the manna their fathers ate in the wilderness. Our Saviour then taught them plainly that he was the "bread of life;" that they must eat his flesh and drink his blood. But this language was sufficiently explained; for he said, "I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." To eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, as he explained his language, is *to believe in him as the Saviour of men*, by the breaking of whose body, and by the shedding of whose blood, sinners must be saved. He did not mean what Bishop Trevern calls "real manducation," the literal eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood; for he said, still further, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." As Nicodemus understood him, when speaking of the new birth (John iii), to mean the natural birth; so did the Jews understand him, no less erroneously, to speak of the literal eating of his flesh; and the church of Rome has fallen into the same monstrous error.

IV. *The changes made by the Roman clergy in the Lord's Supper, prove conclusively the erroneousness of their faith.* It cannot be doubted that the infinitely wise Saviour instituted and administered the ordinance just as he designed it to be observed by his church in all succeeding generations. If there had been good reasons for administering it in a different manner, those reasons must have been known to him, and would have induced him to act accordingly. We are authorized to conclude, therefore, that the sacrament of the Supper, just as it was administered by him, is best adapted to express the truth, and to secure spiritual benefits to those who partake of it; and, consequently, the very clearest evidence a church or an individual could possibly give of having a faith which is not the faith of Christ, would be the fact that it had constrained them to lay impious hands upon his sacred

Digitized by Google

ordinance, and materially to alter it. Just such evidence of corruption have the Roman clergy given. Let us inquire into those alterations.

1st. The Roman clergy have taken the *cup* from the laity and non-officiating clergy. The fact is clear (and it is admitted by the Council of Trent) that Jesus Christ did administer the Supper in the use of both bread and wine, and did thus deliver it to his Apostles. "The sacred Council, therefore, taught by the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and piety, and following the judgment and practice of the church, doth declare and teach that the laity and non-officiating clergy are not bound by any divine precept to receive the sacrament of the eucharist in both kinds; nor can any one who holds the true faith, indulge the slightest doubt that communion in either kind is sufficient to salvation. *For although Christ the Lord did in the Last Supper institute this venerable sacrament of the eucharist in the species of bread and wine, and thus delivered it to the Apostles;* yet it does not thence follow that all the faithful in Christ are bound by divine statute to receive both kinds. Nor can it be fairly proved from the discourse recorded in the sixth chapter of John, that communion in both kinds is commanded by the Lord, howsoever the same may have been interpreted by various holy fathers and doctors." It may be well just here to remark, that the Roman clergy agree with the Fathers when the language of the Fathers suits them; and contradict them when it does not. But you will note the distinct admission, that our Saviour in instituting the Supper, did use both bread and wine, and did deliver the institution as thus appointed, to the Apostles. By what authority, then, did the Council of Constance or the Council of Trent take the cup from the laity, and administer to them but half the sacrament? The Council of Trent profess, indeed, to be guided by the Holy Spirit; but this profession is grossly false —for the Holy Spirit never dishonored Christ by changing institutions which he had appointed. He, the Saviour said, would teach his Apostles all things, and bring all things to their remembrance, "whatsoever I have have said unto you;" but he was

Digitized by Google

not sent to change Christ's ordinances. When, and to whom, did the Holy Spirit reveal the fact, that our Saviour did not design to have his Supper administered as he had instituted it?

The Council further say, that in making this change they followed the judgment and practice of the church. But suppose the assertion true, what are the judgment and practice of the church against the authority of Jesus Christ? It is not true, however; for they themselves admit, that "various holy fathers and doctors" held a different doctrine, which they could scarcely have done, if the judgment and practice of the church had been against them. Bishop Milner acknowledges that the cup was not taken from the laity by established law until the 15th century. "It appears," says he, "that in the 12th century, only the officiating priest and infants received under the form of wine, which discipline was confirmed at the beginning of the fifteenth, by the Council of Constance, on account of the profanations and other evils resulting from the general reception of it in that form."* We shall notice this statement in a few minutes.

Strangely enough, Milner attempts to prove that Christ and the Apostles did sometimes, in administering the sacrament, use bread alone. For proof he refers to Luke xxiv, 30–31. "And it came to pass, as he (Christ) sat at meat with them,"—that is, two of his disciples—"he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight." But there is not a particle of evidence that in this instance the Saviour administered the sacrament to them; and, therefore, the argument is worthless. He also adduces Acts ii, 42—"And they continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers." The Bishop assumes, that by the *breaking of bread* is meant the reception of the Lord's Supper; and from the fact that *wine* is not mentioned, he infers that it was not used. But even if we admit that this phrase has certain reference to the Supper, the inference drawn by the Bishop is wholly unwarranted. The Supper, it is admitted, was originally insti-

* End of Con., Let. xxxix, p. 241.

Digitized by Google

tuted by the use of both bread and wine; and it cannot be denied, that where it is particularly described, as in 1 Corinthians xi, both elements are mentioned. The cause must be hardly pressed, when one of its ablest advocates can sustain it only by *assuming* that a certain phrase refers to the ordinance in question, and *inferring*, simply because the cup is not mentioned, that the Apostles in their practice departed from the institution as administered by Christ himself. If we reason legitimately at all, we must conclude that they administered the Supper just as he did, until the contrary is proved by positive evidence. Just as well might we assert that *baptism* was sometimes administered without the use of *water*, or without the use of the name of the *Trinity*, because it is frequently spoken of as having been administered, without water or the Trinity being mentioned!

The language of Paul, in 1 Cor. xi, 27, is appealed to in support of the law which forbids the cup to the laity. "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and [or] drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." Roman writers contend that instead of the words "*and drink*," the true reading is "*or drink;*" and hence they infer that the use of either the species of bread or wine is sufficient. To this we reply—1st. That it is, at least, doubtful whether the original reading was *kai* (and) or *ē* (or). The Alexandrian manuscript, and Syriac version, which was made in the first or second century, together with the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, read *and*, instead of *or*. 2d. But if we admit that the passage should read, *eat or drink*, the inference that the cup may be dispensed with is not legitimate; for in the immediate connection the Apostle states particularly, that our Saviour administered the cup as well as the bread, and gives not the slightest intimation that it would be proper, under any circumstances, to make such a change. He also uses such language as this: "For as often as ye eat this bread *and* drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." Again—"But let a man examine himself and so let him eat of that bread, *and* drink of that cup. For he that eateth *and* drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damna-

Digitized by Google

tion to himself," &c. Can any one doubt whether Paul administered wine as well as bread to the people. Does he intimate that bread alone was ever used in this sacrament?

But the church of Rome, we are told, had "just and weighty reasons" for withholding the cup from the laity and non-officiating clergy. This is surprising indeed. We know that our Saviour had the very best reasons for administering his Supper as he did; for he never acted without such reasons. We know, moreover, that all the reasons for a contrary practice, which have been given by the Roman clergy, were known to him; and had they been worth anything, would have induced him to administer the Supper as they do. How, then, can any rational man believe, for one moment, that their reasons for departing from the original mode of administering the Supper, are good? Let it not be forgotten that the taking of the cup from the laity is, as Milner says, a matter, not of *doctrine*, but of "*variable discipline;*" and that in matters of *discipline* the Roman clergy do not pretend to infallibility. Jesus Christ was infallible in matters of discipline, as well as doctrines and morals; the Roman clergy (or church) confessedly are not: and yet they, in their fallibility, change a most important ordinance appointed by him who *knows all things!* Nay, more: they denounce *anathema* against those who venture to deny that they had "just grounds and reasons" for this bold proceeding!—anathema against those who believe that the Lord Jesus Christ was wiser than they!*

But let as look at the reasons assigned for the change. Bishop Milner says it was made in the fifteenth century, "on account of the profanations, and other evils resulting from the general reception of it in that form."† What the profanations, and other evils were, he does not state. But what a charge is impliedly brought against his church by the statement he makes! Strange indeed, that a Roman bishop, zealously defending his church, as the holy, apostolical church, should intimate that the Lord's Supper could not be administered by her clergy, as Jesus Christ administered it, without *profanations* so great that she was constrained to take

* De com. sub. utraque specie. † End of Con., Let. xxxix.

Digitized by Google

from the people, and also from the non-officiating clergy, *one-half of it!* Verily, if such was the state of things in the fifteenth century, it was time to cease to administer it at all, until the church could be purified. Surely there must have been urgent necessity for the Reformation of the 16th century! But the state of things cannot be much better *now;* for the same grossly unscriptural practice is still kept up.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent assigns several reasons for the change, which require a brief notice.

1. "In the first place, the greatest caution was necessary to avoid accident or indignity, which must become almost inevitable, if the chalice were administered in a crowded assemblage." If this reason was of any weight against administering the cup to the laity, would it not have occurred to our Saviour and his inspired Apostles? When, under the ministry of the Apostles, tens of thousands, both of Jews and pagans, were converted, and when there were no houses of worship in which the sacraments could be administered, would not this difficulty have been much greater than at a later period? How happened it, then, that our Saviour gave no intimation that he purposed having his Supper administered without the use of wine? And how happened it that the Apostles passed no such law as that enacted by the Roman clergy? Bishop Milner acknowledges that the law by which the cup was taken from the laity and non-officiating clergy, was not enacted until "the beginning of the fifteenth century," when this high-handed measure was adopted by the Council of Constance!* How are we to account for the fact, that for fifteen hundred years the necessity of this law, although greater than at the time it was enacted, never appeared either to the Apostles or to the church? The truth is, the doctrine of transubstantiation had then recently come into existence; and the law was made to suit the false doctrine. If the doctrine held by Protestants is true, evidently the taking of the cup from the laity is both unnecessary and improper. The difficulty mentioned by the Catechism of Trent does not exist, if our doctrine be true. The very fact that

* End of Con., Let. xxxix.

Digitized by Google

the Romish faith admits and requires a change in the Lord's Supper from the original institution, is one of the clearest evidences of its falsity.

2. "In the next place," says the Catechism, "the Holy Eucharist should be at all times in readiness for the sick, and if the species of wine remained long unconsumed, it were to be apprehended that it may become vapid." We scarcely know whether we should most admire the logic of the Roman clergy, or be astonished at their gross inconsistency and impiety. They reason thus: the *sick* cannot always be accommodated with wine, therefore neither the laity nor the non-officiating clergy ought to receive it! Would not the logic have been equally good, if they had concluded to take the cup from the *officiating clergy* also? But mark the inconsistency and impiety of their reasoning. They assure us that the wine is, by the consecration of the priest, converted or transubstantiated into Jesus Christ himself; and then they tell us, this same wine, which is really not wine, but Jesus Christ himself, will become *vapid* if it remain long unconsumed! There is no true Christian, we verily believe, whose feelings would not be shocked by such a statement! But this difficulty, like those just noticed, it seems, did not occur to our Saviour and his inspired Apostles. It was left for the superior wisdom of the Roman clergy to discover it! The truth is, the Saviour and the Apostles did not regard this sacrament as in itself efficacious, or at all necessary for the sick and dying. They, therefore, had no difficulty about the keeping of the wine. But the Roman clergy have wholly changed the nature and design of the sacrament; and then out of their *new doctrine* arises the difficulty they mention, and the consequent necessity of taking the cup from the laity. The change is made to suit the doctrine.

3. The Catechism assigns a third reason for mutilating this sacred ordinance, viz.: "There are many who cannot bear the taste or smell of wine." This reason scarcely deserves a moment's notice. It shows, however, how difficult the Roman clergy feel it to be to justify their conduct in laying profane hands on the ordinance of Christ. There are very few who labor un-

Digitized by Google

der any difficulty of tasting or smelling wine; and if the number were much greater, no reasonable man would think of doing more to meet the difficulty, than to permit such persons to omit the use of it. Who would ever have thought of depriving the whole church of the use of one of the elements used by our Saviour, because one in a thousand might dislike the taste of it! But did not this difficulty (if it be a difficulty) exist at the time the Supper was instituted, and during the ministry of the Apostles? Why, then, did our Lord use wine? And why did the Apostles pass no law forbidding the cup to the laity? Or do the Roman clergy claim to be wiser or better than Christ and the Apostles?

4. The last and, perhaps, the most singular reason for this unscriptural law, is thus stated by the Catechism: "Finally, a circumstance which principally influenced the church [i. e. the pope and his clergy] in establishing this practice, means were to be devised to crush the heresy which denied that Christ, whole and entire, is contained under either species, and asserted that the body is contained under the species of bread without the blood, and the blood under the species of wine without the body. The object was attained by communion under the species of bread alone, which places, as it were, sensibly before our eyes, the truth of the Catholic faith." * In view of this reason, which, it seems, was the principal one for taking the cup from the laity, I have two remarks to make, viz.: 1st. It is certainly a singular mode of crushing heresy, to mutilate one of the most important ordinances appointed by the Head of the Church. One would naturally have thought that heresy would be more readily crushed by preserving and defending the ordinances just as they were instituted by Infinite Wisdom. 2d. But it is here distinctly admitted that the Romish faith is much more clearly and strikingly exhibited by taking the cup from the laity, than by administering the sacrament as our Saviour administered it. This is truly an important and instructive acknowledgment. We know that our Saviour designed by the

* See Catechism of Trent, pp. 171, 172.

Digitized by Google

administration of his Supper, to exhibit the true faith in the clearest and most impressive manner. Will any one venture to deny this? Will any one dare affirm that he instituted this important sacrament so as not, in the fullest and best manner, to exhibit the truth? But it is acknowledged by the Roman clergy that the Supper, as instituted and administered by him, does not very strikingly exhibit *their faith.* They confess, that those whom they denounce as heretics, did gain great advantage to their views by appealing to the ordinance as originally administered by Jesus Christ; that the advantage was so great that they determined to crush the heresy by mutilating the ordinance, and forbidding the cup to the laity and non-officiating clergy! And they declare that by this change the object was attained; because it "places, as it were, sensibly before our eyes, the truth of the Catholic faith." Now it is certain that the ordinance, as instituted and administered by our Saviour, does most strikingly exhibit the true Christian faith. It is acknowledged by the Roman clergy, that as thus administered, it exhibits most impressively the faith of Protestants.* And it is confessed, that as administered by Christ, it does *not* exhibit forcibly, if at all, the Roman faith; so far from it, that the clergy have actually changed it, and forbidden the people to receive it as administered by him, in order to make it set forth their faith. In view of these facts, let me ask every man of common sense, who holds the true Christian faith, Protestants or Papists? Who are the true successors of the Apostles, those who retain the ordinances as administered by Christ Jesus, and whose faith is thus most strikingly exhibited; or those who, to make this most important sacrament teach their faith, have essentially changed it?

2d. But the doctrine of Rome is proved false by the *additions* made to the Lord's Supper, as well as the *subtractions.* Interpreting literally the words of our Saviour—"This is my body"

* "I do not deny, that in their [Protestants] mere figurative system, there may be some reason for receiving the liquid as well as the solid substance, since the former may appear to represent more aptly the blood, and the latter the body." End of Con., Let. xxxix.

Digitized by Google

—they add, in order to make out the doctrine, the important and significant words, "*soul and divinity.*" "Whosoever," says the Council of Trent, "shall deny, that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, *together with his soul and divinity*, and consequently Christ entire, let him be accursed." As the taking of the cup from the people was necessary to sustain the doctrine of transubstantiation, so is this unscriptural addition equally necessary; for it would not do to say that the living body of Christ is separated from his soul and divinity? Where, in the Scriptural account of the Lord's Supper, do we find anything about the presence of his soul and divinity? If such a thing were true, it is most unaccountable that the Apostles, instructing the ignorant in their epistles, said nothing about it. If the Protestant doctrine is true, their teaching is just what it should have been—nothing is omitted.

3d. *The mode of administering the Lord's Supper proves conclusively, that it is not the ordinance instituted by our Saviour.* In a devotional book, the title of which is *True Piety*, published by the authority of the Rt. Rev. Bishop David, late of Kentucky, I read as follows: "When the priest gives you the blessed sacrament, saying, *The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul to life everlasting, Amen;* receive it with a lively faith, a profound humility, and a heart inflamed with love. At the time of your receiving, let your head be erect, your mouth opened moderately wide, and your tongue a little advanced, so as to rest upon your under lip, that the priest may convey the blessed sacrament into your mouth; which being done, shut your mouth, let the sacred host moisten a little on your tongue, and then swallow it down as soon as you can, and afterwards abstain awhile from spitting. If the host should chance to stick to the roof of your mouth, be not disturbed, neither must you put your finger in your mouth to remove it, but gently and quietly remove it with your tongue, and so convey it down. And then return to your place, and endeavor to entertain, as well as you can, the guest whom you

Digitized by Google

have received."* Go, read the inspired accounts of the administration of the Lord's Supper, and contrast them with these ridiculous and disgusting directions, and say whether Rome has not wholly corrupted the sacred ordinance. If the Protestant doctrine is true, the language of our Saviour, "take, eat—drink ye all of it," is all that is necessary.

V. *That the doctrine of transubstantiation is false, is further proved by the worship the church of Rome requires to be given to the consecrated bread and wine.* The doctrine teaches that the bread and the wine, after consecration, are each the Lord Jesus Christ, body, blood, soul, and divinity. Accordingly, the Council of Trent anathematizes every one who ventures to affirm "that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy eucharist with the external signs of that worship which is due to God." And the same Council curses all who assert "that the eucharist is not to be honored with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rites and customs of holy church, nor publicly presented to the people for their adoration." Accordingly, nothing is more common, in those countries where Popery prevails, than to see processions passing through the streets, in which the clergy, followed by a multitude, are bearing the host—the consecrated wafer—which the people are expected and required to fall on their knees and worship. Thompson, in his Recollections of Mexico, says "There is scarcely an hour in the day when the little bells are not heard in the streets, announcing that some priest is on his way to administer the sacrament to some one sick or dying. The priest is seated in a coach, drawn by two mules, followed by ten or a dozen friars, with lighted wax candles, chanting as they go. The coach is preceded by a man who rings a small bell to announce the approach of the host—when every one who happens to be in the street is expected to uncover himself and kneel, and the inmates of all the houses on the street do the same thing. Nothing is more common than to hear them exclaim, whenever they hear the bell, 'Dios viene!

* pp. 237-238.

Digitized by Google

Dios viene!'—God is coming! God is coming!—when, whatever they may be doing, they instantly fall on their knees. What I have described is the visit of the host to some common person. The procession is more or less numerous, and the person in the coach of more or less dignity—from an humble priest to the Archbishop of Mexico—according to the dignity and station of the person visited. Sometimes the procession is accompanied by a large band of music. The visit of the host to Senora Santa Anna, of which I have heretofore spoken, was attended by a procession of twenty thousand people, headed by the Archbishop. Until very recently, every one was required to kneel; and a very few years since an American shoemaker was murdered in his shop, for refusing to do it. But now they are satisfied if you pull off your hat, and stop until the host passes."*

Now, go to the New Testament, and read all that is there recorded concerning the eucharist, and see whether you can find one word from which it can be inferred that the Apostles worshipped the consecrated bread and wine, or required others to do so. Did they ever carry it about to the sick and dying? Did they ever carry it on a holy day in procession, and call upon those they passed to kneel? I will not ask whether they ever had a man *murdered* for refusing to worship the host. Why do we find among primitive Christians nothing of all this, which is now so prominent in the church of Rome? The only satisfactory answer is—*because primitive Christians knew nothing of the doctrine of transubstantiation.* Rome has changed and corrupted the doctrine of God's word, and then changed the worship to suit it. And her persecuting spirit, which shows itself in seeking to kill those who are too conscientious to yield to her idolatry, is a further evidence that she has corrupted the ordinance. I say, too conscientious to yield to her *idolatry;* for the worship of the consecrated wafer and wine is the grossest idolatry. It is giving to a lifeless piece of bread, or a cup of wine, the honor and worship due only to God. If this is not idolatry, what is?

VI. *The doctrine of the* MASS, *which is founded on that of tran-*

* Ch. x, p. 102.

Digitized by Google

substantiation, affords further conclusive evidence that it is false. It is not more true, that he who tells one falsehood, must tell several more in order to conceal it, than that he who adopts one serious error in religion, will feel himself constrained to avoid palpable inconsistency by adopting others.

The Lord's Supper, we are told by the Roman clergy, was instituted, not only as a *sacrament*, but also as a *sacrifice* to be offered up to God. When received as a sacrament it is "the celestial food of the soul;" and, when offered as an oblation, it is a real propitiatory sacrifice for the living, and the dead in purgatory. So they inform us. "Whoever," says the Council of Trent, "shall affirm, that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the mass; or that the offering is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat: let him be accursed." Again—"Whoever shall affirm, that by these words, 'Do this for a commemoration of me,' Christ did not appoint his Apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood: let him be accursed." Once more—"Whoever shall affirm, that the sacrifice of the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, *satisfactions*, and other necessities: let him be accursed."*

The falsity of the doctrine of the mass is evident from several considerations which I will now present.

1. It is declared to be the same sacrifice which was offered on the cross, which is false and absurd. The *victim*, we are told, is the same. That is, the consecrated wafer is Jesus Christ! The monstrous absurdity of this doctrine I have already exposed. But if Christ be the *victim*, who is the *priest?* The officiating clergymen, we are told, "consecrate the holy mysteries not in their own, but in the person of Christ. This the words of consecration declare: the priest does not say, 'This is the body of *Christ*,' but 'This is *my body;* and thus invested with the character of Christ, he changes the substance of the bread and wine into the substance

* De Sacrificio Missa, Chap. ix.

Digitized by Google

of his real body and blood."* The wafer is Jesus Christ; the priest is virtually Jesus Christ; and, therefore, the victim and the priest are Jesus Christ! Such is the logic by which the Roman clergy prove the sacrifice of the mass to be the same as that offered on the cross. Does it require refutation? Is not the simple statement of the doctrine the most complete exposure of it?

But does Jesus Christ really shed his blood and endure suffering in the mass? This is not pretended. The Council of Trent teaches, that in the mass Christ is offered *without blood* (incruente immolatur).† The Catechism of Trent speaks of Christ on the cross and Christ in the mass, as "the bloody and unbloody victim."‡ And Bishop Milner says, the sacrifice on the cross is the same with that in the mass—"in the one there being a real, and in the other a mystical effusion of the victim's blood." Again, he asserts, "that a mystical immolation of him takes place in the holy mass."‖ It is easy to conceal a difficulty or an absurdity under unmeaning phraseology. What does the Bishop mean by a "*mystical effusion*" of Christ's blood? What idea can be attached to the phrase—"*mystical immolation?*" Does Christ in the mass endure *mystical sufferings?* But Milner tells us, that on the cross there was "a REAL" effusion of blood, and in the mass there is "a *mystical*" effusion. He places the words *real* and *mystical* in contrast. Since, then, a *mystical effusion* is the opposite of a *real effusion*, and since a *mystical immolation* is the opposite of a *real immolation;* we are obliged to conclude, that in the mass there is no real effusion of blood and no real immolation, and, consequently, no real sacrifice of any kind—that there is nothing *real* in the whole thing—that it is a *nonentity*—a figment of the disordered brain, or a cunning device to delude the ignorant and superstitious, and get their money. Unless it be true, that men are chargeable with committing *mystical sins*, there can be no efficacy in a mystical immolation.

But it was absolutely necessary that, by phraseology significant or unmeaning, the clergy should make the sacrifice of the mass identical with that offered on the cross; for the Scriptures teach,

* Cat. of Trent, p. 175. † De Sacri., cap. ii. ‡ p. 175. ‖ End of Con., Let. xl.

Digitized by Google

in language too clear to be misunderstood, that Christ "was ONCE offered to bear the sins of many;" and that "by *one offering* he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."* It devolved upon them, therefore, not only to prove that the consecrated *wafer* is Jesus Christ, "body, blood, soul, and divinity," but that a bloody sacrifice is the same as an unbloody sacrifice, that the officiating priest is virtually Christ, and that a sacrifice, the whole efficacy of which consisted in the *sufferings* endured, is the same as a sacrifice in which there is no suffering at all! But what is there too absurd for designing men to invent, or for superstition to believe?

2. The purposes for which the mass is said to be offered, prove it unscriptural and false. They are the following:

1st. As "a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."† Was the sacrifice of Christ on the cross one of praise and thanksgiving? Where are we so taught? His groans, and tears, and blood, were a sacrifice strictly propitiatory for sin. It was not a sacrifice of praise. Now if, as the Roman clergy aver, the mass is identical with the sacrifice on the cross, how can it be offered for a purpose so widely different?

2d. The mass, we are told, is offered "as a daily remembrance of the passion of Christ?"‡ The Council of Trent teach, that our Saviour instituted the mass, when he said to his Apostles, "Do this for a commemoration of me."§ The mass, be it remembered, is precisely identical with the sacrifice on the cross; and yet we are gravely told it is a remembrance, a commemoration of it! That is, this sacrifice is a commemoration of itself! Verily the Roman clergy seem to have gone on a voyage in quest of the most remarkable absurdities! We can easily see why Protestants eat the bread and drink the wine of the Supper in remembrance of Christ; but that Christ should be sacrificed in commemoration of his being sacrificed, that a sacrifice should be the commemoration of itself, is an absurdity too glaring, one would think, to be received by even the most ignorant.

* Heb. ix, 28 and x, 14. † Catechism of Trent, p. 175. ‡ True Piety, p. 81.
§ De Sac. Miss., cap i.

Digitized by Google

3d. The mass, we are told, is offered *in honor of the saints*, in order to secure their intercession for believers on earth! The Council of Trent says—"Although the Church is accustomed to celebrate, sometimes, certain masses in honor and memory of the saints, nevertheless, it teaches that the sacrifice is not offered to them, but to God only, who has crowned them with glory; whence the priest does not say, I offer sacrifice to thee, Peter, or Paul, but giving thinks to God for their victories, he implores their patronage, that they whom we commemorate on earth may vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven."* Christ sacrificed in honor of the saints! Who are the saints? Creatures, once polluted by sin, and children of the devil, saved by the amazing grace of God, through the sufferings of Christ. And these sinners saved by grace are now to be *honored* by the sacrifice of the Son of God!!! Truly the fearful impiety of Rome exceeds anything recorded in the history of this proud and presumptuous world! Under the old dispensation we find not an instance in which even an *animal* was offered in honor of any creature on earth or in heaven; but the Roman clergy honor the saints by the sacrifice of their Lord!—they sacrifice the Creator to honor the creature! And by what authority is such a sacrifice offered? Was the sacrifice on the cross offered in honor of the saints? This even Rome does not pretend to affirm. Then since it is pretended that the mass is identical with that, how happens it to be applied to purposes so infinitely different? But the clergy thus honor the saints, they say, in order to secure their intercession. They first, in the face of the Word of God, put the saints instead of Christ as intercessors, and then, to induce them to do the work of intercessors, they sacrifice the Saviour to do them honor! So it would seem the saints in heaven have not sufficient benevolence to intercede for their brethren on earth, unless they can be honored by the sacrifice of Jesus their Lord! The church of Rome attributes to saints in heaven more ungodly pride and ambition, than has characterized the most depraved men on earth. Hence she cajoles and flatters them with blasphemous worship, to induce them

* De. Sac. Miss., cap iii.

Digitized by Google

to appear as advocates for her children, before the throne of God. But to offer the Son of God in sacrifice to honor sinners saved by sovereign grace, argues a blindness and infatuation unequalled in the history of human pride and superstition.

4th. The mass, we are told, is truly propitiatory, and by it "God is appeased and rendered propitious."* This, however, can be proved only by making it identical with the sufferings of Christ on the cross, the absurdity of which has already been exposed.

3. *But another fact which is fatal to the doctrine of the* MASS, *is —that there are no* PRIESTS *in the Christian church; and therefore, there can be no* SACRIFICE. This consequence the bishops of Trent saw; and therefore they asserted that our Saviour appointed the Apostles "priests of the New Testament."† This, however, is not true. In the New Testament the church of God is called "a royal priesthood," because every true Christian is to "offer up spiritual sacrifices—the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving—acceptable to God through Jesus Christ."‡ The ministers of Christ are called apostles, bishops, presbyters, &c., but in not one instance are they called *priests.* I am aware that in the Doway Bible we find priests; but the translation is most grossly incorrect. Where the word *presbuteros* occurs in the gospels, and with reference to Jewish officers, the translators render it *ancient;* but when the same word is used with reference to the ministers of Christ, they translate it *priest.* For example, Math. xv, 2, is thus translated: "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the *ancients* (*presbuteron*)?" Acts xiv, 23, is translated thus: "And when they had ordained for them *priests* (*presbuterous*) in every church," &c. Now I assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that the word *presbuteros* never signifies a priest who ministers at the altar. Literally it signifies *an old man.* It was originally used to designate the rulers of the Jews (Exod. iii, 16); and in the Jewish Sanhedrim the priests and presbyters, or elders, filled different offices. Math. xvi, 21. The word con-

* Cat. of Trent, p. 175. † De Sacrificio Mis. Cap. 1.
‡ Comp. 1 Pet. ii, 5, 9, and Heb. xiii, 15.

Digitized by Google

stantly used, both in the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Old Testament) and in the New Testament, to signify a *priest*, is *chiereus*, and *archiereus* a *high-priest*. But it is a fact, that these words are never used in the New Testament to designate the ministers of the gospel. The grossly incorrect translation of the Doway Bible, for which not one particle of authority can be found, was made to suit the doctrine of the mass. Since, therefore, there are no *priests* in the Christian church, there can be no *sacrifice;* and consequently the doctrine of the mass is proved *false.*

4. *As there are no priests in the Christian church; so there is no* ALTAR, *and, therefore no* SACRIFICE. True, Paul says, referring to the Jewish sacrifices, "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle; but he immediately explains his meaning by saying—"Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth therefore unto him," &c. This was not the "unbloody sacrifice," the "mystical immolation." True, the Apostle exhorts Christians to offer sacrifice; but he leaves not his meaning doubtful—"By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name. But to do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."* Such are the sacrifices, and the only sacrifices, the church of Christ is required to offer.

The Council of Trent found an altar in 1 Cor. x, 21. "Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of devils." By the table of devils they understood the altar on which the heathen sacrifices were offered, and by the table of the Lord, the altar for the mass. But the word TRAPEZA, which in the Latin Vulgate is rendered *mensa*, never signifies an altar for sacrifice. The Greek word constantly used to signify an altar, is *thusiasterion.* But both the Greek word *trapeza*, and the Latin word *mensa*, signify uniformly a table on which food is placed for eating, or a table for other purposes, as the tables of the money-changers in the temple.† And this meaning accords precisely

* Heb. xiii, 10-15. † Math. xxi, 12.

Digitized by Google

with the subject of the Apostle's remarks. He is giving directions concerning the propriety of Christians attending those feasts in which things offered to idols were eaten. "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat," &c. They might eat that which had been offered in sacrifice to idols, and afterwards sold in market; but they must not go to an idolatrous feast. In the Christian church we find neither *priest* nor *altar*, and consequently no such sacrifice as that of the mass.

5. *Finally, we do not read in the Scriptures of any other* SACRIFICE, *than that which was offered on the cross.* The Council of Trent, and Roman writers generally, refer with apparent confidence to Malachi i, 11 "For from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering." Here, indeed, we find a pure offering spoken of; but where is the evidence that it has any reference to the mass. It is a mere assumption without the slightest proof. The meaning of this prophetic language is given by Paul in the passage already quoted—"By him therefore let us offer the *sacrifice of praise* to God, that is, the fruit of our lips;"—and by Peter—"a holy priesthood [the church] to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." What incense has so sweet an odor to God, as the devotion of the heart?—what sacrifice purer and more acceptable, than the praises of a penitent, grateful soul? Wherever on earth there is a faithful child of God, this pure offering is daily made. The "golden vials full of odors," which John saw in the hands of the elders, "are the prayers of saints."* These are *real*, not *mystical* sacrifices. These are sacrifices with which God is well pleased.

The doctrines of transubstantiation and the mass, like most of the prominent doctrines of Rome, give to the clergy immense power and wealth. None but they can convert the bread into Christ Jesus; none but they can administer it as a sacrament; none others can offer the sacrifice of the mass for the living and the dead. Those who dread the fires of purgatory, and those

* Rev. v, 8.

Digitized by Google

who suppose that they have friends writhing in the flames of that middle state, have the strongest motives to keep in favor with the clergy, to leave them a legacy to pray them out of purgatory, when they die, and to pay them well to sing mass for their departed friends. But this feature of the subject was presented in the lectures on penance and purgatory; and I need not here repeat the exposure of the tyranny and oppression exercised by the clergy in connection with this doctrine, and by its means.

The worst features of it are its gross impiety and the fatal deception practiced upon the superstitious multitude, who, turned from the real sacrifice of Calvary, fondly dream that their sins are pardoned, because a priest professes to offer for them a piece of *bread!* "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of Christ Jesus my Lord."

Let us turn from the multiplied errors and endless jargon of Rome to the simple, significant, sublime ordinance of the Supper, as instituted by Jesus Christ; and whilst, in the appointed use of the bread and wine, we affectionately remember his dying love, and show forth his death to others, let us look beyond the mere emblems, and, assisted by our senses, rest by faith on the glorious sacrifice of Calvary. There flows blood which cleanseth from all sin. There is an offering by which he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.

Digitized by Google

LECTURE IX.

Rev. xxii, 9: "Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the Prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God."

Whether the person who addressed the Apostle, and imparted to him the wonderful revelations here recorded, was one of that order of holy beings commonly called *angels*, or was one of the old Prophets, who, though glorified in heaven, was still employed in serving the church on earth, it is not important now to determine. We know that the angels "are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation;" and it is not impossible that glorified saints, who are "as the angels," may be similarly employed. The principle, however, is the same, so far as the present discussion is concerned. John, overpowered by the glory of the celestial messenger, and by the wonderful things by him revealed, fell down once and again to worship him. The angel positively forbade him to do so, because he was a fellow-creature and a fellow-servant of John, and directed him to worship God. "See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the Prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: WORSHIP GOD."

The doctrine clearly taught in this portion of Scripture, is—*that God is the only object of religious worship.* CREATURES may be loved and respected according to their intelligence and their holiness; but religious worship must not be offered to any creature, however exalted. There is a broad distinction between that respect, love, and even reverence, which may be properly felt and expressed towards creatures, and those feelings and acts which constitute religious worship. The latter necessarily involve the idea of accountability and obligation to the being worshipped,

Digitized by Google

and, therefore, put him in the place of God. It is the ascription of divine honor to the object of worship.

In the Doway Bible we find the following note on the corresponding passage (ch. xix, 10): "St. Augustine is of opinion that this angel appeared in so glorious a manner that St. John took him to be God; and therefore would have given him *divine honor*, had not the angel stopped him, by telling him he was his fellow-servant. St. Gregory rather thinks that the veneration offered by St. John, was not divine honor, or indeed any other than what might lawfully be given; but was nevertheless refused by the angel, in consideration of the dignity to which our human nature had been raised, by the incarnation of the Son of God; and the dignity of St. John, an Apostle, Prophet, and Martyr." Here we cannot but remark—1st. How worthless is that "unanimous consent of the Fathers" on which Rome constrains her children to rest their faith. We have here two of the most prominent of them differing widely in the interpretation of a portion of Scripture, on the proper understanding of which depends one of the most important doctrines of the church. 2d. If Augustine expressed the opinion attributed to him, of which we need not now inquire, he did so without the slightest evidence; for John drops not the most distant intimation that he supposed the angel to be God himself. On the contrary, he says he was "one of the seven angels" whom he had seen in a preceding part of the vision (ch. xv, 1). Nor is there more evidence to support the opinion said to have been expressed by Gregory; for John does not intimate that the worship was refused for any of the reasons mentioned, but simply because he was a creature; and therefore the command given to John is—"worship God"—none but God.

It is implied, of course, that God is to be worshipped as a Spirit, and, therefore, not by means of pictures or visible representations of any kind.

I will now state the doctrine of Rome on the points involved in this discussion, and then compare it with the Word of God. The Council of Trent commanded all bishops and others who have the care and charge of teaching, "that according to the

Digitized by Google

practice of the Catholic and Apostolic church, &c.—they labor with diligent assiduity to instruct the faithful concerning the invocation and intercession of the saints, the honor due to relics, and the lawful use of images; teaching them that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men—that it is a good and useful thing suppliantly to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers, help and assistance, because of the benefits bestowed by God through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour; and that those are men of impious sentiments who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked—or who affirm that they do not pray for men, or that to beseech them to pray for us is idolatry, or that it is contrary to the Word of God, or opposed to the honor of Jesus Christ, the one Mediator between God and men, or that it is foolish to supplicate, verbally or mentally, those who reign in heaven."

The same Council teaches, and requires the bishops to teach, concerning *relics*, "that the holy bodies of the holy martyrs and others living with Christ, whose bodies were living members of Christ, and temples of the Holy Spirit, &c., are to be venerated by the faithful, since by them God bestows many benefits on men. So that they are to be wholly condemned, as the church has long before condemned them, and now repeats the sentence, who affirm that veneration and honor are not due to the relics of the saints, or that it is a useless thing that the faithful should honor these and other sacred monuments, and that the memorials of the saints are in vain frequented to obtain their help and assistance."

Concerning *images and pictures*, the Council teaches, "that the images of Christ, of the Virgin, Mother of God, and other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and due honor and veneration rendered to them. Not that it is believed that any divinity or power resides in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped, or that any benefit is to be sought from them, or any confidence placed in images, as was formerly by the Gentiles, who fixed their hopes in idols. But the honor with which they are to be regarded is referred to those who are

Digitized by Google

represented by them; so that we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose likenesses these images bear, when we kiss them, and uncover our heads in their presence, and prostrate ourselves. Let the bishops teach further, that by the records of the mysteries of our redemption, expressed in pictures and other similitudes, men are instructed and confirmed in those articles of faith which are especially to be remembered and cherished; and that great advantages are derived from all sacred images, not only because the people are thus reminded of the benefits and gifts which are bestowed on them by Christ, but also because the divine miracles performed by the saints and their salutary examples are thus placed before the eyes of the faithful, that they may give thanks to God for them, order their lives and manners in imitation of the saints, and be excited to adore and love God, and cultivate piety. Whoever shall teach or think in opposition to these decrees, let him be accursed."

Such is the faith of Rome concerning the worship of saints and angels, the veneration of relics, and the use of images and pictures. Let us test its truth by an appeal to the Scriptures of Truth.

1. That God is to be worshipped, all acknowledge. The faith of Protestants, which requires all to worship Him, is admitted to be true. The command—"Thou shalt have no other gods before me"—requires all to worship and serve Jehovah, and forbids the worship of any other being. On this point we shall have something more to say presently.

2. It is equally clear, though Romanists deny it, that God forbids the use of images or pictures in his worship. The second commandment of the Decalogue leaves no room for doubt on this point: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love

Digitized by Google

me, and keep my commandments." The first commandment forbids the worship of any being but the true God; and the second, in language too plain to be misunderstood, and accompanied by warnings the most solemn, forbids the worship of the true God *by means of images or pictures of any kind.* In other words, the first commandment forbids *polytheism*—the worship of more than the true God; and the second forbids *idolatry*—the worship of God by the use of any visible representation.

The reason of this solemn prohibition is given in the precept, viz: God is jealous of his honor. If an image or picture could be of any advantage in the worship of God, it must be because by means of it a more correct view of his character is presented to the mind. But when Romanists paint God the Father as an *old man*, will any one pretend, that by such a picture a more correct and exalted view of his character is presented to the mind of the worshipper? Will the clergy tell us, that with the sublime and awful view of the divine character exhibited by the Scriptures before our mind, our conceptions will become still more spiritual and sublime by having before the eye the picture of an *old man?*

The Doway Catechism has the following question and answer: "Q. How do you prove it lawful to paint God the Father like an old man, seeing he is a pure spirit, and hath no body? A. Because he appeared to the prophet *Daniel* in the shape of an old man, *Daniel* vii, but this is to be understood, that the pictures we make, are not the proper images of God the Father, but that shape wherein he appeared to *Daniel.*"* It is not true, that God the Father appeared to Daniel in the form of an old man—the very image of infirmity. Daniel says—"I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened." What do we see here? Instead of an old man, trem-

* p. 53.

Digitized by Google

bling over the grave, we have a vision of the King of kings in his glorious majesty, eternity the measure of his existence, and universal dominion his undisputed right! Is there, or has there been on earth, a painter who could even approximate to a drawing of this awful vision? And this is the only authority the Papists can plead for flying in the face of the divine prohibition, and painting God as an old man!

But the authors of the Catechism tell us, that the pictures they make, are not the proper images of God the Father. No—they are infinitely unlike him, and infinitely below him. How, then, can such pictures elevate our views of him, or aid us in offering to him spiritual worship? Is not the tendency necessarily just the opposite? In the name of common sense, why make a picture to represent an object, which picture you feel constrained to tell all who look upon it, is in no respect like the object it is designed to represent, but, compared with it, is most uncomely and degrading?

The second precept of the Decalogue has long been a difficulty in the way of Papists. Instead of "graven image," the Doway Bible has "graven thing;" and by the precept the Roman clergy tell us, they understand "that we must not make idols or images, nor any graven thing whatsoever, to adore it as a God, or with God's honor."* But this interpretation is flatly contradicted by that remarkable portion of Scripture, Deut. iv, 15–19. "Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire; lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female; the likeness of any beast that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air; the likeness of any thing that creepeth," &c. What reason is here assigned for for bidding the making, for religious use, of any graven image, the likeness of male or female? The reason is, that they saw no manner of similitude when God appeared to them on the mount. God is a Spirit infinitely unlike, and infinitely above everything on earth and in heaven; therefore make no attempt to form a

* Doway Cat., p. 51.

Digitized by Google

picture or image of him. It is one of the severe charges prefered by Paul against the Pagans, who are represented as abandoned of God, that "they changed the glory of the uncorruptible God, into an image made like to *corruptible man.*"* This charge lies in an aggravated form against Rome, who has made pictures representing God as an old man! She has done more; she has made pictures for the use of her children, representing the Holy Trinity! I have in my possession one of these pictures, in which the Father is represented as an old man, the Son as crucified on his bosom, and the Holy Spirit as a dove! Well may we be shocked at such impiety, when even the most awful mystery connected with the being of Jehovah is profanely represented by Rome in pictures, to aid the devotions of her children!

I have said the second precept of the Decalogue has long given trouble to the Roman clergy; for its language is as clear a condemnation of their faith and practice, as language can be. True, they tell us they do not worship the pictures or images themselves, but God or the saints intended to be represented by them; but every intelligent Pagan would say the same concerning the images of his gods. The word *idolatry*, is derived from the Greek word *eido*, to see, and it means the worship of God or of gods, by *visible representations.* Romanists are, therefore, idolaters. In their trouble to escape the force of this second commandment, the clergy have united the first and second in one, and divided the tenth into two—thus making two distinct precepts prohibiting the one sin of covetousness! Having made this arbitrary and unscriptural division, they not unfrequently leave out the second precept from their catechisms. This is acknowledged and justified by the Doway Catechism: "Q. Why are not these words expressed at length in many of our shorter catechisms? A. Because they are sufficiently included in the preceding words, 'Thou shalt not have strange (or other) gods before me.' Q. How declare you that? A. Because if we must have no other but the only true God, who created heaven and earth, then it is clear to the reason of every child, that we must not

 * Rom. i, 23.

Digitized by Google

have many gods, or any graven things for gods, or adore any other things for gods."* Here we have evidence conclusive that the interpretation of the second precept, given by the Roman clergy, is false; for they make it mean precisely the same thing as the first, and then omit it in their catechisms, because the meaning of the first is plain even to the mind of a child, and therefore what we call the second, is entirely superfluous! If the doctrine of Protestants is true, the second commandment, so far from being superfluous, is of unspeakable importance. The first points out the *object* of religious worship—God Almighty; the second determines the *manner* in which he is to be worshipped—he is a Spirit, and must be worshipped, not by means of pictures and images, but in spirit and in truth. Which interpretation is true, that which makes a very prominent part of God's law superfluous, and induces men to mutilate it in their Catechisms; or that which retains it all, and makes all of it equally significant and important?

This argument becomes perfectly conclusive, in view of the fact that in the temple at Jerusalem there was neither image nor picture representing God. And never, so far as we can ascertain, did the Jews attempt to make anything of the kind. Why did they not? If such things are an aid to devotion, did they not need them quite as much as the Christians? The uniform practice of inspired men, under the Old Dispensation, is proof conclusive that they understood the Old Testament Scriptures just as Protestants understand them, as forbidding the making of any image or picture to represent the Great God. And is there in the New Testament anything favorable to the practice of Rome? This is not pretended. The truth is clear, that the church of Rome, in open violation of the plainest precepts of the Word of God, has PAGANIZED Christianity, "and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." She has become grossly idolatrous.

There might appear to be something more to justify the use of pictures and images of Christ, since he appeared on earth in

* p. 51.

Digitized by Google

human nature. But, in the first place, there is nothing in the Scriptures to countenance the practice. And besides, no painter or sculptor on earth ever did, or ever will make a picture or image of Christ that is not unspeakably below the reality, and that does not tend to degrade, instead of elevating our views of him. We have never seen a human countenance which was not marred by the depravity of our fallen nature. The painter or sculptor himself is under the blinding and degrading influence of sin. It is not to be supposed, therefore, that he could succeed in anything like a just representation of the countenances of Adam and Eve before the fall. How far short, then, must such men come of drawing the likeness of him who is infinitely more than man, through whose countenance, itself expressing the perfection of holiness, shone the glories of Divinity! A Roman Catholic enters a church, and falls on his knees before a picture representing Christ on the cross. Is there one feature of the face correctly drawn? Probably not one. It bears no resemblance to Christ more than the picture of any other man. It falls far, very far, beneath the conceptions we have formed of him by reading the Gospels? Can such a thing aid our devotions? Why have we in the New Testament no description of his personal appearance? He knew what was in man, and he knew that such a description, without aiding the faith of his people, might lead to the corruption of that spiritual worship which he came to establish.

The Doway Catechism proves the lawfulness of the use of images, "because we read in *Baronius*, that famous church historian, in the year of Christ, 31, that Christ himself sent his own image to King Abdagar, and made it also by a miracle on the handkerchief of *St. Veronica*, and on his own shroud." * Baronius lived in the 17th century. What evidence is there that the stories he tells of what happened so many centuries before he lived, are true? In the authentic and inspired accounts of the life and works of our Saviour, we not only do not find these stories recorded, but we find nothing analogous to them—nothing from which we can infer the probability of such things. We

* p. 52

Digitized by Google

therefore reject them as, like a multitude of other traditions of Rome, utterly false.

Another proof adduced of the lawfulness of the use of images, is the lifting up the brazen serpent in the Jewish camp in the wilderness. "Q. What other proof have you for the lawful use of images? A. First, out of John iii, 14, where Christ approves the making and exalting the brazen serpent, by which the Israelites were healed in the desert, and owns it to be an image or figure of himself, exalted on the cross." * That Moses did right in raising the brazen serpent in the camp, no one doubts, since he did so in obedience to the command of God. But that the serpent was an *image* of Christ, no one would ever dream, who was not sorely pressed for arguments to sustain the unscriptural faith of Rome; if it is to be so considered, then the Roman clergy should have a *serpent*, instead of a *man*, in their churches!

But the authors of the Catechism, whilst referring to the brazen serpent, in support of their faith, forgot one important fact, viz: that it led the Jews into idolatry, and was, on that account, broken in pieces by king Hezekiah. "He removed the high places, and broke the images, and cut down the groves, and broke in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehushtan," that is, a piece of brass. † The translators of the Doway Bible, in a note on this passage, say: "So he called it in contempt, because they had made an idol of it." Now, if such is the tendency of human nature to idolatry, that the Jews were led into the commission of that sin, by a piece of brass, in the shape of a serpent, which was never intended to be used in religious worship, who does not see how much greater the danger of idolatry, when the images of Christ and the saints are suspended in the churches, and the people are taught to kneel and pray before them? It is in vain that the Roman clergy talk of "an inferior or relative honor." The language is perfectly indefinite; and the result will be just as in the case of the brazen serpent. And if, to prevent idolatry, it was necessary that Heze-

* Dow. Cat. p, 52. † 2 Kings, xviii, 4.

Digitized by Google

kiah should break in pieces the brazen serpent, is it not evident that the Roman clergy are most inexcusable for placing in the churches pictures and images far more likely to lead to that sin? Rome has borrowed much from the types and shadows of the Jewish dispensation, but much more from the darkness of Paganism.

I have said that, according to the Scriptures, God is the only object of religious worship, and consequently the worship and invocation of saints and angels are unscriptural and sinful. Angels, it is true, are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation; and possibly glorified saints may be similarly employed; but it does not follow that it is right to worship them, or to invoke their intercession on our behalf. The Protestant doctrine, that God is the only object of religious worship, is fully established by the following incontrovertible facts, viz.:

1. *There is, in the Scriptures, no command and no permission granted, to worship or pray to saints and angels.* God has taught us that he is a jealous God; that he will not give his glory to another. It is most evident, therefore, that men have no right to offer religious worship to any being in the universe, without a command or express permission to do so; and that they who, unauthorized by him, teach men to worship any other being, do contract a fearful amount of guilt. Those who defend the doctrine in question, do not pretend to find in the Scriptures any precept or permission to support it.

2. *It is a fact that the Scriptures afford no* EXAMPLE *in favor of the doctrine of the worship of saints and angels.* The inspired writers gave many directions concerning religious worship and prayer; but they never directed men to worship and invoke by prayer any being but God. They have left on record many prayers, both in the Old and New Testaments, but not one prayer, or one petition, to any saint or angel. Search the Bible through—read every prayer and every petition in its sacred pages—and you will look in vain for anything like the saint-worship of Rome. This fact cannot be successfully denied. Roman writers cannot find any such prayers. How shall we account for

Digitized by Google

this fact? Did the inspired writers believe with the Council of Trent, "that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men—that it is a good and useful thing suppliantly to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers for help and assistance?" If they did, why did they never happen, in all their directions and exhortations concerning the duty of prayer, to intimate anything of the kind? Did they ever offer prayers to saints and angels? Why, then, do we find in the Bible, where so many prayers are recorded, no trace of such a practice? The Saviour taught his disciples to pray; and the Lord's prayer is left on record, as a model for his church in all succeeding ages. How happens it, that this remarkable prayer contains not one petition to any being but God? If it were true, that it is either a duty or a privilege to pray to saints and angels, would he have given his disciples no intimation of the kind? When the Romish clergy teach their followers to pray, do they act thus? Take up one of their prayer books, and you will soon be convinced that they regard prayers to saints as among the most important parts of religious worship. They have abundantly supplied, out of their own fruitful imaginations, that, in regard to which, if Popery be true, the inspired writers, and Jesus Christ himself, were sadly deficient! The Catechism of the Council of Trent says, "When kneeling before the image of a saint, we repeat the Lord's prayer, we are also to recollect that we beg of the saint to pray with us and to obtain for us those favors which we ask of God in the petitions of the Lord's prayer; in fine, that he become an interpreter and intercessor with God."* Our Lord, in teaching his disciples to pray, omits, entirely, petitions to saints. The Roman clergy, in their fancied wisdom, supply the defect, informing their followers that they are, in repeating this prayer before the image of a saint, to understand themselves as praying also to the saint!

Bishop Milner says, "That it is lawful and profitable to invoke the prayers of the angels, is plain from Jacob's asking and obtaining the angel's blessing, with whom he had mystically wrestled. Gen. xxxii. 26. and from his invoking his own angel to

* p. 327

Digitized by Google

bless Joseph's sons, Gen. xlviii, 16." * But the angel with whom Jacob wrestled was God himself, the second person in the adorable Trinity, who appeared to him in the form of a man. Therefore it was that his name was changed, and he was called *Israel*—prince of God; "For as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed;" and therefore Jacob called the name of the place *Peniel* [face of God], for he said, "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." This same angel is, by the Prophet Hosea, declared to be Jehovah: "By his strength he had power with God: yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed: he wept and made supplication unto him: he found him in Bethel, and there he spoke with us; even the Lord God of hosts; the LORD [Heb. JEHOVAH] is his memorial."† Wonderful interpreters of Scripture are the Roman clergy, who refer us to a prayer offered to God, as evidence that prayers should be addressed to *creatures!* The angel whose blessing Jacob invoked upon the sons of Joseph, was the same with whom he had wrestled; and consequently these passages afford no support to the doctrines of Rome.

Milner attempts to prove that saints do intercede for Christians, "from the Book of Revelations, where the four-and-twenty elders in heaven are said to have *golden vials full of odors*, which are the prayers of the saints." Rev. v, 8.‡ The passage is as follows: "And when he [Christ] had taken the book, the four beasts and four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints." Now let it be remembered that in the language of the Scriptures all believers on earth are *saints*. 1 Cor. i, 2; Acts xxvi, 10; Rom. i, 7. Then let it not be forgotten that the revelations made to John the Apostle, in these wonderful visions, concerned chiefly *the church on earth*, her trials, persecutions and triumphs. Jesus Christ, "the Lion of the tribe of Judah," opens the book of God's purposes concerning his church; and the four-and-twenty elders, clothed in white raiment,‖ with

* End of Con., Let. xxxiii.

† Hosea, xii, 3-5.

‡ End of Con.. Let. xxxiii.

‖ Rev. iv, 4.

Digitized by Google

their vials full of odors, represent the church of Christ worshipping and praising him. The prayers of the saints, therefore, are those offered to God by his people on earth, not the intercessions of those in heaven.

But it is said Paul asked Christians to pray for him; why, then, may we not ask the prayers of saints in heaven? True, Paul asked the prayers of believers on earth; but, so far as the Scriptures inform us, he never once asked those of the saints in heaven, nor directed others to do so. Why did he not? He certainly had good reasons for this omission. He did not believe that it is part of the work of saints and angels in heaven to pray for men on earth. Had his faith been identical with that of Rome, we should have read in his epistles how, in his afflictions and persecutions, he called on the Virgin Mary, the saints and angels for aid. But in vain do we look in his epistles or in the Acts of the Apostles, or in the New Testament, for anything of the kind. The name of Mary, which figures so prominently in the devotional books of Rome, is not once mentioned by the Apostles, after the brief historical facts connected with her are stated. We ask the prayers of Christians because they are directed by God to pray one for another. We do not ask the prayers of saints and angels in heaven, because we have no authority from God to do so.

3. *In the Scriptures we find no* SAINTS' DAYS—*days observed in honor of particular saints, when their intercession is to be specially sought.* The adoption of one important error, as I have repeatedly remarked, leads naturally, if not necessarily, to the adoption of others. Rome makes intercessors of the saints in heaven, or of those she has canonized as saints; then she makes prayers to be offered up to them, and appoints days to be religiously observed in honor of them, when their assistance is to be particularly invoked. In the Bible they are never mentioned as intercessors; and, of course, no prayers are addressed to them, and no days appointed in honor of them—no St. Abraham's day, St. Moses's day, St. David's day; no "all saints' day." The Jewish church had many holy days appointed by God, but not one of them

Digitized by Google

connected with any saint. The Roman prayer-books are consistent with Roman faith and worship; and the Scriptures are consistent with Christian faith and worship; but the two are radically unlike and opposite.

4. *It is perfectly absurd for Christians in all parts of the earth to be offering prayers to finite beings in a distant part of the universe, employed with all their powers in the service and enjoyment of God.* Let it be admitted, if you please, that saints and angels often visit the earth, what evidence can we have that the particular individual to whom our prayers may be addressed is present, or can hear us? In a devotional book, which I have had occasion to quote more than once, as published by Bishop David, late of Kentucky, I find the following singular prayer:

"*A Prayer to the monthly Patron.*

O thou blessed inhabitant of the heavenly Jerusalem, who hast been appointed by the divine Goodness to be my patron during this month, receive me under thy protection, defend me by thy intercession from all dangers of soul and body; obtain that I may be a faithful imitator of thy virtues, and that the fire of divine love may be more and more kindled in my heart.

D. Pray for us, St. N.

R. That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ."*

Now I am utterly at a loss to know how the pope and his clergy ascertained that the saints have *monthly* appointments to intercede for Christians on earth. That angels are ministering spirits to them we know; but that they have such appointments as this prayer contemplates, is more than doubtful. How, then, can the devout Papist have any assurance that the saint is listening to his prayers? All Papists pray constantly to Mary; and, of course, it often happens that ten thousand persons, in different and distant parts of the earth, are addressing prayers to her at the same moment. Now can any man, in his sober senses, believe that she is present to all of them, and can hear all their petitions? Is she omnipresent and omniscient? Is she equal to God? It will not relieve the difficulty to say, as does Bishop Milner, that

* p. 391.

Digitized by Google

God can communicate to the saints in heaven the prayers offered to them on earth, as he conveyed to Elisha (2 Kings vi, 9) what was passing in Syria. For, in the first place, God never communicated to Elisha or to any other creature, what ten thousand persons, in different places, were saying to him at the same instant. In the second place, he has not promised to make any such revelation to the saints in heaven, in order that Christians on earth may have the benefit of their intercession. *Show us the promise, and we will believe.*

But if the Roman clergy fail to establish the doctrine of saint-worship by the Scriptures, they have another source of evidence, viz: *the miracles wrought at their tombs.* "The blind see, the lame walk, the paralyzed are invigorated, the dead raised to life, and evil demons are expelled from the bodies of men."* We object to this evidence, for several reasons. 1st. Except in a single instance, which occurred under peculiar circumstances, the Scriptures give no account of any miracle wrought at the tomb of a saint. We read of no pilgrimages to the tombs of the saints, of no prayers offered at such places. All these practices have sprung up at a later day. How shall we account for the fact, that the tombs of saints, so much frequented by Papists, were so much neglected by pious men of old, and by Apostles and primitive Christians? The miracles said to have been wrought at the tombs of saints, like the infallibility of the Roman clergy, are of a *new kind*, and therefore of very suspicious character. 2d. The miracles said to have been wrought at the tombs of the saints, have been in Romish countries, or in distant ages; and the witnesses by whom they are proved, are those interested in having them believed, or the ignorant and superstitious. In the United States, where, if any where on earth, miracles are needed to convert infidels and heretics, we are permitted to witness none of them. Those of which we hear are always wrought "in a corner," in some convent where it is impossible to expose an imposition, however gross. In view of the unscriptural character of those miracles and the lack of evidence to prove them genu-

* Catechism of Trent, p. 248.

Digitized by Google

ine, the intelligent and candid will be far from regarding them as sufficient to prove a doctrine and authorize a practice not found in the word of God.

4. If we should even admit that praying to saints and angels is not in itself idolatry, *it is perfectly clear that its tendency is to lead to that sin.* The Roman clergy, it is true, make a distinction between the worship they offer to God, and that which they offer to saints, calling the former *Latreia*, or supreme worship, the latter *Douleia*, or inferior worship. The language, however, is perfectly indefinite; and consequently the worshipper is left to determine for himself the degree of honor due to his patron saint. The tendency of human nature, as the history of the world abundantly proves, is to "worship and serve the creature more than the Creator." Anxious to obtain the assistance of the saints, the ignorant and superstitious will not long guard against ascribing to them attributes and honors due only to God. If, as we have seen to have been the fact, the Jews were led into idolatry, by regarding with religious veneration the brazen serpent; how much more likely will men be to fall into the same sin in worshipping the Virgin Mary, and the Apostles, and martyrs.

Churches are erected in honor of the saints, and placed under their special patronage. Who has not heard of St. Peter's church at Rome? And I know not how many in the same city, are under the special protection of the Virgin. Every church built by Papists has the name of some patron saint, whose particular favor will, of course, be extended to those who devoutly visit it and worship in it. There is to be seen the image of the saint, and before it the clergy teach the people to kneel and pray. Is there no danger of idolatry in such cases? Unless human nature has undergone a wonderful change, since Hezekiah broke the brazen serpent, there is. Nay, to prevent the prevalence of that sin among the people is impossible.

Thompson, in his Recollections of Mexico, gives an account of the erection of a church to the honor of the Virgin Mother. In the year 1531, an Indian, Juan Diego, was going to the city of

Digitized by Google

Mexico, early in the morning; and as he was passing over a mountain about three miles from the city, he saw a female descending from the clouds. He was terribly frightened; but she told him not to be alarmed, that she was the Virgin Mary; and that she had resolved on becoming the patron saint of the Mexican Indians, and on taking them under her especial protection; and she bade him go and tell the bishop that she desired to have a church built at the foot of the mountain, and dedicated to her. The Indian hastened to the city, and related to the bishop what had occurred; but he was incredulous, and drove the Indian away. The next day he met the Virgin by appointment at the same place, and told her the bishop would not believe him. "Very well," said she, "do you meet me here to-morrow at the same hour, and I will give you a proof which the bishop will not doubt." Juan Diego was punctual in meeting the appointment; and the Virgin directed him to go to the top of the mountain, and to fill his apron with roses which he would find scattered profusely on the ground, and take them to the bishop, which he did. When he opened his apron, he was amazed to find, that by another miracle, a portrait of the Virgin had been painted on it, dressed in a gorgeous cloak of blue velvet with stars of gold all over it. This was enough. The bishop was convinced, and the church ordered to be built. The Indians contributed as they could, and were converted by thousands. "The original miraculous portrait," says Thompson, "in a rich frame of gold inlaid with diamonds and pearls, is still to be seen in the church which was built, and almost every Mexican has one of more or less value in his house, and of every variety from cheap engravings to the most costly paintings; below the picture are these characteristic Latin words, 'Non fecit taliter omni nationi.' * * * If the reader should again ask, and does any body believe this? I answer, that on the anniversary of this miracle I went to the church of Guadaloupe where *more than fifty thousand people* were assembled, among them the President Bravo and all his cabinet, the archbishop, and in short everybody in high station in Mexico. An oration in commemoration of the event was delivered by a distinguished member

Digitized by Google

of the Mexican Congress. He described all the circumstances of the affair as I have given them, but with all the extravagance of Mexican rhetoric, just as one of our fourth of July orators would narrate the events of the Revolution. The President and others exchanged all the while smiles and glances of pride and exultation."*

Can any one doubt, that, influenced by these wonderful stories told and credited by the archbishop and the clergy, and by all the splendor, pomp, and parade thrown around this affair, the multitude will be induced to place Mary instead of God, and to offer to her divine honor? Or shall we say that human nature was one thing in Judea, where the brazen serpent was worshipped, and wholly another thing in Mexico?

The language addressed to the saints in the prayers prepared by the clergy, tends greatly to the same result. Let me repeat to you the Litany of the Blessed Virgin; and whether it approximates to idolatry, judge ye.

Holy Mary, Holy Mother of God, Holy Virgin of Virgins, Mother of Christ, Mother of divine grace, Mother most pure, Mother most chaste, Mother undefiled, Mother unviolated, Mother most amiable, Mother most admirable, Mother of our Creator, Mother of our Redeemer, Virgin most prudent, Virgin most venerable, Virgin most renowned, Virgin most powerful, Virgin most merciful, Virgin most faithful, Mirror of Justice, Seat of Wisdom,	*Pray for us.*

* Recollec. of Mexico, pp. 110, 111, 112.

Digitized by Google

Cause of our joy,
Spiritual Vessel,
Vessel of Honor,
Vessel of singular Devotion,
Mystical Rose,
Tower of David,
Tower of Ivory,
House of Gold,
Ark of the Covenant,
Gate of Heaven,
Morning Star,
Health of the Weak,
Refuge of Sinners,
Comfortress of the Afflicted,
Help of Christians,
Queen of Angels,
Queen of Patriarchs,
Queen of Prophets,
Queen of Apostles,
Queen of Martyrs,
Queen of Confessors,
Queen of Virgins,
Queen of all Saints,* } *Pray for us.*

Passing by all the fulsome flattery lavished upon the Virgin, so unlike anything contained in the Word of God, I ask, what can be the meaning of the expressions, Morning Star, Gate of Heaven, Refuge of Sinners, Seat of Wisdom, Cause of our Joy, &c., &c.? Is not this language just such as is applied in the Scriptures to Christ, and to him only?

But we have something even stronger than this. The following specimens of idolatrous worship of the Virgin are found in the Psalter of the Virgin Mary, compiled by St. Bonaventura, contained in Chemnizius' *Examen Consilii Tridentini.* This saint has actually substituted, in the Psalms, the name of Mary for the name of God!—ascribing to her divine perfections, and giving her divine honor and worship.

In Psalm ix we read as follows: "I will confess to thee, O Lady, with my whole heart, and I will declare among the people thy praise and thy glory. For to thee is glory due, giving of

* True Piety, pp. 165-166.

Digitized by Google

thanks, and the voice of praise. Let sinners find grace with God through thee, the author (inventrice) of grace and salvation.

Psalm x. I trust in the Lady, because of the sweetness of the mercy of her name. Her eyes look upon the poor, and her hands are extended to the orphan and the widow. Seek ye her from your youth, and she will exalt you before the face of the people. Let her mercy take away the multitude of your sins, and her faithfulness, pleasing to God, confer abundance of merits upon us. Extend to us thine arm, holy Virgin, and turn not thy glorious countenance from us.

Psalm xxi. God, my God, look upon me by thy merits, holy Virgin Mary. O, my mistress, I have cried to thee day and night, and thou hast made thy mercy with thy servant. Because I have hoped in thy grace, thou hast taken away everlasting reproach from me. Let the families of the Gentiles ADORE thee, and let all orders of angels glorify thee.

Psalm xxiii. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, but thou, most holy Mother, reignest with him forever. Thou hast put on glory and honor. The splendor of the sun is upon thy head, and the beauty of the moon under thy feet. The shining stars adorn thy throne; the stars glorify thee, O Morning Star. Remember us, O Lady, in thy loving kindness, and make us worthy of glorifying thy name.

Psalm xxix. I will exalt thee, O Lady, since thou hast received me; from my unjust adversary thou wilt deliver me. Thou wilt turn unto me, and quicken me," &c.

The Scriptures, I have said, contain not a prayer, not even one petition, addressed to saint or angel. St. Bonaventura undertakes to supply this "lack of service;" and for the purpose of doing this, he boldly corrupts the inspired Psalms, and teaches all who read his psalter, to commit the grossest idolatry! No wonder the Roman clergy have passed laws, enforced by severe penalties, to prevent the general reading of the Scriptures. They are well aware that the spirit of the noble Bereans is fatal to their faith and to their authority.

But the Pope of Rome, "the center of unity," who has the

Digitized by Google

chief authority in defining articles of faith, teaches his people to commit idolatry. Let me read a brief extract from the Encyclical Letter of Gregory XVI, published in 1832. "But that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most blessed Virgin Mary, *who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope.* May she exert her patronage to draw down an efficacious blessing on our desires, our plans, and proceedings, in the present straitened condition of the Lord's flock. We will also implore in humble prayer, from Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and from his fellow Apostle Paul, that you may all stand as a wall to prevent any other foundation than what hath been laid." When the pope himself uses such language concerning the saints, no wonder if the people become idolators. If Mary alone destroys heresies—if she is the entire ground of our hope; what is left for Christ to do? What need have we of any Saviour but the Virgin?

5. Connected with the doctrine of saint worship, is the notion, which affords additional proof of its erroneousness, that particular towns, districts, or countries, or particular classes or professions of men, are taken under the special patronage of particular saints. Mary, as we have just seen, is believed to have taken the Mexican Indians under her special protection; and the poor deluded creatures rely on her aid, just as if it were true that she had made them the special objects of her care. St. Blaise, as we learn from Rev. Alban Butler, "is the principal patron of the commonwealth of Ragusa," and it is affirmed that he was especially successful in *curing sore throats.* "In the holy wars," says Butler, "his relics were dispersed over the west, and his veneration was propagated by many miraculous cures, especially of sore throats." From some cause not certainly known, *the wool-combers* elected him as the titular saint of their profession. "No other reason, than the great devotion of the people to this celebrated martyr of the church, seems to have given occasion to the wool-combers to choose him the titular patron of their profession; on which account his festival is still kept by them with a

Digitized by Google

solemn guild at Norwich."* Many other saints have had similar appointments, but it is more than doubtful whether they pay any attention to them. It is extremely probable that St. Blase has never considered himself bound to take care of wool-combers; that St. Patrick has little to do with Ireland; and that St. Anthony pays no attention to horses.

This feature of Romanism is of Pagan origin. The Pagans of ancient times peopled every country with gods, and gave to every district its patron deity. Particular departments were assigned to each of the principal gods, in the government of the world. Jupiter was the god of heaven; Neptune presided over the sea, and Pluto reigned over the infernal regions. Agricultural pursuits were assigned to Ceres, war to Mars, &c. Rome has adopted the principle, and put saints in place of heathen gods and goddesses. But do we find anything of all this in the Bible? Would any one, reading the Scriptures to ascertain the character of Christianity, ever imagine that the worship and patronage of departed saints constituted a prominent feature of it?

6. Connected with the superstitions already noticed, is the custom of carrying in public processions the images of the saints. Thompson, in his Recollections of Mexico, gives an account of "our Lady of Remedies," which is instructive. Cortes and his army, exposed to great danger from the incessant attacks of the natives of Mexico, retreated to the top of a hill, twelve miles from the city. In the knapsack of one of his soldiers, it is said, he found a small alabaster doll, about eight inches high, with the nose broken, and one eye out, which the soldier had brought with him from Spain. This he exhibited to his wounded and desponding soldiers, told them it was an image of the Virgin Mary which she had sent him from heaven, and that she had promised to heal their wounds, and secure to them the conquest of Mexico. This circumstance excited in the army prodigious enthusiasm, under the influence of which they again conquered Mexico. Cortes immediately built a chapel on the hill to which he had retreated,

* Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, &c., v. ii, p. 23.

Digitized by Google

and dedicated it to the Virgin Mary of Remedies. "In the chapel," says Thompson, "he placed the miraculous image, where it has been kept for more than three hundred years with wax candles always burning, and maids of honor in constant attendance. I asked a gentleman, connected with the church, what was the value of the diamonds worn by the image of our Lady of Remedies when I saw it in the procession. He said he did not know; but that her whole wardrobe and jewels were worth more than a million of dollars. Among these are different petticoats of diamonds, pearls, and emeralds. On special occasions, our Lady of Remedies is carried to the city, such as the prevalence of the cholera or other pestilence. When it is found that the disease is abating in any particular quarter of the city, the image is carried there; if the disease disappears, it is of course the work of "our Lady of Remedies;" if it continues, it is to be attributed to the sins of the people, which are said to be so great that the powerful intercession of the Mother of God cannot avail to have them pardoned. The cures of our Lady of Remedies, like those of humbler physicians, are by no means gratuitous, but her services are a source of large revenue to the church."

Such is the history of this wonderful image and its virtues. It may be said, that only the more ignorant and superstitious believe it. Thompson says, "Everybody believes it, and it would be regarded in Mexico little less than blasphemy to doubt it." In proof of this statement, he says, "The anniversary of the presentation of this image to Cortes is religiously observed, and of all the religious festivals in Mexico it is the most numerously attended. This anniversary is in August. I had some curiosity to witness it, and rode out to the chapel, twelve miles from Mexico. I can form no accurate estimate of the immense concourse which was assembled. If I were to say fifty thousand, I might be under the mark; If I were to say a hundred thousand, I might not be over it. * * * It was this miserable doll which I saw carried in that magnificent procession of which I have spoken, in which were all the high dignitaries of the government

Digitized by Google

the church, and the army; and following immediately the host itself, which Catholics believe to be Christ in the flesh."*

In all Roman countries similar scenes are witnessed. Need I ask, whether there is anything in the Scriptures even distantly resembling this miserable superstition? Is it not evidently one of the many unchristian superstitions which flow from the doctrine of saint worship? In vain do Roman writers attempt to defend the use of the images of the saints, by referring to the fact, that over the ark of the covenant there were "two carved images of cherubims."† They received no religious worship; and no prayers were offered to those holy beings thus represented.

7. Intimately connected with the doctrines of image and saint worship, stands the worship or veneration of RELICS. The Council of Trent teaches, that "the holy bodies of the holy martyrs are to be venerated by the faithful, since by them God bestows many benefits upon men. So that they are to be wholly condemned, as the church has long before condemned them, and now repeats the sentence, who affirm that veneration and honor are not due to the relics of the saints, or that it is a useless thing that the faithful should honor these and other sacred monuments, and that the memorials of the saints are in vain frequented to obtain their health and assistance."

Among the relics most venerated by Papists is the cross on which our Lord was crucified. This precious relic was found, we are told, by Helen, the mother of Constantine the Great. "That pious Empress," says Reeve, "now eighty years of age, had long wished to visit the land which the Son of God, in human form, had sanctified by his footsteps, and to find the cross on which he had consummated the world's redemption. She was told that, to succeed in this undertaking, she must first find the holy sepulchre, which lay buried, according to tradition, under a mountain of earth." The Empress, it seems, was not discouraged in her arduous undertaking. "Numbers of hands," Reeve goes on to state, "were set to work, a whole mountain was removed, they came to the surface of the old mount of Calvary: the holy

* Recollec. of Mexico, pp. 105-108. † Milner's End of Con., Let. xxxii.

Digitized by Google

sepulchre was at last discovered, and near it was found the cross, with other instruments of our Saviour's crucifixion. The memory of this invention is celebrated annually by the church on the third of May."* The cross, it seems, had lain there for *three hundred years*, and was yet perfectly sound. This is remarkable. But since two thieves were crucified at the same time and place, the question might arise, how could the Empress determine on which our Saviour was crucified? The Roman Breviary throws light on this difficult question. It informs us that when the place, where the cross lay, was cleared of the rubbish, "three crosses deeply buried were drawn out, and separated from them was found the title affixed to the cross of our Lord, which, when it could not be ascertained to which of the three it had been affixed, a miracle removed the doubt. For Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem, having offered prayers to God, applied each of the crosses to a woman laboring under a severe disease; to whom, when the others were of no service, the third cross being applied cured her instantly." The Empress, we are further informed, caused a splendid church to be erected over the holy sepulchre, where she left part of the cross; the other part she gave to Constantine, who had it placed in the church of the Holy Cross in Rome. The empress was also so happy as to find the *nails* with which the Saviour's body was fastened to the cross.

All this is wonderful enough; but the most unaccountable thing of all is the singular indifference of the Apostles and primitive Christians about this most sacred and valuable relic. It is said, Adrian, the Emperor, in the second century, caused the whole circumference of Calvary to be covered with an immense mound of earth. Under this mound the cross was found. But how happened the Apostles and primitive Christians to leave it exposed in this manner? Did they entertain the same faith propounded by the Council of Trent? Would the Roman clergy allow such a relic to remain, as the Apostles left the cross, to be profaned and destroyed? Were the Apostles ignorant of the wonderful virtues residing in it? Paul did, indeed, glory in the

* Hist. of Church, vol. i, sec. ix, p. 155.

Digitized by Google

doctrines of the cross; but he evidently paid no attention whatever to the *wood* of the cross.

The preservation of the cross is sufficiently wonderful; but more surprising is that of the seamless garment which our Saviour wore when he was condemned to be crucified, and for which the Roman soldiers cast lots. Of this garment we have no further account in the New Testament. The Apostles seem to have had no more concern about it than the wood of the cross. But we are gravely informed that it has been recently exhibited at Treves, and that it wrought divers wonderful cures! The exhibition of this pretended robe of Christ, which called to Treves an immense concourse of the devout, was the occasion of the recent schism headed by Ronge and Czerski. The inventions of the Roman clergy are sometimes too glaring not to be detected even by the ignorant and superstitious.

But the relics in most general use are the bodies, the garments, &c., of reputed saints, which are scattered in all directions for the edification of the faithful. In the Scriptures we read of many deaths and burials of godly men; but their bodies were permitted to rest quietly in their graves. There was no cutting of them in pieces, and carrying a head here, an arm there, and a toe yonder. Nor were their tombs ever visited for the purpose of religious worship. When Stephen, the first Christian martyr, was murdered by the Jewish mob, we read that "devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him." * We hear nothing more of the body of this man of God. It seems to have been permitted to rest where it was buried. But, strangely enough, the Roman clergy tell us they have it in their possession! Butler says, "John of Glastenbury informs us, that in the reign of King Edgar, in the year of Christ, 962, the relics of St. David were translated with great solemnity from the vale of Ross to Glastenbury, together with a portion of the relics of St. Stephen, the protomartyr!" † Indeed such has been the rage for relics, for several centuries past, that no one, male or female, who becomes a Roman saint, can hope to sleep quietly in the

* Acts viii, 2. † Lives of the Fathers, &c., v. ii, pp. 180-181.

Digitized by Google

grave. No Roman church is regarded as furnished for divine service, until some bones and other relics of reputed saints have been deposited in it. Butler seems to feel that he has not completed the biography of any saint until he has told in what places the body or fragments of it are to be found! Of St. Bridget he says, "A church of St. Bridget, in the province of Athol, was reputed famous for miracles, and a portion of her relics was kept with great veneration in a monastery of regular canons at Abernethe." Of St. Walburge he says, "Her relics were translated in the year 870, to Archstadt, on the 21st of September, and the principal part still remains there in the church anciently called of the Holy Cross, but since that time of St. Walburge. A considerable portion is venerated with singular devotion at Furnes, where, by the pious zeal of Baldwin, surnamed of Iron, it was received on the 25th of April, and enshrined on the first of May, on which day her chief festival is placed," &c. Of St. Cunegundei he says, "Her body was carried to Bamberg, and buried near that of her husband. The greatest part of her relics still remains in the same church." Of St. Casimir he says, "His body and all the rich stuffs it was wrapped in, were found quite entire, and exhaling a sweet smell, one hundred and twenty years after his death, notwithstanding the excessive moisture of his vault. It is honored in a large rich chapel of marble, built on purpose in that church."*

Similar accounts are given of the uses made of the bodies of other reputed saints, by which it is believed stupendous miracles have been and are wrought. Among the most remarkable are those by St. Wereburge, such as "many miraculous cures for the sick, and preservations of that city [where her body was deposited] from the assaults of the Welsh, Danes, and Scots; and in 1180 from a terrible fire, which threatened to consume the whole city, but was suddenly extinguished when the monks carried in procession the shrine of the virgin, in devout prayer."* These miracles, however, are generally wrought "in a corner," or reported as occurring in a distant country, and Papists are the

* Butler's Lives, v. ii, pp. 12, 155, 191, 194. † Ibid., p. 23.

Digitized by Google

witnesses. The cathedral of Cincinnati is enriched with quite a supply of relics, but we hear of no miracles wrought by means of them! Why not? Perhaps Bishop Purcell does report miracles in Europe. In looking over the Annals of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, some years since, I was quite surprised to find an account of a wonderful miracle said to have been wrought by Bishop Flaget, in the vicinity of Bardstown, Ky., where I then resided, by which a dying child was restored almost instantly to life and health, and which resulted in the conversion of the whole family. I made diligent inquiry, but could hear nothing concerning the miracle or the family. I published the account, and called on the Bishop, then residing there, and his clergy for information. They maintained a profound silence! And when the same Bishop went to France, we soon had, in the United States, accounts of miracles wrought by him there. The miracles wrought by the dead bodies of those called saints, are like unto these.

The truth is, many of the relics so sacredly preserved and venerated by a priest-ridden people, are not the relics of those whose names they bear. Who, for example, believes that the Roman clergy have in their possession the body of Stephen, the protomartyr? It is said, and no doubt truly, that many of the saints have a greater number of heads, arms, legs, &c., than originally belonged to them! Mosheim has given the true history of this miserable superstition. "It was not enough," says he, giving a history of the church in the 9th century, "to reverence departed saints, and to confide in their intercession and succors; it was not enough to clothe them with an imaginary power of healing diseases, working miracles, and delivering from all sorts of calamities and dangers; their bones, their clothes, the apparel and furniture they had possessed during life, the very ground which they had touched, or in which their putrified carcases were laid, were treated with a stupid veneration, and supposed to retain the marvellous virtue of healing all disorders, both of body and mind, and of defending such as possessed them, against all the assaults and devices of Satan. The consequence of this wretch-

Digitized by Google

ed notion was, that every one was eager to provide himself with these salutary remedies; for which purpose great numbers undertook fatiguing and perilous voyages, and subjected themselves to all sorts of hardships; while others made use of this delusion to accumulate their riches, and to impose upon the miserable multitude by the most impious and shocking inventions. As the demand for relics was prodigious and universal, the clergy employed all their dexterity to satisfy these demands, and were far from being nice in the methods they used for that end. The bodies of the saints were sought by fasting and prayer, instituted by the priest in order to obtain a divine answer and an infallible direction, and this pretended direction never failed to accomplish their desires; the holy carcass was always found, and that always in consequence, as they impiously gave out, of the suggestions and inspiration of God himself. Each discovery of this kind was attended with excessive demonstrations of joy, and animated the zeal of these devout seekers to enrich the church still more and more with this new kind of treasure. Many travelled with this view into the eastern provinces, and frequented the places which Christ and his disciples had honored with their presence, that with the bones and other sacred remains of the first heralds of the gospel, they might comfort dejected minds, calm trembling consciences, save sinking states, and defend their inhabitants from all sorts of calamities. Nor did the pious travelers return home empty; the craft, dexterity, and knavery of the Greeks, found a rich prey in the stupid credulity of the Latin relic hunters, and made a profitable commerce of this new devotion. The latter paid considerable sums for legs and arms, skulls and jaw-bones, several of which were Pagan and some not human, and other things that were supposed to have belonged to the primitive worthies of the Christian church; and thus the Latin churches came to the possession of those celebrated relics of St. Mark, St. James, St. Bartholomew, Cyprian, Pantaleon, and others, which they show at this day with so much ostentation."*

And what is there in the Scriptures of Truth, to encourage

* Mosheim's Hist., v. ii, cent. ii, pp. 37-38.

Digitized by Google

this rage for relics—this tearing into fragments the bodies of dead men and women, and placing them, as a sacred treasure, in the church? Let Bishop Milner tell us: "Surely Dr. Porteus will not say that there is no warrant in Scripture for honoring these, when he recollects that *from the body of St. Paul, were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs and aprons, and the diseases departed from them*, Acts xix, 12; and that, *when the dead man was let down and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his feet*, 2 Kings xiii, 21."* Did the inspired men of the Jewish church reason on this subject as Dr. Milner does? They knew the place where Elisha was buried; and they knew that this miracle had been wrought there. Did they go, or encourage others to go, on pilgrimages to pray to the saint? Or did they take up his body, and bear it in triumph to the temple? Or did they give it out by parcels and fragments to the people as a method of promoting their piety, and of securing them against temptations, diseases, and calamities? Nothing of all this was done. Among the Jews, as already remarked, the dead were permitted to repose undisturbed in their graves.

But handkerchiefs and aprons from the body of Paul wrought miracles. Precisely so. Paul was enabled, whilst living and preaching the gospel, to work miracles in this way; but does it follow that the body of Paul, when dead, was to be venerated, and carried about in fragments to work miracles? Paul wrought miracles whilst engaged in preaching the gospel; therefore the dead bodies of the saints are to be kept, venerated, and placed in churches, that they may secure blessings to the living! Such is the Bishop's logic. But why did he not tell us that the Apostles sent and took the body of John the Baptist, and by means of it wrought great miracles? Ah, the Bishop was sorely pressed. He was anxious to prove that the church of Rome is right in teaching her children to venerate relics and to keep them in order to secure the divine favor; and he was constrained to refer to cases which prove just the opposite.

From these multiplied and ever multiplying superstitions, let

 * End of Con., Let. xxxix.

Digitized by Google

us turn with thankful hearts to the pure, simple, spiritual worship of the sacred Scriptures. There we learn that God is a Spirit; and they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. There we learn that "there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time."* This mediator is all-sufficient; for "by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified;" and he is able to save them to the uttermost that come to God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.† There we find no images of God, of Christ, and of Saints, no prayers to angels or to saints, no relics. These are all the inventions of superstitious or cunning men, which dishonor God and fatally deceive the souls of men.

*1 Tim. ii, 5, 6. † Heb. x, 14 and vii, 25.

Digitized by Google

LECTURE X.

Mark vii, 4. "And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and of tables."

One of the forms of error which has been most popular in every age of the world, is that which ascribes great efficacy to ordinances and ceremonies. The carnal mind rises in opposition to that pure, spiritual worship and service which only are acceptable to God; but it is quite ready to embrace any system of religion, which, without the mortification of sinful passions, promises heaven to those who are zealous in their attendance upon external ordinances. All men desire some religion in the service of which they may enjoy an approving conscience, and on which they may found the comfortable hope of future happiness; and they are sufficiently disposed to "cleanse the outside of the cup and the platter," provided the inside be left in its impurity.

When errors of this class are embraced, there is manifested a strong disposition, not only to pervert the ordinances divinely appointed, but to multiply those of man's invention. In proof of this I need only refer to the history of Paganism and Judaism. When Noah and his family left the ark, the ordinances which God had appointed, were few and simple; but soon their true design passed out of view, and their number, immensely multiplied, became an oppressive and intolerable burden. For the Jewish church God appointed ordinances, one would think, sufficient in number and variety; but the time came when they were no longer regarded as "a shadow of good things to come," but as possessing intrinsic efficacy to justify and save. And just in the proportion that vital piety declined in the church, did the zeal for ceremonies increase. When our Saviour appeared on earth, the corruption had become general. The men who sat in Moses'

Digitized by Google

seat had become "blind leaders of the blind." They taught the people to "tithe, mint, anise, and cummin," whilst the weightier matters of the law were disregarded. They multiplied fasts and ablutions. When they came from the market they dared not eat, until they had washed their hands. And many other traditions had been received and imposed on the people; such as the baptism of cups, pots, and brazen vessels. Even their household utensils must undergo frequent religious purgations. All these traditions led to the rejection of the commandments of God, and made his word of none effect. And let it be remarked, too, that these traditions were enforced by the *authority of the church;* for they were "the traditions of the elders," and were observed by "the Pharisees and all the Jews." And because they were traditions of *the church*, our Saviour was condemned by the Scribes and Pharisees for disregarding them. "Then the Scribes and Pharisees asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands?"

The great practical evil resulting from this error, is, that under its influence men undervalue true religion, pure morality, just as much as they overrate ordinances and ceremonies. So far as these last were concerned, no class of religionists were ever more religious than the Pharisees; but as to pure morality they were most corrupt, and were, therefore, compared by our Lord to whited sepulchres. Their religion did not prevent them from devouring widows' houses under pretence of promoting the kingdom of God, nor induce them to regard "the weightier matters of the law, justice, judgment, and mercy."

The history of the Jewish church is, in this respect, substantially the history of the church of Rome, with this difference, that the latter has gone far greater lengths in multiplying ordinances, and ceremonies, and observances, which make void the word of God, than did the former even in the most corrupt period of her history. I propose now to point out a number of those unscriptural additions. I shall not attempt, because the time would fail me, to mention them all; for their name is *legion*.

I. The first class of corruptions I notice, is the appointment of

Digitized by Google

holy days, to be observed religiously by the people. Among them we find such as these: Ember-days, Christmas, Epiphany, Ash-Wednesday, Lent, Passion-Sunday, Passion-Week, Palm-Sunday, Holy-Week, Maundy-Thursday, Good-Friday, Holy-Saturday, Easter-Sunday, Easter-Week, Whit-Sunday, Trinity-Sunday. Besides these and others like them, the church has a multitude of *saint's days*, such as the Feast of All Saints, Commemoration of All Souls, Octave of All Saints, St. Xavier's, St. Andrew's, &c., &c. If any individual should undertake to observe all these days, he might not have one day in the year for the ordinary business of life. Now it is a fact, that all these days, with the services peculiar to them, are observed simply on the authority of the Roman clergy. Certain it is that in the New Testament we find not the most distant allusion to any of them. We learn there that all the holy days which were peculiar to the Jewish dispensation were abolished. Paul censured the Gallatian Christians, because they still observed "days, and months, and times, and years;"* but he gave not the slightest intimation that other holy days, equal or greater in number, had been, or were to be, appointed for the Christian church. Why did he not? In the New Testament we find but *one day* regarded as a Sabbath, the first day of the week. John the Apostle says, "I was in the spirit *on the Lord's day;*"† and the Apostle directed Christians to observe, as a day sacred to religious service, the first day of the week—the day on which our Lord rose from the dead.‡ This was the only Sabbath our Saviour appointed for his church; and this, according to the commandment in the moral law, he required all to remember, to keep it holy. But the Roman clergy, in their wisdom, have appointed a multitude of holy days, and instituted services peculiar to them. The consequence is, the Sabbath appointed by the Head of the Church is trampled under foot. In every country where Romanism predominates the desecration of the Sabbath is general. In the morning there is service in their churches; but the remaining portion of the day is devoted to gambling, cock-fighting, bull-fights, theaters, &c., &c. This humil-

* Gal. iv, 10. † Rev. i, 10. ‡ Acts xx, 7. 1 Cor. xvi, 2.

Digitized by Google

iating fact is candidly acknowledged by Bishop Trevern. I must read to you his language on this subject:

"For the honor of the English government, and for the shame of Catholic countries, I am bound to publish that the Sunday is observed in England with an exterior regularity which we unfortunately are far from equaling. On this day, especially consecrated to God, the laws and customs allow no public assemblies out of the churches and temples: no balls, no routes, no masquerades, no Ranelagh, no Vauxhall; all theatrical amusements are forbidden. In London, where commerce is so prodigiously carried on, the public conveyances remain at rest, the course of letters is suspended, the post does not receive them, although it is permitted to them in the evening to make their way to their destination: throughout the whole kingdom, stage-wagons employed in trade or commerce, stop on the high roads. I know not whether an act passed upon a Sunday would not be annulled by its very date alone. Certain, however, it is, that the civil power is obliged to suspend its pursuits, and concede to the debtor the right of appearing freely on the day of the Lord. On this day, moreover, the Parliament is closed, in spite of the emergency of affairs; and I have often seen it respectfully interrupt its sessions at the approach of great solemnities. It must be confessed that there is in these laws a tone of wisdom and gravity that makes an impression on the mind. English persons of distinction have often testified to me their astonishment at not finding in Catholic countries the same respect for the Sunday. They have declared to me that they had been much scandalized on the subject; and certainly they had but too much reason to be so." *

Mark well this testimony of Bishop Trevern. He not only acknowledges that England, which is but partially under direct religious influence, is far ahead of *some* Catholic countries, but of Catholic countries generally, in the observance of the Sabbath; and he more than intimates what are the common employments in which the Sabbath is spent in those countries—balls, routes, masquerades. and the like! And so open and shameless is the

* Amica. Discuss., v. i, p. 143.

Digitized by Google

profanation of the Lord's Day, that English persons of distinction, not generally very Puritanic in their views, had often testified to the Bishop their astonishment, and declared that they were greatly scandalized at what they witnessed! And in the United States, the state of things, so far as the influence of the Roman clergy can extend, is not likely to be better. I have read, in the *Catholic Magazine*, of April, 1845, which is the official organ of Archbishop Eccleston, of Baltimore, a review of the proceedings of the Sabbath Convention which met in that city a short time before, of which John Quincy Adams was Chairman. The review begins by pronouncing such conventions *unconstitutional*—thus teaching us what we may expect, should our Constitution ever be subjected to Romish interpretation! "We also doubt the constitutionality of such conventions as the one alluded to; but, assuredly, if such an exhibition is not against the letter, it is opposed to the spirit of the Constitution." I give a single specimen of the Archbishop's regard for the Sabbath day. In answer to the question, whether it is right to play at cards on that holy day, the Review says, "We answer, that to play at cards, as many do, making use of profane and blasphemous language, betting money, which justice and charity forbid us to squander, in bad company or in disreputable haunts—to play at cards in any one of these ways is criminal not only on Sunday, but on every day of the week. But to play at cards without any of those circumstances which lead to immorality is not more sinful on Sundays than on other days, and implies nothing more unlawful than a conversation or simple amusement would be."

Perhaps it may be well to give one more specimen. The Review pleads for the running of public conveyances on the Sabbath. "As traveling is not strictly forbidden on the Lord's day, if the cars run between Washington and our city, we may go to the former place on Sunday for the purpose of visiting a friend, and still have time enough to attend worship, while the leisure enjoyed in the cars affords an excellent opportunity of reading and meditation."

Such is the tendency of Romanism to immorality. When the

Digitized by Google

Jews multiplied their fasts and ablutions, they neglected the weightier matters of the law. In the proportion that they regarded the commandments of men, they neglected the law of God. So has it been with Rome. Just in the proportion that she has multiplied holy days, which Christ never authorized her to appoint, has she disregarded the Lord's Day, until in every country where the Roman influence prevails, it is a day on which more sin is committed than on any other day of the week, and until one of her principal ecclesiastics is not ashamed to justify such desecration! Even civil rulers have been convinced that the observance of the Sabbath is necessary to the morals of the country; but the Roman clergy, while claiming peculiar sanctity, trample it under foot! Let every friend of religion and of our free institutions know, that just to the extent to which Romanism shall prevail in this country will the Sabbath become a day of dissipation and immorality—as injurious as it has hitherto been beneficial to the people and the country.

2. Prominent among the inventions of the Roman clergy is what they call *the sacrament of extreme unction.* It was instituted, they tell us, by James the Apostle, in the following language: "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."* The *matter* of the sacrament, the Catechism of Trent teaches, is "oil of olives, consecrated by episcopal hands. No other sort of oil can be the matter of this sacrament; and this its matter is most significant of its efficacy." The *form* of the sacrament is thus stated: "By this holy unction, and through his great mercy, may God indulge thee whatever sins thou hast committed, by sight, smell, touch, &c., &c."† It is to be administered, not to persons in health, though on a dangerous voyage, or about to go into a dangerous battle, or already condemned to death, but only to those "whose malady is such as to excite apprehensions of approaching dissolution." It is a sacrament, it

* James v, 14-15. † p. 207.

Digitized by Google

would seem, very important to all, yet which multitudes can never enjoy! It is to be "administered, not only for the health of the soul, but also for that of the body." "The sacred unction is to be applied, not to the entire body, but to the organs of sense only —to the eyes the organs of sight, to the ears of hearing, to the nostrils of smelling, to the mouth of taste and speech, to the hands of touch, to the loins which are, as it were, the seat of concupiscense, and to the feet by which we move from one place to another." The sick person must first confess to the priest, and partake of the wafer before extreme unction can be administered. As to the efficacy of the sacrament, the Catechism teaches "that the grace of this sacrament remits sins, especially lighter offenses, or, as they are commonly called, venial sins. Its primary object is not to remit mortal sins." "It quiets fear, illumines the gloom in which the soul is enveloped, fills it with pious and holy joy, fortifies us against the assaults of Satan," &c.*

That this sacrament is a human invention, is clear. 1st. Because the anointing of which James speaks, was connected with and was designed for the restoration of the sick to health. "Let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." Observe, the promise of restoration to health is positive, and therefore it must always follow the proper administration and reception of the anointing. Such too, was the design and the effect of the anointing practiced by the twelve Apostles before the crucifixion of Christ; which, as the Catechism of Trent says, had some reference to the sacrament—for it is said, "they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, *and healed them*."† But the extreme unction of the church of Rome is rather designed to prepare persons *for death*, than to raise them up. Rarely indeed, if ever, do we hear of a miraculous cure, even alleged to be wrought by means of it. The Catechism says, "Finally, the recovery of health, if advantageous for the sick person, is another effect of the sacrament. However, should this effect not follow, it arises not from any defect

* Cat. of Trent, pp. 208-211. † Mark vi, 12-13.

Digitized by Google

in the sacrament, but from weakness of faith on the part of him by whom it is received, or of him by whom it is administered." Sad, indeed, must be the state of faith among Roman Catholics, when of all the multitudes constantly receiving extreme unction, none are restored to health by means of it!

The truth is, the anointing of which James speaks, like that previously practiced by the Apostles, was confined to the age of miracles, when the claims of Christianity were to be established by divine testimony. When, therefore, miraculous cures ceased to attend it, there was no more reason for its use. That such was its design is evident, from the fact that, much as the inspired Apostles say about justification, the remission of sins, and all that appertains to preparation for heaven, they never once mention it, save in the case now under consideration. Indeed, the authors of the Catechism of Trent could not avoid making an importan' concession, in order to account for the fact that extreme unction fails to effect cures. "It may, however, be proper to observe," say they, "that Christianity, now that it has taken deep root in the minds of men, stands less in need of the aid of such miracles in our days, than in the early ages of the church."* This is true; and, therefore, the anointing with oil with which miraculous cures were connected, ceased to be of use, when miracles ceased to be necessary.

Extreme unction, with all the crossings, prayers, &c., is one of the multiplied inventions of Rome, the effect of which is to turn the minds of the dying from the rich provisions of the gospel, and induce them to rely upon worthless ceremonies. It is cruel thus to deceive the dying in the last hours of their existence, and to divert their minds from the true source of all consolation.

3. Among the multiplied inventions of Rome, it may be instructive to notice some of the PRAYERS she teaches her children to repeat. One of the most remarkable of these is "The Litany of the Blessed Sacrament"—a prayer to the *consecrated bread and wine.* It begins with petitions to Christ, to the Father,

* p. 211

Digitized by Google

and to the Holy Spirit, and then continues in the following language:

O living bread, which came down from heaven,
O Saviour of Israel, who art truly a hidden God,
O wheat of the elect,
O wine, which maketh virgins to spring forth,
O bread which is fat, and yields dainties to kings,
Continual sacrifice,
Clean oblation,
Lamb without blemish,
Food of angels,
Hidden manna,
Memorial of the wonders of God,
Supersubstantial bread,
Word made flesh, and dwelling among us,
Holy victim,
Chalice of benediction,
Mystery of Faith,
Most high and venerable Sacrament,
Most holy sacrifice, truly propitiatory for the living and the dead,
Heavenly antidote, by which we are preserved from sin,
Most stupendous of all miracles,
Memorial of the most sacred passion of our Lord,
Gift of God, exceeding all fullness,
Singular pledge of divine love,
Overflow of divine liberality.
Most holy and august Mystery,
Remedy which confers Immortality,
Awful and life-giving Sacrament,
Bread, by the omnipotence of the Word changed into flesh,
Unbloody sacrifice,
Our food and our guest,
Delicious banquet, at which ministering angels are present,
Sacrament of piety,
Bond of unity,
Offerer and oblation,
Spiritual sweetness tasted in its very source,
Refection of holy Souls,
Viatic of those who die in the Lord,
Pledge of the glory to come,
Be merciful; *spare us, O Lord,*" &c.*

Have mercy on us.

* True Piety, pp. 280-282.

Digitized by Google

This is a specimen. It is not all, but it is enough to show the idolatry of Rome, and her imitation of pagan worship in the endless and senseless repetitions which characterize her worship. Would any one who formed his judgment of the character of Christianity and of its worship from reading the Scriptures, ever dream that such a thing as this could constitute a part of it? Why do we find nothing of the kind there? Because we find nothing of the absurd doctrine on which it is founded.

In the same book we find a prayer "*to the sacred heart of Jesus.*" It reads thus: "O most amiable Heart of my divine Redeemer! considering thy infinite love for all men and for me in particular, &c.—I do this day consecrate myself to thee. * * * In particular I consecrate to thee my heart, &c. Receive it then, O divine Heart of Jesus, purify it, sanctify it, &c." We have here also a "*prayer to the sacred Heart of Mary.*" "O sacred Heart of Mary, ever virgin and immaculate in her conception; O heart the most holy, the most noble, the most grand that ever was formed by the hand of God in a pure creature! O heart, full of grace, goodness, mercy, and love, &c., vouchsafe to accept of the small tribute of my humble homage. Prostrate before thee, O most pure heart of the Mother of Mercy, I wish to render thee all the honor which is justly due to the heart of the Mother of my God."*

Is there a difference between Jesus and the *heart* of Jesus; or between Mary and the *heart* of Mary? If there is, what is it? If not, what is the meaning of a prayer directed, not to Jesus, but to his heart? Is there any such prayer in God's word? God alone can tell us what kind of worship is acceptable to him. Has He taught us to offer prayers such as these?

On the 398th page of this book we have "The Litany of the Infant Jesus." It reads thus:

"Infant, Jesus Christ,
Infant, true God,
Infant, Son of the living God,
Infant, Son of the Virgin Mary,
Infant, begotten before the day-star,
Infant, the Word made flesh,
} *Have mercy on us.*

* p. 392.

Infant, Wisdom of thy Father,
Infant, the integrity of thy Mother,
Infant, the only-begotten of thy Father,
Infant, the first-born of thy Mother,
Infant, the image of thy Father,
Infant, the origin of thy Mother,
Infant, the brightness of thy Father,
Infant, the honor of thy Mother,
Infant, equal to thy Father, &c., &c." } *Have mercy on us.*

Passing by the senseless repetitions which so remarkably characterize the prayers of Rome, we may with propriety enquire, what is the sense and propriety of addressing a prayer to the *infant* Jesus, when he has long ceased to be an infant? But it is useless to ask a reason. The Roman clergy regard themselves as fully authorized to exercise *ad libitum* their inventive powers in the worship of God, without feeling at all bound to give a reason for what they do!

4. Among the means of grace invented by the clergy we find holy ashes, holy palm, holy fire, holy water, holy medals, holy ground, &c. Let us look a little more particularly into these things. There is a certain day which the clergy have named *Ash-Wednesday*, on which they sanctify ashes and put them on the heads of their followers. The Roman Missal informs us, that "The ceremony of applying ashes, in the form of a cross, to the heads of the faithful on this day, is a relic of the ancient discipline of the Church, which at the beginning of Lent, subjected public and scandalous sinners to public and canonical penance." They seem to have so far improved upon the ancient discipline, that they now put the ashes on the heads, not of scandalous sinners only, but of all the faithful. The ashes, it seems, are intended to be a sign of penitence. "We are therefore to perform this holy ceremony with an humble and contrite soul, with a firm resolution of entering upon penitential practices in order to punish our sins, and to satisfy for them in a manner that may bear some proportion to the enormity of our offenses." We do read of those in olden times who repented is sack-cloth and ashes; but, not knowing how to make *holy ashes*, they were constrained to place

Digitized by Google

common ashes on their heads, if they used the article at all. And when men put on sackcloth, and put ashes on their heads, the occasion was one of great distress; but now it is a thing which is to be done on a certain day, whether there be any extraordinary sorrow or not. But how do the ashes become *holy?* The Roman Missal contains the prayer offered by the priest on the occasion, during which he, two or three times, makes the sign of the cross in the ashes. It is as follows:

"O Almighty and Eternal God, spare those that repent, show mercy to those that humbly entreat thee: and vouchsafe to send from heaven thy holy angel, to ✠ bless, and ✠ sanctify these ashes, that they may be a wholesome remedy to all who humbly call upon thy holy name, and conscious of their sins, accuse themselves, and deplore their crimes in sight of thy Divine Majesty, or humbly and earnestly have recourse to thy sovereign bounty: and grant, by our calling upon thy most holy name, that whoever shall be touched by these ashes for the remission of their sins, may receive health of body and defense of soul."

Again—"O God, who desirest the conversion, and not the death of sinners, graciously consider the weakness of human nature and mercifully vouchsafe to ✠ bless these ashes, which we design to receive on our heads, in token of our humiliation and to obtain forgiveness," &c.

After some other prayers, the priest, having sprinkled the ashes with holy water, repeating an anthem, and fuming them three times, places them on his own head, and on the heads of the people.*

There is a certain Sunday in the year, called by the Romanists *Palm-Sunday.* "It is so called," says the Missal, "from the ceremony of blessing branches of *palms*, olives, or some other tree, to be distributed among the faithful to carry in procession, in remembrance of what the Jewish people did, when Jesus Christ, six days before his passion, made his triumphant entry into Jerusalem, riding on an ass' colt, as had been foretold by the Prophet," &c. The Jewish people were under the necessity of

* Rom. Missal, pp. 113-115.

Digitized by Google

using the palm in its natural state; but the Roman clergy, it appears, have found means of rendering it quite holy, of having imparted to it some wonderful virtues.

"After sprinkling the holy water, as usual on other Sundays, the office begins," as we learn from the Missal, with an anthem. After some other ceremonies the following prayer is offered: "We beseech thee, O Holy Lord, Almighty Father, Eternal God, that thou wouldst be pleased to ✠ bless and ✠ sanctify this creature of the olive tree, which thou madest to shoot out of the substance of the wood, and which the dove, returning to the ark, brought in its bill: that whoever receiveth it may find protection of soul and body; and that it may prove, O Lord, a saving remedy, and a sacred sign of thy grace." Again, "O God, who gatherest what is dispersed, and preservest what is gathered; who didst bless the people that carried boughs to meet Jesus, bless ✠ also these branches of the palm tree and olive tree, which thy servants take with faith in honor of thy name; that unto whatever place they may be carried, the inhabitants of that place may obtain thy blessing; and thy right hand preserve from all adversity and protect those that have been redeemed by our Lord Jesus Christ, thy Son."

After some other prayers the priest sprinkles the palms with holy water, with certain other ceremonies, fuming them thrice with incense. The palms being now holy, and possessing, of course, wonderful efficacy to preserve the body from storms and other dangers, and the soul from the power of Satan, they "are distributed to the people kneeling and kissing them as well as the priest's hand." During the distribution certain anthems are sung, after which the procession is formed, and they go forth chanting anthems. When the procession returns to the church, other ceremonies I need not detain you to mention, are performed, and the deluded people bear to their houses the precious treasure—the blessed palm!*

One might be induced to imagine, that there was never on earth a class of men so holy as the Roman clergy; for they con-

* Roman Missal, pp. 230-237

Digitized by Google

secrate almost everything. Even the *fire* with which they burn incense, and the candles they burn in their churches, are made holy. In blessing the *fire*, the following prayer is offered, accompanied, of course, with the sign of the cross "O God, who by thy only Son, the chief corner stone of thy church, hast bestowed on the faithful the fire of thy divine love: bless + this new fire produced from a flint for our use, and grant that during this paschal solemnity we may be so influenced with heavenly desires, that with purity of mind we may come to these festivals, where we may enjoy a light which will never end." With similar ceremonies, too long now to be read, the incense and the candles are blessed, so as to give, of course, a holy light, and impart purity to all concerned! *

You will have noticed, in the passages I have read from the Missal, that *holy water* is a thing in constant use. The Catechism of Trent informs us that "when the Lord was baptized, water was consecrated to the salutary use of baptism," and that he endowed it with a divine and wonderful virtue; but yet it was not holy enough for the priesthood, nor did it possess sufficient virtue. They, therefore, undertake to add to its purity and its divine virtue! "In the first place, then," says the Catechism, "the water to be used in baptism should be previously prepared: the baptismal water is consecrated with oil of mystic unction; and this cannot be done at all times, but according to ancient usage, on the vigils of certain festivals, which are justly deemed the greatest and most holy solemnities in the year, and on which alone, except in cases of necessity, it was the practice of the ancient church to administer baptism." † What the particular ceremonies in making holy water are, we need not stay to inquire. After quite a number of ceremonies, the priest divides the water in the form of a cross, prays that a regenerating, sanctifying virtue may be imparted to it, touches the water with his hand, still praying; he then makes the sign of the cross three times over the font, saying, "Wherefore I bless thee, O creature of water, by the living + God, by the true + God, by the holy + God, by

* Roman Missal, pp. 300-303. † Catechism of Trent, pp. 118-133.

Digitized by Google

that God who in the beginning separated thee from the dry land, and whose Spirit moved upon thee." Here he divides the water with his hand, and throws some of it toward the four quarters of the world, and then continues praying and crossing the water. Thus, we are expected to believe, it has a virtue it possessed not before. It is kept in the churches, and the people are, from Sabbath to Sabbath, sprinkled with it; and those who are baptized are believed to have become pure as an angel.

In connection with the holy water, it may be well to notice some of the many corruptions of the sacrament of baptism which the Roman clergy have invented. Of these we have an account in the Catechism of Trent. 1st. "The person baptized is brought or conducted to the door of the church, and is forbidden to enter, as unworthy to be admitted into the house of God, until he has cast off the yoke of the most degrading servitude of Satan, devoted himself unreservedly to Christ, and pledged his fidelity to the just sovereignty of the Lord Jesus." The priest asks him what he demands of the church, and having received the answer, proceeds to instruct him catechetically.

2d. Then comes the *exorcism*. "It consists of words of sacred and religious import, and of prayers; and is used to expel the devil and crush his power." The Roman clergy seem to proceed upon the assumption that every human being is actually possessed of the devil, and that this is the fact even when they come with sincere faith and repentance to receive the ordinance of baptism! And therefore they go about to expel him by the charm of certain words and ceremonies, far more resembling witchcraft than Christianity. If the devil can feel amused, he is doubtless often provoked to smile at the senseless mummery by which the Roman clergy seek to frighten him.

3d. In connection with exorcism, or immediately after it, salt is put in the mouth of the candidate for baptism. His forehead, eyes, breast, shoulders, and ears are signed with the sign of the cross. Then his nostrils and ears are touched with spittle, and he is admitted to the baptismal font. Then he is interrogated, "Dost thou renounce Satan?—and all his works?—and all his pomps?"

Digitized by Google

To each of which questions he or his sponsor gives an affirmative answer. Then he is "anointed with the oil of catechumens on the breast and between the shoulders." Then he makes his profession of faith, and receives baptism, administered, not with pure water, but with water mixed with oil, which the clergy call *holy water.* The priest, after administering baptism, anoints with chrism the crown of his head, puts a white garment on him, and a burning light in his hand. Finally, the name of some saint is given him, whose virtues, it is expected, he will imitate.*

The Apostles, we are informed by Luke the Evangelist, baptized three thousand persons on the day of Pentecost. Suppose they had waited to make holy water, and then had gone through all these ceremonies, what number, suppose ye, they could have baptized? And was there anything defective in the baptism administered by them? Was it of less efficacy than that administered by the Roman clergy? If it was not (and they will scarcely venture to say it was), then it is perfectly clear that all these additions, to say the very least, are perfectly worthless. And by what authority do they thus cumber the ordinances of Christ with their inventions? Was the water used by the Apostles as efficacious as the holy water of the priests? Will they dare say it was not? But if it was, then all their pretensions to making water holy, by invoking the awful name of the Trinity, are false and deceptive. Was the devil as fully expelled from those baptized by the Apostles, as from those now baptized by the Roman clergy? Will they deny that he was? If he was, then their exorcism is a deception practiced upon the ignorant, and an impious appeal to God for nothing. The whole of these corruptions of the sacred ordinance divert the attention of those baptized, from the truth, and cause them to rely upon human inventions for salvation.

I have mentioned the blessing of the *candles* burned in the churches. The clergy also make holy candles for the people. This is done on the festival of the "Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary." "By the distribution of the blessed candles, the

* Catechism of Trent.

Digitized by Google

faithful are exhorted to be as piously disposed as holy SIMEON was when he took Christ in his arms, &c. Let us therefore receive the candles from the hands of the priest with a becoming piety, as an emblem of Christ, who is the light of our souls," &c. This festival, it is not pretended, is of Apostolic institution. The Missal says, it must have been of an early date, "since we find mention made of it in the fifth century."

In blessing the candles the priest prays, "We humbly beseech thee, by the invocation of thy most holy name, and by the intercession of Blessed Mary, ever a virgin, whose festival we this day devoutly celebrate, and by the prayers of all thy saints, vouchsafe to bless ✠ and sanctify ✠ these candles, for the service of men, and for the good of their bodies and souls in all places," &c. Having gone through the prescribed ceremonies, the priest, sprinkling the candles with holy water, and fuming them, "distributes them to the faithful, who receive them kneeling, *first* kissing the candle, and then the hand of the priest." * These most precious treasures are carried home, and sacredly preserved by the faithful, who light them when dangers threaten, a storm is rising, and on similar occasions; for they are to be "for the good of their bodies and souls in all places."

There are *holy medals*, too, prepared by the clergy, and sold to the faithful, who wear them around their necks, and place them around the necks of their children, to protect them from diseases and other dangers, or to cure them when sick. I have one of these precious articles, a great number of which is said to have recently passed through the custom-house in New York, for the benefit of the faithful. It has suitable inscriptions upon it, which I am not able to decipher; but no matter, its virtues depend not on the ability of the possessor to read them.

One of the most remarkable inventions of the pope, and, if the truth is told about it, one of the most valuable discoveries of any age, is the AGNUS DEI. The following is an authentic history of it, together with an enumeration of its wonderful virtues:

* Roman Missal, pp. 549-552

Digitized by Google

"*Of Agnus Dei's.*

"An *Agnus Dei* is a little cake made of Virgin wax and blessed by the Pope on the first Low Sunday after his inauguration, and afterwards every seventh year on the same day. The ceremonies used by the Sovereign Pontiff on this occasion are of great antiquity in the Church. Mention is made of them in the *Roman Order*, which, in the judgment of the learned, is anterior to the eighth century. The Ceremonial of the Church of Rome prescribes the matter, the form and prayers of this consecration; and even explains their mystical significations.

"These *Agnus Dei's* are made of the whitest and purest virgin wax, a symbol of the human nature which the Son of God was pleased to assume by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the chaste womb of the most holy Virgin. On the wax is impressed the image of the spotless Lamb of God, immolated for us on the Altar of the Cross. Holy water is used, because with that element God, both in the Old and New Testament, has wrought very great prodigies, and it is the matter of the Sacrament of our regeneration. Balsam is also used, to signify that Christians in all their words and actions ought to be the good odor of Jesus Christ. Lastly, use is made of the chrism, with which the church consecrates all the things which are especially destined to the divine worship, as churches, altars, priests, &c. Chrism is also an emblem of charity, the most sublime of virtues.

"The Sovereign Pontiff dips these wax-cakes in the water which he has previously blessed, and into which he has poured and mixed the balsam and holy chrism. Before and after the immersions he addresses to God his prayers, beseeching him to bless, sanctify, and consecrate this wax, and to pour upon it such virtue as to enable those who will use it piously, and preserve it with devotion and faith, to obtain the following graces:

"1. That seeing and touching with faith the image of the Lamb impressed on the wax, they may be excited by these exterior symbols to a remembrance of the mysteries of our redemption: to sentiments of adoration, gratitude and love, for the infinite goodness of God towards men; and to a firm hope and confidence

Digitized by Google

that through the divine mercy their sins shall be forgiven, and their souls cleansed from all the defilements of sin.

"2. That at the sight of the sign of the Cross impressed on this blessed wax, the evil Spirits, seized with fright, may fly away from the servants of God; and that by virtue of the same, they may be protected against storms, wind, hail, whirlwinds, and lightning.

"3. That by an effect of this divine benediction, we may be enabled to discover the artifices of Satan, to resist his suggestions, and to avoid his snares.

"4. That the same blessing may procure to pregnant women a happy deliverance and the preservation of their fruit.

"5. That those who will make a pious use of those *Agnus Dei's*: may be protected from adversity, pestilence, the corruption of the air, the falling sickness, shipwreck, fire, inundations, and all malignant influence.

"6. That in prosperity as well as in adversity, we may be defended by the divine power against all the snares of men and devils, that we may be preserved from a sudden and unprovided death, and from all dangers, through the mysteries of the life and passion of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"A great number of miracles have placed it beyond all doubt, that the Author of all good gifts pours his graces and favors on faithful souls, by the means of these wax images of the divine Lamb; as an effect of the blessing of the Sovereign Pontiff, Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, and of the prayers which he offers to God in the name of the whole Church. If, therefore, those who carry about them an *Agnus Dei*, do not always obtain the effects of these prayers, they must ascribe it only to their want of faith, or their ill directed devotion. God may also have in his adorable heart secret reasons not to hear our prayers. It is often for his glory and our salvation, that he refuses to grant our request.

"*Translated from the original of the Apostolical chamber printing office.*"*

Verily, if this whole affair is not one of the "lying wonders"

* True Piety, pp. 438-440.

Digitized by Google

of which Paul spoke, everybody ought to buy an *Agnus Dei!* It is infinitely better than life-preservers, life-insurances, and all the plans adopted by unbelieving men to protect themselves and their families from dangers. And besides all its temporal advantages, it scares the devil and his legions so badly that they fly away from the servants of God. James the Apostles said to believers, "Resist the devil, and he will flee from thee;" but he evidently knew nothing of this happy device of the pope. Peter had not invented the little wax Agnus Deis. But there is no telling what a number of happy discoveries have been made in matters religious, since the Apostles fell asleep. Roman Catholics are furnished with hundreds of means of grace, of which those holy men never dreamed. But there is nothing of which we have yet heard, that, in the blessings it confers and the evils from which it protects men, equals the Agnus Dei! This account of it, too, comes from head-quarters—it is translated from the original of the Apostolical-Chamber printing office, and the truth of it has been proved by a great number of miracles! Truly the pope, if he can only induce men to believe all this, may carry on a brisk trade in the article!

I pass without particular notice the consecration of burial grounds, that the bodies of the dead may lie in holy ground; the baptism of bells, that there may be religious efficacy in their sound; the numerous funeral ceremonies, &c., &c., and direct your attention to one of the most disgusting and impious customs of which history gives any account. As St. Blase is the patron saint of the wool-combers, so St. Anthony, it seems, has taken charge of horses, asses, mules, &c. The festival of this saint is observed annually on the 17th of January, when the good people of Rome and vicinity send their horses to the convent of St. Anthony, in Rome, to be blessed by the priest, and secure for the year the protection of the saint. "The priest," says a late writer, "in his sacerdotal garments, stands at the church door, with a large sprinkling brush in his hand, and as each animal is presented to him, he takes off his skull cap, mutters a few words in Latin, intimating that through the merits of the blessed St. Anthony, they

Digitized by Google

are to be preserved the coming year from sickness and death, famine and danger, then dips his brush in a huge bucket of holy water that stands by him, and sprinkles them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The priest receives a fee for sprinkling each animal, and Dr. Middleton remarks that among the rest he had his own horses blessed at the expense of about eighteen pence, as well to satisfy his own curiosity, as to humor his coachman; who was persuaded, as the common people generally are, that some mischance would befall them within the year, if they wanted the benefit of this benediction. He adds, a revenue is thus provided sufficient for the maintenance of forty or fifty of the lazy drones called monks."*

This impious custom, in which the name of the adorable Trinity is awfully profaned, and religion exposed to ridicule and contempt, in the metropolis of Popery, and under the eye of the Pope himself, was exposed by Rev. Dr. Breckenridge in his controversy with Bishop Hughes. What was his reply? Did he condemn this disgusting profanation of things most sacred? No he replied thus: "But then in Rome, there is one day in the year (not to speak of kissing the pontifical slipper) 'for blessing horses, asses, and other beasts.' In answer to this I have only to say, that on *no day* in the year would a minister of the Gospel refuse, *if respectfully invited*, to perform a similar operation, over a piece of good beef, such as may always be found in our Philadelphia market. I see no difference, except that in *this case* the 'beast' happens to be dead; and that the maxim has it, 'nil nisi *bonum* de *mortuis*.'"† Few would have believed that a custom too dark for even the dark ages would have been thus defended by an American bishop! Still fewer would have thought it possible that any sensible man, however devoid of religious feeling, would confess that he could see no difference between this and the practice sanctioned by our Lord himself, of offering thanks to God for our daily bread! But so it is. The Romish clergy of America feel constrained to defend such abominations committed in Rome, either because they must otherwise abandon the claim of infalli-

* Dowling's Hist. of Romanism, p. 117. † No. v, p. 40.

Digitized by Google

bility which they set up for their church, or because they dread the displeasure of their lord the pope!

Among the inventions by which the Roman clergy maintain their influence, we may mention the wonderful stories related of many of their saints. They claim for their church the power of working miracles, and to the miracles alleged to have been wrought they often appeal, as proof conclusive, that theirs is the only true church. I will give a brief account of a few of them, that the audience may judge of their true character.

In the Breviary, a book approved by the pope and his clergy, which in preceding lectures I have had occasion to quote, it is related of St. Philip Nerius, that "wounded by the love of God, he languished continually, and his heart burned with so great fervor, that when it could no longer be contained within its limits, the Lord enlarged his bosom in a wonderful manner, two of his ribs having been broken and elevated. But performing sacred rites, or praying more fervently, sometimes raised in the air, he appeared to shine on every side with a wonderful light. He performed for the poor every office of charity; he was deemed worthy to bestow alms upon an angel under the form of a poor man; and having fallen into a pit, whilst carrying bread to the poor by night, he was taken out unhurt by an angel. * * * * He was rendered illustrious by the gift of prophecy, and wonderfully excelled in discerning spirits. He always preserved his virginity inviolate, and attained to such a degree of purity that he could distinguish those who preserved their chastity, by their pleasant odor, and those of a contrary character, by their filthy smell." *Festa Maii, Dei* xxvi.

Another miracle, no less edifying than these, is related of St. John, one of the popes. It is as follows: "John, the Etruscan, governed the church during the reign of Justin the elder: to whom he went on a visit to Constantinople for the purpose of obtaining aid, because Theodoric a heretical king, was disturbing Italy; which journey God rendered illustrious by miracles. For when a certain nobleman had loaned him a horse for the journey to Corinth, which on account of his being very gentle his wife was

Digitized by Google

accustomed to ride, it came to pass, that when afterwards the horse was sent back to his owner, he became so fierce, that with neighing and the agitation of his whole body, he ever afterward threw his mistress; as if he deemed it an indignity to carry a woman after the Vicar of Christ had sat upon him. Wherefore they made a present of the horse to the Pontiff." *Die* xxvii *Maii.* The Breviary concludes the life of the Pontiff, who was imprisoned by Theodoric the Goth until he died, by stating, that a certain monk saw the soul of Theodoric carried to hell by Pope John and Symmachus, through one of the volcanoes of the Lipari Islands!—and for the truth of this story the Breviary appeals to the testimony of St. Gregory, one of the popes! *

Among the miracles of which the Breviary gives an account, one of the most remarkable is that concerning *Peter's chains.* It is as follows: "During the reign of Theodosius the younger, when Eudocia his wife had visited Jerusalem for the sake of fulfilling a vow, she was there favored with many presents: above all others she received the illustrious gift of an *iron chain*, adorned with gold and gems, which they declared was the same with which the Apostle Peter had been bound by Herod. Eudocia piously venerating the chain, afterwards sent it to Rome to her daughter Eudoxia, who brought it to the Pontiff: and he in turn showed her another chain with which, under the reign of Nero, the same Apostle had been bound. Whilst, therefore, the Pontiff was comparing the Roman chain with that which had been brought from Jerusalem, it happened that they became so united together, that there appeared to be not two chains, but one made by the same workman." In consequence of which miracle so great honor began to be given to those sacred chains, that a church under the name of St. Peter ad Vincula, was erected and dedicated in Rome. By these chains, of course, many miracles have been wrought. By their touch, we are assured, devils are expelled

* Paulo post moritur Theodoricus, quem quidam eremita, ut scribit Sanctus Gregorius, vidit inter Joannem Pontificem, et Symmachum Patricium, quem idem occiderat, demergi in ignem Liparitanum, ut videlicet illi, quibus mortem attulerat, tanquam judices essent ejus interitus.

Digitized by Google

from those possessed, and diseases are instantly cured. The first day of August has been appointed as a festival in commemoration of the miracle of Peter's chains!

I have stated the fact that the Roman clergy profess to have among their relics the body of Stephen, the first Christian martyr. I was much at a loss to know how they found it, since it was buried immediately after his death, and nothing was said concerning the place where it lay. In looking over the Breviary, I obtained some light on this subject. It states that the bodies of St. Stephen the protomartyr, of Gamaliel, of Nicodemus, and of Abibon, which had for a long time lain in an obscure and filthy place, were discovered by divine direction to a Presbyter named Lucian, during the reign of the Emperor Honorius, near Jerusalem. Gamaliel appeared to him in a dream, in the form of a grave and noble old man, told him where the bodies lay, and bade him go to John, a priest of Jerusalem, and by his assistance to secure for their bodies a more suitable burial. Which things being heard, the clergy of the whole region round about were called together, and conducted to the place. They found the places opened, from which the sweetest odor was sent forth. The fame of this wonderful discovery spread rapidly; a multitude of people assembled from all directions; the sick were healed, and returned to their homes; and the sacred relic was taken and placed in a church at Constantinople, and afterwards, by order of the pope was carried to Rome! Such is the story gravely told in the Breviary; and the church celebrates the discovery of the body of Stephen, on the third day of August.

A miracle still more wonderful than any I have yet mentioned, is the *translation of the house of Loretto.* The Breviary states, as an undoubted fact, that it was removed by the ministry of angels from Palestine from the power of infidels, first to Dalmatia, afterwards across the Adriatic. There can be no mistake, it seems, that it is the identical house; for, says the Breviary, "that it is the same in which the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, is proved as well by the Pontifical edicts or proclamations (diplomatibus), and by the most celebrated veneration of the

Digitized by Google

whole world, as by the continual virtue of miracles, and the grace of heavenly benefits."* This miracle, like others of the same class, is celebrated by an annual festival.

It is related of St. Januarius, that his body on one occasion extinguished the flames of Vesuvius. "In primis memorandum quod erumpentes olim e monte Vesuvio flammarum globos, nec vicinis modo, sed longinquis etiam regionibus vastitatis metum afferentes, extinxit." His blood, too, which usually exists in a coagulated state, the Breviary tells us, "when it is placed in view of the martyr's head, becomes liquefied in a wonderful manner, and boils, as if it had recently been shed." This miracle which the Breviary calls "præclarum illud"—that noble miracle—is now annually witnessed, we are told, in Naples!

The Breviary is full of just such stories as these, all of which are declared to be confirmed by miracles, and are celebrated in the festivals of the church.

We cannot judge the hearts of men; but we are constantly tempted to ask, do the clergy themselves believe one half of these things? Do they really believe that their holy ashes, blessed palm, holy water, and the like, possess any virtue to benefit either soul or body? Do they believe, that by their medals, Agnus Dei's, and such things, God has wrought, and does now work, the wonderful cures of which they testify? Can they really believe that the priest who, in his robes, sprinkles the horses, asses, and mules of the people of Rome with holy water, in the awful name of the Trinity, is not guilty of prostituting religion in the most shameful manner? Can any man of common sense believe that St. Philip had so much religion that it broke two of his ribs? Is it possible to believe the story about the miraculous translation of the house of Loretto? Or that about Peter's chains, or St. Januarius' blood? Can it be that the Roman clergy of these United States do really swallow all the

* Eademque ipsam esse in qua Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis tum Pontificis diplomatibus, et celeberrima totius orbis veneratione, tum continuo miraculorum virtute, et cœlestium beneficiorum gratia comprobatur.

Digitized by Google

trash of this kind which they daily peruse in their Breviary? I can scarcely believe it possible.

But what are we to think of that church which is literally loaded with human inventions, grossly corrupting the Word of God? whose ministers constrain their followers to offer prayers to which we find nothing analogous in the Word of God; invoke the name of God to bless ashes, water, candles, medals, and the like, and teach their people to rely for blessings temporal and spiritual upon such incantations? What should we think of their corruption of the ordinance of baptism—their salt, and spittle, and oil, and candles, and exorcisms? What shall we think of the "lying wonders" which fill the pages of the Breviary, and by which the ignorant and superstitious are constantly deluded, and induced to rely upon them as a means of salvation? Can such a church be regarded otherwise than as apostate? If Rome were suddenly divested of all these miserable corruptions, would not her identity be lost? Would her own children be able to recognize her? Surely we need no longer wonder at the immorality that prevails in all Roman countries. Nothing but Christianity in some good degree of purity, can sustain sound morals. As I before remarked, just in the proportion that the Jewish teachers multiplied ordinances and ceremonies which God had not authorized, did they disregard the claims of true religion and sound morality. In proportion to their zeal in cleansing the outside of the cup and the platter, was their neglect of the inside. So it has been with Rome. Long has the attention of her clergy and people been turned away from the great doctrines of the cross, to the inventions of man; which, though they make a great show of sanctity have no power to sanctify.

Digitized by Google

LECTURE XI.

EPH. v, 25. "Even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it."

It is perfectly evident, from this and similar language of the inspired writers, that Jesus Christ our Saviour has *but one church*. There are small bodies called churches, which are branches or parts of "the church which is his body," but in the general sense of the word he has but one church. That church he "loved and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish." It is to him as the apple of his eye. It is "the bride, the Lamb's wife." He is head over all things to his church; and to it he will secure a glorious triumph over all the powers of darkness.

We all desire to be in communion with the true and only church of Christ, that we may enjoy her rich blessings, and share in her glorious triumphs. If we have the spirit of Christ, we would gladly participate in her self-denial, her trials, and her conflicts in her militant state; and when the Bridegroom shall come, we would be "arrayed in fine linen, clean and white," and would be "called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb." But how shall we find the church? By what means shall we be able to distinguish her from those churches which falsely claim to be Christ's? It surely cannot be very difficult to discern it, for it is "the light of the world," and is like unto a city set on a hill. But it is certain that many have been, and many are now, deceived, and have placed themselves under the instruction of false teachers, and in communion with churches that are "synagogues of Satan." We, too, may be deceived. Let us, therefore, pro-

Digitized by Google

ceed cautiously. The true church, we know, differs widely from all others; but we must have a *certain rule* by which to distinguish it from them. What is that rule?

1. It is not *tradition;* for, as we had occasion to prove in the first lecture of this series, if there be *unwritten* traditions of divine authority, they are exclusively in the keeping of the church; and therefore we can know nothing about them until we find it.

2. We cannot rely, in this investigation, *upon uninspired ecclesiastical history*, nor upon any writings of *uninspired men.* The history of the church has been imperfectly written; and the earlier part of it has been written by men who lived long after the events transpired which are recorded, and who were but scantily furnished with materials out of which to write it. The persecutions which raged against Christianity, during the earlier ages, destroyed most of the documents which might have thrown light on the history of the church; and even those that have come down to us through the dark ages are not entirely uncorrupted. Learned men, moreover, differ widely concerning many important historical facts. Some of the most learned cannot find a pope, the supreme visible head of the church, for several centuries after the death of Christ; whilst others profess to give a complete catalogue of popes up to Peter himself! Even Roman Catholic historians differ very materially from each other. Bishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, rejects Dupin's Ecclesiastical History, though it was approved by the famous Popish Doctors of the Sorbonne, in France. He says—"The authority of Du Pin I have challenged on just grounds." * And Rev. Joseph Reeve denounces, in no very measured terms, the history written by the celebrated Abbe Fleury. He says—"Under the modest declaration of writing purely to edify, he passes the most insulting censures upon the highest authorities, when adverse to his own private system, and peremptorily pronounces almost everything wrong in point of discipline, which has not the practice of wise antiquity for its sanction. As if no change of times and circumstances can ever

* Campbell and Purcell's Debate, pp. 32, 33.

Digitized by Google

authorize a change of discipline for the spiritual benefit of the faithful, and for the encouragement of virtue," &c.*

Plain men of moderate education cannot enter into these historical controversies, and examine all the records of antiquity, in order to determine what is true and what false; and even of the most learned few have leisure for such investigations. Few, indeed, can read the ponderous folios of those called Fathers, even if such reading would certainly guide them to the truth, which it would not.

There must be some means by which all sincere inquirers after truth, even the unlearned, can find the true church. It will answer no good purpose for Roman writers to give a catalogue of all the popes, up to the days of the Apostles; for men equally learned, and no less interested in ascertaining and teaching the truth, do affirm that true history furnishes no such catalogue, nor any such system of doctrines and worship as those of Rome; and, as already remarked, very few indeed can ever examine the historical questions involved in the controversy. By what means, then, can the people find the true church?

It throws no light upon the subject to ask, as do Roman controvertists, where were the Protestant churches before the days of Luther, and Calvin, and Knox, and Cranmer? For it is easy to reply—1st. That those eminent men were only instruments in the hands of God in purging the church of those errors and superstitious practices into which she had fallen. 2d. That long before they lived there were many, very many, in every age, who held the doctrines of the Reformation, and protested loudly against the accumulating errors of Rome. 3d. That the same objection, substantially, was urged by the Jewish teachers, the Scribes and Pharisees, against Christ and his Apostles. They said, "We are Moses' disciples. We know that God spake unto Moses: as for this fellow, we know not whence he is." †

Nor will it be of any service to the cause of Rome for her clergy to blacken the character of the Reformers, the Waldenses, and others claimed by Protestants as witnesses for the truth. For,

* Pref. to Ch. Hist., p. xv. † John ix, 28-29.

Digitized by Google

in the first place, men as learned as they, and quite as impartial, and every way as worthy of credit, deny the truth of the charges, and pronounce them slanderous. In the second place, we have the writings of those men, and the creeds they drew up, and they refute all such slanders. And, in the third place, we see the fruits of their labors, and they are good—good in their effects upon the liberties and upon the morals of men.

Nor is it worth while for Roman writers to say, that if Luther, Calvin, and Knox had been true Reformers, they would have been enabled to confirm their mission by *miracles*. This would be a valid objection, if they had proposed to establish a new system of religion, or to add new articles of faith, or new ordinances to those already received. But they proposed nothing of the kind. They simply called on men to believe and obey the Scriptures, admitted to be the word of God, and to reject every thing contrary to them. Ezra and Nehemiah were great Reformers, as even Romanists must admit; and yet they wrought no miracles. Why? Because they did not propose any new articles of faith, nor institute any new ordinances, but only urged the church to abandon her errors and corruptions, for which she had been in exile during seventy years. John the Baptist was a great Reformer; but he wrought no miracles. Why? Because he added nothing to the inspired Scriptures, and instituted no new ordinances, but only lifted up his voice in the wilderness, and called upon the people to abandon the errors into which the corrupt teachers had led them, and to prepare to receive "him of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write." When Christ came he wrought miracles, and so did his Apostles. Why? Because He claimed to be the Messiah, and must prove his claims well founded; and they proposed to place the church under a new dispensation, to appoint a new order of ministers, and new ordinances. The Reformers of the sixteenth century did nothing more than Hilkiah the Priest, who found the Book of the Law among the rubbish in the Temple, and called public attention to the contents of that blessed volume; than Ezra and Nehemiah, who expounded it to the people. There was, therefore, no reason why they should

Digitized by Google

work miracles. They appealed simply to the Scriptures in support of the principles of the Reformation, and the only question of importance, is, whether the Scriptures sustained them.

The question returns—how shall we distinguish the true church from all others? Tradition will not aid us. Uninspired history cannot settle the question. And the objections urged by Roman writers against Protestant churches, are not valid. But is there any rule which is infallible, and by which we can safely test the claims of every church? All agree that there is. What is that rule? It is the BIBLE. All who have any claim to the name of Christians, hold, that it is given by inspiration of God. Here, then, we have something on which we can rely. Men may have misinterpreted and perverted its language; but if God has undertaken to teach us, we can understand him. If he has given us a rule by which to discover the true church, we may safely use it, and rest satisfied with the result.

The Bible gives us an account of the church under the Old Dispensation, and of its organization under the New. It is under the New Dispensation that we wish now to contemplate it. Let us, then, with this sacred volume in our hands, and the fear of God in our hearts, look for the true church. What are its distinguishing marks?

I. Let us first enquire into the *organization* of the church of Christ. What officers had she? 1st, There were *Apostles*, inspired men, appointed by our Saviour to introduce the New Dispensation, to be witnesses of all things they had seen our Saviour do, and heard him teach, and of his resurrection, and to organize the church as it should continue till time should end. "And ye are witnesses of these things."* "Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto the same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a *witness* with us of his resurrection."† Paul was called and ordained some time after the twelve, "as one born out of due time;" yet he saw the Lord, and was therefore a *witness*. "Am

* Luke xxiv, 48. † Acts i, 21-22. See also Acts x, 39-41.

Digitized by Google

I not an Apostle? am I not free? *have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord.*"* The church had indeed long been in existence; but such a change in its organization became necessary, as would be adapted to the New Dispensation. The Apostles were appointed to this work.

Here the question arises—was it the design of our Saviour that the Apostles, as such, should have successors? Certainly as *witnesses* they could have none; for those who might come after them could not SEE what they saw, and could not, therefore, testify. As officers to introduce the New Dispensation they could have no successors. Moreover, if they had successors as *Apostles*, those successors, possessing *apostolic authority*, must of course possess *apostolic gifts*. But Roman bishops do not pretend to possess the individual inspiration and infallibility, which the Apostles had. Since, then, they confessedly have not apostolic gifts, it is clear that they have not the apostolic office. In the *ordinary duties* of their office, viz: baptizing and teaching, the Apostles had successors; but in their extraordinary duties they had not.

Besides apostles, the primitive church had presbyters, bishops or pastors, and deacons. The word translated *bishop*, signifies on *overseer*—one who watches over the interests of a portion of the church. Scriptural bishops were pastors of churches, and were also called *presbyters* or *elders*. "From Miletus Paul sent to Ephesus, and called the presbyters (or elders) of the church;" and those elders he exhorted to take heed to all the flock, "over which," said he, "the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers* or *bishops*."† Timothy was ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.‡ Of the elders or presbyters, some *ruled well*, and others, besides ruling, labored in word and in doctrine.§ The deacons were appointed to attend to the temporalities of the church.‖ The permanent officers of the church evidently were teaching presbyters, ruling presbyters, and deacons.

Now let us compare the organization of the church of Rome

* 1 Cor. ix, 1. † Acts xx, 17-28. ‡ 1 Tim. iv, 14.
§ 1 Tim. v, 17. ‖ Acts vi, 1.

Digitized by Google

with that of the Apostolic church. In the former we find the *Tonsure*, in which "the hair of the head is cut in form of a crown, and should be worn in that form, enlarging the crown according as the ecclesiastic advances in orders." This tonsure, about the precise meaning of which Romanists are not agreed, is regarded as a consecration to God, and preparation to receive orders. Next to the Tonsure is the *Porter*, who is consecrated to "take care of the keys and door of the church, suffering none to enter to whom entrance is prohibited;" to "assist at the Holy Sacrifice, and take care that no one shall approach too near the altar, or interrupt the celebrant;" and to discharge other functions not particularly mentioned in the Catechism of Trent. The next officer is the *Reader*, "to whom it belongs to read to the people, in a clear and distinct voice, the sacred Scriptures, particularly the nocturnal Psalmody; and on him also devolves the task of instructing the faithful in the rudiments of the faith." Next comes the *Exorcist*, "to whom is given power to invoke the name of the Lord over persons possessed by unclean spirits. Hence, the Bishop, when initiating the Exorcist, hands him a book containing the exorcisms, and says: *Take this and commit it to memory, and have power to impose hands on persons possessed, be they baptised or catechumens.*" We come, next, to the *Acolyte*, whose duty it is, "to attend and serve those in holy orders, Deacons and Sub-Deacons, in the ministry of the altar. The Acolyte also attends to the lights used at the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, &c. These minor orders, as they are called, are said to "form, as it were, the vestibule through which we ascend to holy orders." Next to the Acolyte, comes the *Sub-Deacon*, whose office "is to serve the Deacon in the ministry of the altar—to prepare the altar-linen, the sacred vessels, the bread and wine necessary for the Holy Sacrifice, to minister water to the Priest or Bishop, at the washing of the hands, at mass," &c. Then comes the *Deacon;* "to him it belongs constantly to accompany the Bishop, to attend him when preaching, to assist him and the Priest also during the celebration of the Holy Mysteries." "To the Dea-

Digitized by Google

con also, as the eye of the Bishop, it belongs to enquire and ascertain who, within his diocess, lead lives of piety and edification, and who do not." Next to the Deacon comes the *Priest*, at whose consecration a chalice containing wine and a patena with bread is handed him by the Bishop, who says: "Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate mass as well for the living as for the dead." "By these words and ceremonies," says the Catechism of Trent, "he is constituted an interpreter and mediator between God and man, the principal function of the Priesthood. Finally, placing his hands on the head of the person to be ordained, the Bishop says: receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you retain, they are retained; thus investing him with that divine power of forgiving and retaining sins, which was conferred by our Lord on his disciples. These are the principal and peculiar functions of the Priesthood." I shall have something to say on this point presently.

The next grade of office, is that of diocesan *Bishop*, who presides over not only the people, but the clergy of a certain district. "But Bishops," says the Catechism of Trent, "are also called 'Pontiffs,' a name borrowed from the ancient Romans, and used to designate their chief-priests." Then comes the *Arch-bishop* or *Metropolitan*, who presides over several Bishops; and next to him the *Patriarchs*, "the first and supreme Fathers in the Episcopal order." Finally we reach the Pope himself, surrounded by his Cardinals, possessing "the most exalted degree of dignity and the full amplitude of jurisdiction."*

Now mark the fact: *in this whole hierarchy there is not one office which appertained to the Apostolic church!* Do we find in the New Testament anything like what Papists call *tonsure*—shaving hair from the crown of the head? Do we find there any such officer as *porter*, *reader*, *exorcist*, or *acolyte?* We do not; and, what is more important, we find nothing of the duties those officers are to discharge. The primitive church had no need of persons to assist at any *sacrifice*, because no sacrifice was offered.

* Cat. of Trent, pp. 216-222.

Digitized by Google

Readers were not needed, because the presbyter or bishop thought it no hardship to read the Scriptures. Exorcists were not needed, because Christans were not possessed with devils, and there were no "catechumens." Acolytes were not needed, because where there were religious services at night, any one could light the lamps, and they had not yet borrowed from the heathen the custom of having holy candles burning in the day. Sub-deacons were not needed, because the deacons could serve themselves, and required no help. There were deacons; but they were not such deacons as those in the church of Rome. Instead of accompanying the bishops, aiding them in the celebration of mass, being *eyes* for them, &c.—their business was to attend to the widows and the poor of the church, as any one will be convinced, who will read the 6th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.

In the primitive church there were no priests. The Greek word which signifies a *priest* is never used to designate a minister of the gospel. When our Saviour gave the apostles that great commission which should continue till the end of the world, he gave it in these words, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."* Now, let me ask any man of common understanding, what are the *great duties* required by this commission of those who fill the office of the ministry? Are they not *teaching* and *baptizing?* But what is the principal function of the priest's office in the church of Rome? It is a function not mentioned, or even remotely alluded to, in the great commission, viz: "to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate mass as well for the living as for the dead." "By these words and ceremonies," says the Catechism of Trent, "he [the priest] is constituted an interpreter and mediator between God and man, *the principal function of the priesthood.*" In addition to this principal function, the bishop says—"Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven," &c. When our Saviour

* Math. xxviii, 19-20.

Digitized by Google

used this language to the apostles, he imparted to them divine inspiration, thus qualifying them for the extraordinary work they were called to perform. Does the man who is ordained a priest, and to whom the bishop addresses this language, receive the gift of the Holy Ghost and become an inspired man? This is not pretended. Then why is the language employed, when the gift which accompanied it is no longer received? But let the fact be distinctly marked—that the two principal and peculiar functions of the Roman priesthood are not only not the principal functions of the Christian Ministry, but are not even alluded to in the great commission given the Apostles and their successors in the work of the ministry. Moreover, these functions, as understood by Rome, are an impious assumption of the prerogatives of the Son of God. The priests, we are told, are, by their consecration, constituted *mediators* between God and man. Paul says distinctly—"There is *one* Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus."* They pretend to forgive sins *judicially*. No such power was ever claimed even by the inspired Apostles.

In the New Testament we find no "pontiffs" or chief priests, such as Roman bishops. The Catechism of Trent says truly, that the name *pontiff* was borrowed from the ancient Romans; and the office, as well as the name, is of pagan origin. And many other things there be, in the faith and worship of Rome, for which she is indebted to paganism; insomuch that her cathedrals now do far more resemble pagan temples than houses of Christian worship.

Of archbishops, patriarchs, cardinals, popes, we read not a word in the New Testament. The fact is clear, that the entire organization of the church of Rome, from the lowest to the highest order of her officers, is unscriptural, so grossly unscriptural, that no one who had formed his ideas of the Christian church from reading the inspired accounts of it found in the Sacred Volume, would ever dream that the church of Rome had any connection with it. Not only the offices, but the duties embraced in them, and the doctrines on which they are based, are as unlike

* 1 Tim., ii, 5.

Digitized by Google

the offices, duties, and doctrines of the New Testament, as darkness is unlike the light. The former are not so much corruptions of the latter, as they are positive *inventions*, or rather substitutions of pagan offices, doctrines and rites. *The conclusion is unavoidable that the church of Rome, as to her organization, is not the church of Christ.*

2. We, in the next place, inquire what was the WORSHIP of the Apostolic church? The worship, like the organization, of the primitive church, was remarkable for its beautiful simplicity. It consisted in the following particulars:

1st. The preaching of the word. "But we," said the Apostles, "will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word." * Most solemnly did Paul charge Timothy—"preach the word, be instant in season and out of season." † And wherever the Apostles and Christian ministers went, their great business was *the preaching of the gospel.* Paul the Apostle states distinctly that this was the work to which he was specially called. "For Christ sent me not to baptize, *but to preach the gospel.*" ‡ How radically different the views entertained by the Apostles of the work of the ministry from those of the Roman clergy. The great work of the latter is to say mass and hear confessions; the great work of the former, to preach the gospel. 2d. The next important part of worship, in the primitive church, was *praying to God.* The Apostles said, "We will give ourselves to *prayer*, and to the ministry of the word." Christians are exhorted to be "instant in prayer," to pray "with all prayer and supplication in the spirit," &c. And we have mention made in the Acts of the Apostles of a most interesting prayer-meeting at the house of Mary, the mother of John, to which Peter went, when miraculously delivered from prison, "where many were gathered together praying." §

But mark the fact—the Apostolic church never prayed before *images* of any kind; nor did they ever address one petition to saint or angel; all their prayers were offered *to God.* Every

* Acts vi, 4. † 2 Tim. iv, 1-2 ‡ 1 Cor. i, 17.

§ Acts xii, 12. See also Acts i, 14.

Digitized by Google

petition in the Lord's prayer is addressed to God; and it is recorded of Cornelius, a man greatly honored of God, that he "*prayed to God always.*"* And although God sent an angel with a message to him, we are not informed that he worshipped the angel. When Peter was imprisoned by Herod, it is recorded that "prayer was made without ceasing of the church *unto God* for him." † Neither Cornelius nor the church prayed to any being but God. Peter said to Simon Magus, "Pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee." Paul thus directs the Philippians: "But in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known *unto God.*" The same Apostle said to the Romans, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer *to God* for Israel is, that they might be saved." It is unnecessary to multiply quotations from the Scriptures. It is an indisputable fact, that there is not in the New Testament, nor in the Old, one prayer addressed to saint or angel; and it is a fact, that in every instance in which the object of worship is mentioned, that object is God.

How wonderfully different is the worship of the church of Rome. In the devotional books of that church we find many prayers addressed to Mary, the mother of Christ, to Paul, Peter, James, all the Apostles, all saints, and all angels; and when we enter their houses of worship, instead of finding them offering prayers to God, as did the Apostolic church, we see them kneeling before the image or picture of Christ, and the images and pictures of the saints, and praying before them. And there we see them fall on their knees and adore a little piece of bread, and pray to that bread and to a cup of wine!—and we hear them declare that every such piece of bread and every such cup of wine is literally and truly the Son of God! Verily, this cannot be the church of Christ. Her worship is not the worship of the Apostolic church.

3d. Another important part of divine worship in the Apostolic church was *singing the praises of God.* Paul and Silas, in the prison of Philippi, at midnight, "prayed, and sang praises unto

* Acts x, 2. † Acts xii, 5.

Digitized by Google

God." * And Paul exhorts the Colossians to teach and admonish one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, "singing with grace in your hearts *to the Lord.*" † And to the Ephesians he gives a similar exhortation.‡ All the inspired Psalms, prepared specially for the worship of the temple, are addressed to God, or speak of his works and perfections. Not one contains an address to saint or angel.

Now let us enter a Roman church, and what will we hear? Hymns addressed to *saints*, instead of God, like the following:—

"Bright Mother of our Maker hail!
Thou Virgin ever blessed;
The ocean's star by which we sail,
And gain the port of rest.

Whilst we this Ave thus to thee
From Gabriel's mouth rehearse,
Prevail that peace our lot may be,
And Eva's name reverse.

Release our long entangled mind,
From all the snares of ill;
With heavenly light instruct the blind,
And all our vows fulfill."

Or the following:

"O Jesus, let thy anger cease,
Thy Virgin Mother for our peace
At thy tribunal pleading stands,
And mercy earnestly demands.

And you, O Angels, who in nine
Distinguished orders glorious shine,
Preserve our minds, our hearts and wills
From present, past, and future ills.

Ye Prophets and Apostles plead
Before our Judge, and intercede
For sinners, that by tears unfeigned
His pard'ning grace may be obtained.

* Acts xvi, 25. † Col. iii, 16. ‡ Eph. v, 19.

Digitized by Google

Ye crimson troops of Martyrs bright,
And Confessors arrayed in white,
Let us no longer exiled roam,
But call us to our heavenly home.

Chaste Virgins, and ye truly wise,
Who from the deserts filled the skies,
For us an everlasting reign
Amongst the saints of Christ obtain," &c.*

In the Apostolic church there was no such intermingling of the praises of creatures with those of the Creator. This is idolatry. The worship of the church of Rome is not the worship of the Christian Church. Primitive Christians in their prayers and in their songs acknowledged no mediator but Christ, and called upon no other.

4th. The first day of the week, "the Lord's day," was observed as the only Sabbath of the Apostolic church; but in the church of Rome we find a multitude of holy days, which her children are required to observe; and many of those days are observed in commemoration of the lives, and superstitious works, and pretended miracles of certain persons called *saints*.

We have made another step of progress in our investigation. We have ascertained that the *worship* of the church of Rome, as well as her organization, is most unlike that of the Apostolic church—that it is decidedly idolatrous. Let us now turn our attention to another point, and enquire—

5th. What were the *ordinances* of the Apostolic church?—What were the means of grace which that church enjoyed, in addition to her worship? The first we notice, is the ordinance of *baptism*. This ordinance was administered by a presbyter or minister of the gospel, with ordinary water, in the name of the Holy Trinity. It was not regarded as possessing any inherent efficacy either to sanctify the soul, or to procure pardon of sins. It was regarded as an ordinance by which men were visibly identified with Christ, and as emblematic of the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. "The like

* True Piety, pp. 465, 513.

Digitized by Google

figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." * And Paul says, "By one spirit we are all baptized into one body." † Baptism was the divinely appointed pledge of remission of sins to all true believers, and the outward sign of the influences of the Holy Spirit in sanctifying the heart. But the fact that men had been baptized, was never referred to, as proof that they were either pardoned or sanctified.

When we come to examine the baptism of Rome, we are told, "That such is the admirable efficacy of this sacrament as to remit original sin, and actual guilt however enormous." And this "transcendant efficacy," by which a sinful being is at once justified, and made so perfectly pure, that God sees nothing in him to hate, is ascribed to a wonderful virtue imparted to water.—"Should we, however, ask how our Lord has endowed water with a virtue so great, so divine; this indeed is an inquiry which transcends the power of the human understanding." ‡ And to render the ordinance still more efficacious, the Roman clergy prepare *holy water*, mixing oil with it, exorcise the person in order to expel the devil, put salt in his mouth, sign with the sign of the cross his forehead, eyes, breast, shoulders, and ears; touch his nostrils and ears with spittle; anoint him "with the oil of catechumens" on the breast and between the shoulders. After all this *powowing* over him, the ordinance is administered with the impure water prepared by the priest; and then the crown of his head is anointed, a white garment is put on him, and a candle is put in his hand, and the name of some saint given to him.—Is this the simple, significant, impressive ordinance of which we read in the New Testament? O no, it is not; or if its identity has not been destroyed, it has been so corrupted and perverted, that its true nature and design are almost wholly out of view.—Instead of an instructive ordinance, adapted to impress divine truth on the mind, it is a means of fatally deceiving men who are induced to rely upon a mysterious efficacy it is supposed to

* 1 Pet. iii, 21. † 1 Cor. xii, 13. ‡ Cat. of Trent, pp. 118, 127.

Digitized by Google

possess, instead of looking immediately to Christ for justification, and to the Holy Spirit for inward purity.

The Lord's Supper is still less like the original institution. Instead of an ordinance in which, by the use of bread broken, and wine poured out, the death of our Saviour is impressively set forth, and his people taught to partake of it in remembrance of him; we find men calling themselves *priests*, pretending by mysterious words to convert bread and wine into the very person of the Son of God, body, blood, soul, and divinity; calling on all to bow down and adore the bread and wine, over which they have uttered those dark sentences; taking one half of the ordinance from the people, and, instead of bread broken, placing a thin white wafer on their tongues, assuring them that they are eating Jesus Christ. Then the same men carry the wafer in public processions, to be adored by the people, say what they call *mass*, pretending to offer a real propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. Such a commingling of the absurd, the ridiculous, and the impious was never before known! The ordinances of God's house are not administered by the church of Rome.

But what do we see? In the primitive church there were no means of grace, except the preaching and reading of the Word, prayer, singing, baptism, the Lord's Supper, and occasional fasting. But in the church of Rome we find holy water, holy oil, holy fire, holy ashes, holy palm, holy candles, holy medals, holy Agnus Dei's, holy ground, holy relics, &c., &c., all of which are declared to be efficacious in securing important blessings to soul and body, protection from storms, diseases, shipwrecks, devils, and I know not what more! And yet, strange to tell, in those countries where all these holy things are most venerated and most abundantly used, wickedness prevails, and the people are far more degraded and wretched than where such inventions are unknown!

We come, then, fairly to the conclusion, that, so far as organization, worship, and ordinances are concerned, the church of Rome is not the Apostolic church; and I cheerfully leave the intelligent and candid who have heard my preceding lectures, to determine,

Digitized by Google

whether she is not equally corrupt in all her distinguishing doctrines. The two great distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel—*justification by faith in Jesus Christ*, and *sanctification by the influences of the Holy Spirit*, are about as much corrupted as the two sacraments which are designed emblamatically to present those doctrines to the minds of men. Instead of the former we find, in the church of Rome, *penances* by which men make satisfaction for their own sins, works of supererogation or the superabundant merits of the saints, made over to their less zealous brethren, the mass offered for the living and the dead, as a real sacrifice for sins, extreme unction, purgatorial fires, and the like. Instead of the latter, we have baptism, holy water, bodily inflictions, purifying fires of purgatory, and many such inventions.

By way of giving further evidence against the claims of Rome, let me state the fact, that she not only tolerates and patronizes all the errors I have named and many more; but she excommunicates and anathemizes all who refuse to believe and practice them, or even doubt their infallible truth. No man can openly preach the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and yet remain in her communion. She requires, as terms of membership, that every one shall believe all she teaches, and obey all her commands. She requires every one of her children to receive his faith, not on the ground that it is sustained by the Word of God, but simply because the clergy dictate it. She constrains them all, as a condition of membership, to be idolaters. She arrays herself in deadly hostility against all who hold and preach the pure gospel. Long has she, as often as opportunity has been afforded, unsheathed the sword of persecution against all who would obey Christ rather than her; and often has she committed cruelties at which human nature shudders. There is not now, in this wicked world, one enemy of the Gospel, so powerful and so determined.

Shall we recognise such a body as the church, or even a branch of the church of Christ? There may be pious persons in her communion; but they are pious simply because they do not really believe her errors; as there have been true Christians in Unitarian communions, who do not deny the Divinity of Christ. Long did

Digitized by Google

the conflict between light and darkness wax more and more violent, as error and wickedness overspread a great part of Christendom. From time to time, the faithful servants of God separated from the pope's communion; until the voice of God was heard, in the 16th century—"Come out of her my people." That voice was sounded by the Reformers from nation to nation, until all Christendom heard it. The pope was aroused from his security. The forces were mustered on either side for the fearful conflict.—Gradually those who loved the truth, obeyed the summons, and stood firmly under the banner of the cross. The separation continued to progress. Finally the Council of Trent assembled, and made apostacy from Christ a term of communion. Errors tolerated and patronized before, were now *enforced*. All must receive them, or be excommunicated and cursed. Up to that time, men in the Roman communion might deny the plenary inspiration of apocryphal books; but the Council placed them on an equality with the inspired books. Step by step, the Man of Sin had forced his errors upon the people; and now in a general council he and his church take, before the world, the attitude of rebels against God. Just so did the Scribes and Pharisees corrupt the Jewish church more and more, until they resolved to put out of the synagogue every one who should venture to acknowledge Christ. Then the final separation was soon effected; and that church was no longer a church of God.

It is difficult to say precisely how far a church may go in error, before it becomes a synagogue of Satan. I can acknowledge a church as a component part of Christ's church, even when, as a body, it teaches many gross errors. But when it requires, as terms of communion, the reception of an immense mass of human composition, and tradition as the word of God; the solemn promise and oath to believe as infallibly true all the errors its clergy may choose to teach; the daily commission of gross idolatry, and the like;—when a church not only requires these things, but excommunicates, and anathematizes, and persecutes unto the death, all who hold the truth;—I cannot, I dare not, recognize it as a part of Christ's church. It is a rebellious province, and has gone over

Digitized by Google

to the enemy. The Man of Sin did rise in the temple of God—the church—and long did he tyrannize over a large portion of it; but the time came when the church threw off his ghostly authority, and returned to the pure worship of God. The church was in Babylon; but she came out, at the command of God, and left it to perish. We have now nothing to do with her priests or her ordinances.

The church did not, by coming out of Babylon, unchurch herself; nor did the Reformers by throwing off the corruptions of popery, cease to be ministers of Christ. As well might it be said that John the Baptist ceased to be a priest, because he threw off the accumulated errors of Judaism, and, despite of the rage of the Scribes and Pharisees, gathered a multitude of disciples who ultimately left the Jewish communion.

It may be said that the Council of Trent established no new doctrines, and that the church of Rome was quite as corrupt before, as after its meeting. This is not admitted; but suppose it to be so. Was not the Jewish church quite as corrupt before John the Baptist began to preach, as when her rulers determined to excommunicate every man who dared to acknowledge the Saviour? I presume it will not be denied that it was. But pious men still lingered in her bosom, opposing, as they could, her corruptions. The aged Simeon and Anna the prophetess, and Zachariah and Elizabeth, and Mary and Joseph, and many others were still there. Nothing had occurred to call them out, to separate the chaff from the wheat. But when the stirring voice of John was heard, followed by the fearful denunciations and the gracious words of the Messiah, the signal for the final separation was given. It required some time to effect it, but it was effected, and the corrupt mass left to be overwhelmed by the judgments of God. So it was with the Reformation of the 16th century. God sent forth chosen men, and called his people out of Babylon, and they obeyed his voice. The question was then made before the world, whether Rome should longer lord it over God's heritage; and whilst they who feared God were separating themselves from the corrupt mass, she arrayed herself in more systematic and determined hostility

Digitized by Google

to the truth. From the day when the assembled Fathers of Trent pronounced their "anathema to all heretics," whatever may be said of the previous mixture of good and evil, we cannot recognize in the bosom of Rome the true church.

But can we find the true church? Yes—wherever we find a body of people, having substantially the Scriptural organization, the Scriptural worship, the Scriptural ordinances, and the Scriptural faith of which we have spoken; there we find a portion of the true church. There are in our world a great number of such churches—churches differing somewhat in several of these particulars, some more pure, some less so, but essentially agreeing; and these churches constitute the true Church Catholic. They are not all united under one visible head; but neither was the Apostolic church. They do not meet in general council; but neither did the primitive church. The different churches in the Apostolic age recognized each other as brethern in Christ; but they did not hold regular assemblies in which all were represented. Such councils are useful in their place; but they are not essential to the unity of the church.

In what, let us inquire, consists the unity of the church? This is an important question; and it shall be answered by an inspired Apostle. "And he gave some Apostles; and some Prophets, &c. —till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."* Here we find the real unity of the church. It consists not in the circumstance of a common name, such as Catholic, or Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Baptist. All the churches in the world that acknowledge Christ as the Messiah, are called *Christians;* but it does not follow, that they all hold the true Christian faith. Names, aside from realities, are nothing. If several bodies of professing Christians are found to hold substantially the same faith; the fact, that, while they all claim the general name of Christians, they have different distinguishing names, will not destroy their real unity. One portion of the church of Rome is called Dominicans; another, Jesuits; a

* Eph. iv, 11-13.

Digitized by Google

third, Franciscans; but they all claim to constitute one church. It may be said, they are all united to one visible head at Rome; and therefore their unity is preserved. So are the different Protestant denominations that have the Scriptural marks we have mentioned, united to one head, the Lord Jesus Christ; for they all believe in him as the Messiah, the Saviour of men.

And in this consists the real unity of the church—in unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. The revelation of God embraces a great variety of topics; and it is not to be supposed, that on every single point any two men will see alike. In the church of Rome, notwithstanding all her boasting about unity, there are differences of belief—differences, too, as we have proved, on points of great practical importance. One party believes in the personal infallibility of the pope, when he undertakes officially to define articles of faith and morals; and they, of course, receive his decisions as if Christ had spoken. Others deny that he is infallible, and maintain that he may be a heretic. One party believe that the pope has, by divine gift, universal temporal power, and can, therefore, depose kings and princes, and absolve their subjects from their oath of allegiance. One party believe, that it is not only right, but that it is the solemn duty, of temporal princes to punish heretics, even with death; and that the church has the right to command them to do so. The other party, found only or chiefly in Protestant countries, profess not to believe this doctrine. Some eminent men claimed by Roman Catholics have held the doctrines commonly called Calvinistic; whilst others have held those called Arminian.

But our cunning adversaries are prepared with an answer. They tell us they differ from each other, not in *faith*, but only in *opinion*. This, however, is a mere play upon words. The question whether the pope is infallible is as truly a question concerning *faith*, as is the question whether he is the visible head of the church. The question whether it is right to kill men for being heretics is as truly a question of morals (and therefore of faith), as the question whether it is right to steal. And the questions which divide the Calvinists and Armenians as truly relate to faith

Digitized by Google

among Romanists as among Protestants. If the latter would only agree to call all the points on which they differ, *opinions*, and those about which they agree, *doctrines* or matters of *faith*, they would just have as much unity as Papists have, without being really more united than they are. The unity of Rome is partly nominal, and partly *forced*. In Roman countries men dare not express views different from those of the church; for penalties, ecclesiastical and civil, await them if they venture to do so. How far they really hold the doctrines of Rome, therefore, cannot be certainly known. The real state of things in all Roman countries is probably about as in Mexico. Thompson, in his Recollections of Mexico says, "I would remark here a fact which surprised me very much. All know that the doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist is a cardinal point in the Catholic creed. * * * Yet I never asked the question of a Catholic in Mexico, and I did so of more than fifty of all classes, from foreign ministers to coachmen and servants, who believed it any more than I did. Whenever I asked the question, 'Do you really believe that the bread and wine used in the sacrament are the flesh and blood of Christ?' the reply, in almost every instance, was the same as that made to me by more than one member of the diplomatic corps, who were Catholics and educated gentlemen, 'What, sir, do you think that I am a fool? no, I believe no such thing. I believe it is a type, an emblem, but nothing more.' I replied, 'Then you are no Catholic; ask your priest; and he will tell you so.' They answered, 'Very well, we have never before heard of it; but if the priests say so, we have no doubt that it is true; for their lives are devoted to those studies, and they know more about them than we do.'" * Well may Thompson ask, "Can free institutions exist in a country where such a state of things exists?"

But the fact is, it requires both *compulsion* and *absurd distinctions* to preserve the *appearance* of Romish unity. It is not "unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God."

As just remarked, it is not to be expected that any two men will precisely agree concerning everything taught in the Bible.

* pp. 108-9.

Digitized by Google

But on those great questions which are essential to ecclesiastical organization, worship, ordinances, and doctrines, multitudes of churches do substantially agree. They all build on the same foundation—Christ crucified; and all expect to be sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Some may build more "wood, hay, and stubble;" others, more "gold, silver, and precious stones;" but all who build on this only true foundation are true Christians, and will be saved.*

But can we trace any of the Protestant churches up to the Apostles? Yes, just as easily as the Jewish church, after the Babylonish captivity, could trace its history back to Moses and Abraham. Before the captivity, corruptions in faith and worship had greatly multiplied, insomuch that "all the chiefs of the priests and the people transgressed very much after all the abominations of the heathen, and polluted the house of the Lord which he had hallowed in Jerusalem." † They burned incense "to the queen of heaven, and poured out drink-offerings unto her." ‡ They sacrificed in the high places, and committed idolatry under every green tree; until the wrath of God overwhelmed them. Ezra, Nehemiah, Joshua, and others, were raised up to be reformers; and, on the return of the Jews from captivity, a great reformation was effected. All those heathenish practices were rejected, and they re-established the pure worship of God. Now let the false teachers taunt them with the question, "where was your church before Ezra and Nehemiah?" What would be their answer? Would they not say, "We have the Book of the Law, in which we have an accurate description of the church as it was originally organized, and as its worship and ordinances and faith are set forth by Moses. The church erred from the truth; and committed great abominations. We have only thrown off those corruptions, and the church is again restored to purity." Just so we answer the Papists. A large majority of the Jews had apostatized, viz., the ten tribes, just as a large part of the nominal Christian church became corrupt. But we have in our hands the New Testament; we see what the church originally was, in her

* 1 Cor., iii. † 2 Chron., xxxvi, 14. ‡ Jer., xliv, 17.

Digitized by Google

organization, her worship, her ordinances, &c., and we see that by the Reformation the corruptions which had been for ages accumulating, were rejected, and the truth retained. We have churches now, which are just such as those organized by the Apostles.

But suppose the false teachers had said to Ezra, and Nehemiah, "We can trace our church up to Moses and Abraham; yours is of yesterday." They would have replied by denying the truth of the assertion; and would have said, "Moses appointed no incense to be burned to the queen of Heaven, nor any drink offerings to be offered to her; he appointed no sacrifices such as you offer in the high places, and under the green trees. You are corrupters of the word of God." So say we to Romanists, when they boastingly tell us, they can trace their church up to the Apostles. We deny the truth of the assertion. We affirm, that Jesus Christ appointed no pope, no archbishops, no cardinals, no priests, no acolytes, no readers, no porters; he and the Apostles did not talk of mortal and venial sins, auricular confessions, human satisfaction, purgatory, prayers for the dead, masses, indulgences, images, prayers to saints and angels, holy water, holy palm, holy ashes, holy fire, and a hundred more things found in the worship of Rome. She has awfully corrupted the truth, and now preaches "another gospel," which the Apostles never preached. And Roman Catholics must falsify history as much as they have corrupted the gospel, before they can trace even the shadow of their church up to the Apostles.

One thing is certain: those churches which have an Apostolic organization, Apostolic worship, Apostolic ordinances, and Apostolic doctrines, cannot be wrong; and the church that has not these, cannot be right. "To the word and to the testimony." The only book in the world in which a true account of the Apostolic churches can be found, is the New Testament. There we get a view of the church of Christ in its purity. We challenge our adversaries to the investigation. We are prepared to submit our

Digitized by Google

faith, our worship—all, to the infallible test. Dare they do the same?

But there is to be a brighter day in the history of the church of Christ. We have in our hands the true and infallible standard. It may be, that many have not fully conformed their faith and worship to it; but the different branches of the church will come nearer the light. The watchmen will see eye to eye. The light of the moon will be as the light of the sun; and the light of the sun will be seven-fold, even as the light of seven days; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. In the meantime, we rejoice to acknowledge as brethren, all who build on the foundation which God has laid in Zion, even though they build some wood, hay, and stubble; and we pray God to hasten the day, when all error and superstition shall disappear from our world, and when Satan shall be bound a thousand years. AMEN.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

LECTURE XII.

PROVERBS xxii, 6. "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old he will not depart from it."

This portion of Scripture presents a *duty* and a *promise*. The duty is, to train up children in the way they should go—to impart to them such instruction, and bring them under such discipline, as is adapted to guide them in the paths of virtue. The promise (or the declared consequence) is, that, however for a time they may wander in forbidden ways, yet in after life, in the days of mature reflection, they will return to the ways of wisdom and virtue.

It is difficult to estimate adequately the importance of the subject which I now propose for your consideration—*the training of the rising generation*. They are the hope of parents and friends. With what intense interest does every parent, of right feelings, look forward to the future career of the children of his affection. To how great an extent does his happiness or misery in declining years depend upon the character they may form, and the course they may pursue. He hopes for the best; but as he thinks of the dangers that lie thick along the path of life, and of the multitudes of promising youths who have fallen therein, the hopes inspired by parental affection are mingled with painful apprehensions. Can it be otherwise, then, than that affectionate and reflecting parents will feel an intense interest in regard to that training under which principles are to be imbibed, and habits formed, that must, to a great extent, determine the future history of their children?

They are the hope of the church. The present generation of ministers and members is rapidly passing off the stage, and going to their rest. The future prosperity of the church depends

Digitized by Google

upon the proper training and the conversion of the rising generation. God works by means. We cannot, therefore, expect our children to rise up and stand in the place of their parents, as intelligent, unflinching, faithful witnesses for the truth, unless they be trained up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." To every enlightened Christian, therefore, the education of the young is a matter of the deepest interest.

They are the hope of the country. We glory in our free institutions; we desire to see them perpetuated. We would transmit them in their purity to our children, and have them imbibe their spirit, enjoy the rich blessings they are adapted to secure, and hand them down as a rich legacy to the succeeding generation. But, we know that the continuance of our institutions depends upon the intelligence and virtue of the people. Intelligence alone is not sufficient. Intellectual training is important; but it is the *moral principles* of men and of nations which constitute their glory or their shame, and which secure to them prosperity, or plunge them into ruin. No nation was ever destroyed simply or chiefly for the lack of intellectual training. Every enlightened patriot must, therefore, feel an intense interest, not only in the education of the young, but in the *kind* of education they are to receive.

To whom shall we commit this most important trust? This is a question of the very first importance; for the influence of teachers in forming the principles and moulding the character of their pupils must necessarily be very great. This is evident if we consider the design of education—the work committed to their hands. Among the objects to be secured by a good education we may mention the following:

1. To develope, strengthen, and discipline the intellectual powers. 2. To radicate in the mind correct moral principles, and thus form a good moral character. 3. To impart useful knowledge with reference to the avocations of life. 4. To teach every one to understand and maintain his own rights, and to respect the rights of others—to inculcate the principles of civil and religious liberty. The men to whom such a work is commit-

Digitized by Google

ted, must exert upon the minds of their pupils a most extensive influence.

This is not all. Teachers, if successful in their work, must secure both the respect and the affection of their pupils. Children and youth, it is well known, receive little advantage from teachers whom they do not respect and love; and it is equally certain, that they are predisposed to embrace the cherished sentiments, literary, political, and religious, of those for whom they feel an affectionate regard. None of us, perhaps, are fully aware of the extent to which our personal attachments affect our opinions and our faith. When our children are placed under the tuition of teachers, they of course consider them wiser than themselves, perhaps wiser than their parents. They are consequently prepared to attach importance to their opinions; and this disposition is greatly increased by strong affection. Parents and guardians, therefore, are most solemnly bound to look well to the sentiments and the characters of those to whom they commit the instruction of their children and wards. This obligation should be most deeply felt by religious parents, who have solemnly dedicated their children to God, binding themselves in covenant to train them up for God and for heaven; and who believe that they are to be sanctified, and saved "through the *truth*." They are training their children less for distinction among men, than for the eternal happiness of heaven. Are they not under special obligations—obligations to be estimated only by the eternal interests of the soul, to shield their tender minds from evil influences, and to bring them, to the greatest possible extent, under the power of divine truth? Others may say, "We do not send our children to school to learn religion;" but the enlightened Christian will be careful, at least, not to send his where they will learn irreligion or a false religion.

I cheerfully acknowledge the right of the Roman clergy to establish in our country schools and colleges, and to secure, as far as they can by honest means, the education of our youth; and I admire the wisdom of their course. They are truly wise in extending their influence over the mind, ere yet its religious faith

Digitized by Google

is firmly established, and while most susceptible of deep and permanent impressions. But when our people are invited to place their children in those institutions to be educated, and are assured that no improper influence will be exerted over their minds; we have the right—nay, it becomes our indispensable duty, to inquire into their character, and to expose what is wrong or of dangerous tendency in them. And herein the Roman clergy set us an example. They invite and allure the children of Protestants into their schools, but are extremely careful to prevent their people from placing their children in those of Protestants. We have all heard of their persevering opposition to the Common Schools in the city of New York, in which no sectarian sentiments are allowed to be inculcated, and of their zealous efforts to secure a part of the public money for the purpose of establishing schools of their own. And we all remember that letter of Bishop Purcell, of this city, to a gentleman in Europe, in which he expressed the greatest solicitude and even distress, because of the influence of our Common Schools; whilst at the same time he *here* professed great friendship for them! The Roman clergy are so well aware of the influence exerted by teachers over the religious opinions of their pupils, that they prevent their people, as far as possible, from patronizing any Protestant schools. Protestants may well learn a lesson from the example they set us.

There are certainly many serious objections to the schools, of every class, established in this country by the Roman clergy, some of which I now proceed to present.

1. They do not and cannot develope, strengthen, and improve the powers of the mind, as this great work should be done. That they cannot will appear evident from two or three considerations.

1st. According to the creed by which Romanists are governed, *religion and morals* are forbidden subjects of investigation. The Council of Trent, as I proved in preceding lectures, decreed that in faith and morals, and in whatever pertains to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, all should submit to the dictation of the Roman clergy. These subjects, they tell us, are committed exclusively to them; they are our infallible guides. Now it is a fact, that

Digitized by Google

no other class of subjects so tends to strengthen the powers and elevate the character of the human mind, as this. What themes are so boundless, so sublime, so beautiful, as the being and character of the infinite Jehovah, his perfect law, and man's duty and destiny. On these themes the most celebrated poets have dwelt, and to the inspired volume they were indebted for their richest imagery and their loftiest flights. Who that has read Milton, and Young, and Cowper, and many others, can doubt this? But upon these exalted themes, adapted alike to expand and to purify the mind, the Roman clergy must teach their pupils that it is unwise and sinful for them to extend their inquiries beyond the teachings of their church. Church dictation, not freedom of thought, must be inculcated here.

But these subjects, in themselves so deeply interesting to every reflecting mind, are intimately connected with several of the most important branches of science; so that the restraints thrown around the former, greatly trammel the mind in its investigations of the latter. The student of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy, for example, is employed in studying the wonderful works of God; and it is not easy, nor is it wise, to look at the wonders of the intricate machinery of the universe, without contemplating the character of the Great Architect and our duty to Him. But here men are in constant danger of treading on forbidden ground, of interfering with the prerogatives of the clergy. We have all heard of Gallileo, who, for the crime of discovering that the earth revolved round the sun, was imprisoned in the Inquisition! And the influence of clerical dictation in matters of science is most remarkably exemplified in the case of Le Seur and Jacquier, two eminent mathematicians, who published Newton's *Principia*, with comments. For the purpose of escaping the fate of Gallileo, they, in their preface, use the following language: "Newton assumes, in his third book, the hypothesis of the earth's motion. The propositions of that author could not be explained except through the same hypothesis. We have therefore been forced to act a character not our own. *But we declare our submission to the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs against the motion of the earth.*" Such

Digitized by Google

was the language learned men were compelled to adopt in Roman countries, no longer ago than 1742! They trembled to announce a new discovery connected in any way with religion, lest they should be overwhelmed by the anathemas of an ignorant clergy!

In the study of mental and moral science there is still greater danger of treading on forbidden ground. It is with the mind especially that religion is concerned; and from scarcely any other source have more serious errors been introduced into the Christian church, than from false systems of mental philosophy. The philosophy of Plato and of Aristotle successively corrupted the doctrines of the church and perverted the teachings of inspiration; and the same injurious influence has been exerted by more modern systems. Man possesses a moral, as well as an intellectual nature, and in the study of mental science the former as well as the latter is to be investigated. But the moment you enter upon this most interesting study, which is emphatically the study of *man*, you enter a territory over which the clergy claim supreme authority; and instead of freely pushing your investigations guided by your own consciousness, and the writings of standard authors, you are tamely to receive and adopt their authoritative decisions. And the truth is, the mental and moral science of the Roman clergy, like their religious faith, is that of the dark ages, with only such slight improvements as may serve, in this age of light, to conceal its deformity. It is, indeed, impossible to separate religious faith from mental science, so that the one shall not, to a great extent, give color to the other. The Roman clergy cannot teach moral science correctly, because the moral principles inculcated by their church, and imposed on her children by pretended infallibility, are radically unsound. The truth of this statement will appear from several considerations:

The Bible is the only source from which a correct system of moral science can be drawn. It has been the text book used by the most eminent writers on this subject, such as Reed, Brown, Stewart, Wayland, &c In its sacred pages we learn from infallible teachers the character and perfections of God, our own character, our relation to our Creator, and to our fellow creatures, the

Digitized by Google

claims of his moral law upon us, and the motives and encouragements to a life of virtue. It is the only infallible standard of morals. The day has passed when men deemed it necessary to study the writings of Plato and Aristotle, that they might be philosophers; and there is not, so far as my knowledge extends, one system of mental and moral science extant, written by an infidel or a decided Papist, that can claim a respectable stand amongst standard works. The authors whose works are used as text books in our best institutions of learning, are Protestants, who confessedly are indebted to the sacred Scriptures for the systems of moral truth they inculcate.

But the Roman clergy, and teachers who are in communion with the church of Rome, cannot go to the Scriptures for their system of moral science. This has been settled long since by Popes and councils whose decisions are regarded as infallible. If they appeal to the Bible at all, they dare not interpret one passage otherwise than according to the interpretation given by the church and the Fathers. "In order to restrain petulant minds," the Council of Trent forbade any one, priest or private Christian, to wrest the Scriptures to his own sense of them, either in matters of faith or of *morals.*

How can teachers thus bound by decisions and interpretations of the dark ages, teach our children that it is their privilege and duty freely to investigate these important subjects? Are they not, on the contrary, under the necessity of informing them that in such matters they have only to hear the church and receive implicitly her decisions? The clergy, Milner says, do daily read portions of the Scriptures, though he did not state, what is no less true, that even they must read them with the spectacles of the Council of Trent over their eyes. "But," says he, "no such obligation is generally incumbent on the flock, that is, on the laity, it is sufficient for them to hear the word of God from those whom God has appointed to announce and explain it to them, whether by sermons, or catechisms, or other good books, or in the tribunal of penance. Thus it is not the bounden duty of all good subjects to read and study the laws of their country: it is

Digitized by Google

sufficient for them to hear and submit to the decisions of the judges, and other legal officers, pronouncing upon them."* The Roman clergy, you perceive, must and do say to all, that the whole business of interpreting Scripture belongs exclusively to them, and it is not their duty or their privilege to attempt to understand them for themselves. Their system of moral science must be derived, not from the word of God, but from the decrees of Trent and of other councils in the dark ages. But upon the moral principles of men depend their happiness and their usefulness. As these are good or bad, pure or corrupt, they will be elevated or degraded in their character, a blessing or a curse to society. Let me appeal to the fathers and mothers who hear me, and ask—are you willing to have the minds of your children thus trammeled in this most important branch of education? Shall they be taught to think freely on the subject of Mathematics, to sift to the bottom every proposition; but when they would study that science which concerns their own immortal nature, their moral character and their happiness, here and hereafter, tamely to receive the *dicta* of the clergy, and submit themselves to be moulded in moral character, as they please? Or should they not be taught, as rational and accountable beings, to read that best and purest of all books, and inquire freely what are the claims of God's law upon his creatures? Are you willing to have your children feel, that on that subject, which in its almost boundless circle embraces nearly every other, they are to take their faith and their principles without understanding either the one or the other?

2. The moral principles held and taught in Roman schools are radically unsound, and calculated to sap the very foundations of virtue. Romanists hold, for example, this principle, *that the magnitude of a crime is to be estimated, not by the importance of the moral principle of which it is a violation, but by the amount of injury actually resulting from it.* Lying, for instance, is a clear violation of the law of God, and is, therefore, a great sin. Now, in the Doway Catechism we have the following question and answer:

*End of Con., Let. xlviii.

Digitized by Google

"Q. Why is it a sin to lie? A. Because the devil is a liar, and the father of all lies."* It is a sin to tell lies, not so much because God has forbidden it, as because the devil is a liar! The answer to the question would have been quite as reasonable and as Scriptural, if the Catechism had said, it is a sin to lie, because Ananias and Sapphira lied to the Holy Ghost! But this by the way. The question and answer to which I request particular attention, are the following: "Q. When is a lie a mortal sin?—A. When it is any great dishonor to God, or notable prejudice to our neighbor: otherwise, if it be merely officious, or trifling, it is but a venial sin." A venial sin, according to the same authority, "is a small and very pardonable offense against God or our neighbor."† Here we are taught, that we may habitually tell lies, in direct violation of God's law, without being chargeable with any thing more than a small and very pardonable offense—an offense easily "remitted by all the sacraments, by holy water, devout prayer, alms-deeds, and the like good works."‡ We may *steal*, too, as well as lie, without committing any grievous sin; for the same Catechism has the following question and answer: "When is theft a mortal sin? A. When the thing stolen is of a considerable value, or causeth a considerable hurt to our neighbor."§ If the value of the article stolen be not *considerable*—a word perfectly indefinite in its meaning—or if it do not cause a *considerable* hurt to our neighbor; then the sin is very trifling, notwithstanding it is an open violation of one of the most important precepts of the moral law.

In a preceding lecture this subject was presented somewhat extensively, and the principles of Rome, as carried out in the confessional, exposed. I may pass it here, therefore, more briefly than it would otherwise be proper to do. Let me ask those who regard the moral principles their children may adopt, as of primary importance, whether they are willing to have them consider lying and stealing small offenses, under any circumstances? Is it true that the moral turpitude of theft depends on the quantity stolen, or the injury done to a fellow man? Is it not true, that

* p. 48. † pp. 69, 110. ‡ Dow. Cat., p. 111. § p. 66.

Digitized by Google

he who steals *five cents*, proves himself destitute of honesty—a thief in heart and in fact? Yet, according to the moral code of Rome, a man may be in the daily habit of stealing small sums, and in this way may ultimately steal a large sum, and yet be guilty of only a small offense, not sufficiently important to require confession of it to a priest!

But there is yet a more serious aspect of this subject. What will be the inevitable effects of such principles on the moral character of the young? Is it not true, that the worst liars began their downward course by telling lies which they considered of trifling importance? Have not the worst thieves and robbers began their course of iniquity by stealing small quantities? And if your children be taught to regard such lying and thieving "a small and very pardonable offense," will they not be likely to yield to temptation, and thus commence a course which will, in all probability, terminate in disgrace and ruin? But just such morality Romanists must teach; for just such they believe to be infallibly true!

Another false principle of morals abundantly inculcated by Romanists is, that the perfection of virtue consists, not in discharging well the duties of life in its ordinary relations, but in fasting, celibacy, punishing the body, and the like. If you desire proof of this statement, read the accounts given in the Breviary of the most eminent Roman saints—those who have been canonized by the pope, and who are now worshipped by the faithful! I will quote one or two examples from many that might be given. In the Breviary we have the following account of the Virgin Rosa:

"The Virgin Rosa, the first flower of sanctity of South America, born of Christian parents in Lima, was remarkable even from the cradle for the indications she gave of future holiness: for the countenance of the infant being wonderfully transformed into the likeness of a *rose*, gave occasion for this name: to whom afterwards the Virgin Mother of God added a cognomen, ordering her henceforth to be called, Rosa a Sancta Maria. At the age of *five years* she took the vow of perpetual virginity. When

Digitized by Google

nearer grown, lest she should be forced to marriage by her parents, she cut off a most beautiful suit of hair. Being addicted to fasting beyond human measure (humanum modum), she passed whole lents without bread, and eating daily only four grains (granicula) of citron apple. Having taken the habit of the third order of St. Dominic, she doubled the former austerities of her life. She fastened small needles (acus) in a long and very rough girdle of hair: under her veil she wore day and night a crown thickly set with prickles. Pursuing the arduous course of St. Catharine Senensis, she girded her loins with an iron chain thrice carried round. She made for herself a bed of knotty logs, and filled the open fissures with fragments of earthen pots. She made for herself a very narrow seat in an extreme corner of the garden, where, absorbed in the contemplation of heavenly things, reducing her diminutive body by frequent chastisements, fastings and watchings, but flourishing in spirit, she as a victor fearlessly trampled down and conquered the spirit of demons in frequent conflict.

"Being terribly agitated with the pains of disease, the insults of domestics, and by slanderous tongues, she did not yet complain—that she was afflicted as she deserved to be. During fifteen years, most miserably pining away every hour with desolation and thirst of spirit, she bore with fortitude of mind agonies more bitter than death itself. After this she began to abound in heavenly delights, to be honored with visions, and to melt with heavenly ardor. Being wonderfully familiar with her titular angel, St. Catharine Senensis, and the Virgin Mother of God, amidst constant apparitions, she merited to hear from Christ these words: *Rose of my heart, be thou my spouse.* Finally, Clemens X, Pontifex Maximus, with solemn ceremony placed her on the catalogue of holy virgins, after she had been happily taken to the paradise of her spouse, rendered illustrious by many miracles both before and after death." *For* 30*th August.*

Here we have, at once, a specimen of the pretended miracles with which Rome deludes her votaries, and of what she regards as the perfection of virtue. And what were the wonderful virtues

Digitized by Google

of St. Rose? Did she feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and visit the sick? No. Was she like Dorcas, of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles, "full of good works and alms-deeds which she did?" Could the poor show the "coats and garments" that she made? No. What, then, were her virtues? Why, she took the vow of perpetual virginity at the age of *five years!* a pretty early commencement with vows, especially of this kind! Then she starved herself almost to death; she put prickles in her dress, wore an iron chain around her waist, lay on logs and potsherds, and finally succeeded in killing herself! These things constitute what the church of Rome regards as the perfection of virtue!

Take another example. Antonius an Egyptian, born of noble Christian parents, sold all his estate and gave it to the poor. He then aimed to reach the perfection of holiness. He had such an abhorrence of heretics, that he would not go nigh one of them. "He lay on the ground when sleep became necessary. He practiced fasting to such a degree, that he put nothing but salt on his bread, and quenched his thirst with water, nor would he eat or drink until sunset; frequently he even abstained from food for two days: very often he spent the whole night in prayer." Then he was terribly assaulted by the devil, whom he overcame by prayer and fasting. Finally "he betook himself to a vast solitude in Egypt, where, daily progressing toward Christian perfection, he so contemned the devils (whose attacks became so much the more severe as Antonius became more bold to resist) that he reproached them for their weakness." He ultimately became so formidable to devils that many vexed by them were delivered by simply invoking the name of Antonius.

The Breviary is filled with stories such as these; and the examples of those poor fanatics are placed before the clergy and people, for their imitation. It may be said that these stories belong to the dark ages, and that the Roman Catholics of this age, and especially of this country, have more correct views of the principles of virtue. This is a great mistake, as any one can be convinced, who will take the trouble to read the account given by Rev. Joseph Reeve of the "holy Fathers of the Desert." Reeve is a

Digitized by Google

modern writer, whose history is now circulated as a standard work in our country. The edition I have was published in 1835. He gives the same account of St. Anthony which is found in the Breviary. He says, "By the help of corporeal mortification he subjected his mind and senses in a most perfect manner to the law of God." He gives the account of the battles of the saint with the devil, which has just been read. "Satan," says he, "envious of his happiness, appeared to him in hideous shapes, and by various temptations endeavored to deter him from his virtuous course. The fiend's malicious endeavors only served to show how weak his power is against the true servants of God." The same author gives a brief history of St. Pacomius, who, having put himself under the direction of one of those gloomy ascetics whose name was Palemon, in a short time "became an eminent master of a spiritual life." He founded a monastery on the banks of the Nile, and delivered to the monks a written rule, "which," says Reeve, "according to the account he himself gave to St. Palemon, was brought to him by an angel, and by the observance of which, thousands arrived to the highest pitch of Christian perfection." Concerning "those lights of the desert," as Reeve calls them, he remarks, "Such are the virtues which faithful history has recorded of these holy solitaries; virtues at which self-conceited sceptics may sneer, but which more enlightened Christians will ever admire and revere. The church no less abounds in examples than in the doctrines of evangelical perfection."* Let it not be said, when Roman clergymen of the most enlightened countries can send forth the like of this, that Romanism is becoming enlightened and abandoning the superstition of the dark ages. Her moral principles are unchanged, and therefore her clergy and her more superstitious nuns cannot correctly teach moral science. It is truly remarkable, that in their view the perfection of virtue, is just that which makes men and women fit for nothing, useful neither to themselves nor to others. It would be an instructive book that would place in contrast the lives of Bible saints and those of Roman saints. How totally dissimilar in almost

* Church Hist., v. i, pp. 135-139.

Digitized by Google

every feature. Bible saints let their light shine *before men*, that they might see their good works, and glorify their Heavenly Father; Roman saints let their light shine *in the deserts*, where they could not be seen, and where they could have no influence on men. Bible saints, like their Saviour, went about among men "doing good;" Roman saints spent their time in inflicting tortures on their bodies, and fighting with imaginary demons who assailed them in hideous shapes.

In this country we find few who seem to aim at the extraordinary perfection attained by those "lights of the desert." Nevertheless the Roman clergy among us profess to live a life of celibacy, because it is a holier state than that of matrimony; and nuns, who take the vow of "poverty, chastity, and obedience," are but following the same corrupt moral principles which in Asia produced so much miserable fanaticism.

Are you willing, my friends, to have your children taught, that to tell *small lies* and to steal *small sums* of money, are very trifling offenses; and that if they would attain to high degrees of virtue, they must abstain from marriage, which "is honorable in all," live in extreme poverty, become monks and nuns, and starve and chastise their bodies for the good of their souls? Do you say these things are not taught in Roman schools in our country?—But moral science is part, and an important part, of education, and if the Romanists teach it at all, they must teach what they believe. How can they teach anything else? Moreover, who can tell what impressions are likely to be made upon youthful minds, especially on those of young females, by the apparent sanctity and feigned happiness of nuns and priests? There is something romantic in the idea of retiring from the world to live a life exclusively devoted to religion—something which takes very strong hold of the feelings, and induces many to take vows of which they repent through life.

3. Another department of morals in which Roman teachers are no less erroneous than in those just named, is that which relates *to the observance of the Sabbath*. To remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, is not only an important precept of the

Digitized by Google

Decalogue, but it is one, the great importance of which, even as a civil institution, has been perceived by enlightened legislators. Accordingly there are in most of these United States, laws requiring the people to lay aside their ordinary pursuits on the holy Sabbath, and to observe it as a religious rest. These laws have been made, not because our civil rulers were particularly zealous in seeking to promote the interests of true religion, but because of their conviction, that the permanency of our government and of our free institutions, depends upon the *virtue*, as well as the intelligence, of the people, and that no community can long continue to be virtuous who have no Sabbath. There must be a day of frequent recurrence, when the people shall feel bound to lay aside their worldly pursuits, that opportunity may be given to all to obtain that moral and religious instruction by which they may be qualified for the proper discharge of their duties. If there be no such day of religious rest, who does not know that men, borne along by the strong current of wordly pursuits and interests, will soon forget or utterly disregard their obligations to God and to each other. If the Sabbath were abolished or generally disregarded, it is more than doubtful whether our government would continue through another generation. Show me a neighborhood or a village where its sacred claims are disregarded, and I will show you a community where intemperance and vice in their multiplied forms reign almost uncontrolled.

But the Sabbath is to be regarded, not simply or chiefly because it is necessary to a free government, but because its religious instructions and sacred ordinances tend greatly to promote that virtue and religion which lay the foundation of individual and domestic happiness. A large proportion of the wretchedness endured in our world is caused directly by the evil passions and uncontrolled appetites of the sufferer, or of those with whom he is immediately connected. I need not attempt to prove to this audience, that the tendency and the effect of the Sabbath and its sacred services is to dry up the streams of human misery, and to impart true, elevated enjoyment to individuals, to families, and to

Digitized by Google

communities. The Christian values the Sabbath still more, because of its influence upon the eternal happiness of men.

It is a fact, that the Sabbath is, in all Roman countries to a great extent, a day of dissipation; balls, routes, theaters, card-playing, and the like, are the amusements of that holy day in all those countries. This, as I proved in a preceding lecture, is acknowledged by Bishop Trevern. The same disregard of the Sabbath is manifested in our own country, to the extent to which Popery prevails. Nine years of my life were spent in a town where one of their principal colleges is located; and on no other day in the week was there so much noise and sport on the college grounds, as on Sabbath afternoon. The prefect, or one of the officers of the institution, was out with the students, encouraging them in this open desecration of God's holy day. In that college were many sons of Protestant parents. What, suppose you, was the effect upon their minds of such examples, set by men claiming to be peculiarly holy? Go to New Orleans, and inquire in what part of the city the theaters are open on the Sabbath evening; and inquire by what influence the shameful custom has been adopted, of making the Sabbath the day for military parades. Everybody knows that these things do not result from Protestant influence; for, as I have proved, Archbishop Eccleston and his clergy abuse Protestants for their strictness in keeping, and in laboring to have others keep, the Sabbath. And they insist that it is right to spend the Sabbath, after the morning service, in any amusements the people may happen to fancy.

If, then, parents desire to have their children taught to trample under foot the holy Sabbath, there is no place to which they can send them better adapted to produce such a result than a Roman school. But if they would have them regard God's command, and remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy, let them never place them under the influence of Roman teachers.

4th. But the Jesuits seem now likely to become the principal teachers in the Roman schools in our own couutry. Their establishments have recently been broken up in France; and we may expect quite an abundant supply of that order in the United

Digitized by Google

States. Indeed the number is already large; and even now the children of many Protestants, and of a still larger number of American citizens, not professors of religion, are under their tuition. We have in our own city a college, extensively patronized by all classes and by different denominations, which is under the control of Jesuits. It may be well, therefore, to enquire into the moral principles of this mysterious society.

In 1540 a bull of constitution of the order of Jesuits was obtained from Paul III, by Don Inigo Lopez de Ricalde, the youngest son of the noble house of Loyola, who became the general of the order. He had been severely wounded in the year 1521, in the defense of Pampeluna against the French. Having little hope of perfect recovery, he abandoned the pursuit of military fame, and, induced, it is said, by reading a volume of the Lives of the Saints, he sought distinction in the regions of spiritual knight-errantry. The society founded by him, in addition to the three usual vows of *poverty*, *chastity*, and *obedience*, came under a fourth, viz: *of unlimited submission and unconditional obedience to the pope.* The organization of the order for effective operation is most complete, and the training of each soldier of this chosen army of the pope, is more thorough than that of any army of ancient or modern times. "Talk of drilling and discipline!" says Dr. Duff, "why, the drilling and the discipline which gave to Alexander the men that marched from Macedon to the Indies; to Cæsar, the men that marched in triumph from Rome to the wilds of Caledonia; to Hannibal the men that marched in triumph from Carthage to Rome; to Napoleon, the men whose achievements surpassed in brilliancy the united glories of the soldiers of Macedon, of Carthage, and of Rome; and to Wellington, the men who smote unto the dust the very flower of Napoleon's chivalry;—why, the drilling and the discipline of all these combined, cannot, in point of stern, rigid, and protracted severity, for a moment be compared to the drilling and discipline which fitted and moulded men for becoming full members of the militant institute of the Jesuits."*

* Let those who desire to know something of the true character of the

Digitized by Google

The Jesuits, in consequence of their political intrigues, and their immoral principles and practices, were expelled successively by all the governments of Europe. "Wearied at length," says Dr. Duff, "and worn out by their unscrupulous rapacity and all-grasping ambition—their treachery and stratagems—their seductions and briberies—their intrigues and cabals—their laxation of public morals and disturbance of social order—their fomenting of seditions, disloyalties and rebellions—their instigating massacres, and parricidal cruelties, and royal assassinations;—the monks and courtiers, judges and civil magistrates, churches and public schools, princes and emperors of all nations in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America—all, all successively united their efforts in sweeping them clean away, and causing their institute to perish from off this earth, and from under these heavens." Finally Pope Clement XIV, was constrained to suppress the order in July 1773—an act which cost him his life! For in a short period he was poisoned by these his implacable enemies. But in 1814, Pius VII reinstated this dangerous order in all its privileges, and now it is spreading its baleful influence over the whole world. Their repeated expulsions from Roman Catholic governments, and their suppression by the pope, afford sufficient evidence of their dangerous character. But let us look at a few unexceptional testimonies concerning the moral principles of the order.

In 1642, an assembly of Romish clergy at Nantes, denounced a work by the Jesuit Bauni, "as calculated to encourage licentiousness and the corruption of manners; as violating natural equity, and the rights of man, and tolerating blasphemy, usury, simony, and many other enormous crimes, as offenses of no magnitude." In 1643, the Romish university of Paris declared themselves ready to prove, that "there is no article in religion which the Jesuits have not corrupted, and do not daily corrupt, by erroneous novelties; that the scholastic theology has been de-

Jesuits and their principles, read the little work of Dr. Duff on this subject. His authorities are not Protestants, but Romanists, and the Jesuits themselves. The picture drawn from those sources is the darkest in human history.

Digitized by Google

praved by the dangerous opinions of their writers, who have had the approbation, or at least the connivance of the whole society; that Christian morality had become a body of problematical opinions, since their society had undertaken, by a general understanding, to accommodate it to the luxury of the age; that the laws of God had been sophisticated by their unheard of subtleties; that there was no longer any difference between vice and virtue; that by a base indulgence, they promised impunity to the most flagrant crimes; that there was no conscience, however erroneous, which might not obtain peace, if it would confide in them; and that, in short, their doctrines, inimical to all order, had equally resisted the power of kings and the authority of the hierarchy; that if the light which God had placed in all reasonable minds, in order to show the distinction between purity and iniquity, were so far extinguished that such a pernicious theology could be universally received—in that case deserts and forests would be preferable to cities; and society with wild beasts, who have only their natural arms, would be better than with men who, in addition to the violence of their passions, would be instructed by this *doctrine* of *devils* to dissimulate and feign, and to counterfeit the characters of intimate friends, in order to destroy others with the greater impunity." In 1762, the Parliament of Popish France gave the following decision: "The court has ordained, that the passages extracted from the books of one hundred and forty-seven Jesuit authors having been verified, a collected copy shall be presented to his Majesty, that he may be made acquainted with the wickedness of the doctrine constantly held by the Jesuits, from the institution of their society to the present moment, together with the approbation of their theologians, the permission of superiors and generals, and the praise of other members of the said society—a doctrine authorizing robbery, lying, perjury, impurity—all passions and all crimes; inculcating homicide, parricide, and regicide; overturning Religion, in order to substitute in her stead Superstition; and thereby sanctioning magic, blasphemy, irreligion, and idolatry. And his majesty shall be most humbly entreated to consider what results from instruction so pernicious."

Digitized by Google

Would such charges have ever been made against the Jesuits, by Romanists themselves, if their moral code were not most infamous? I have time now to point out only two or three of their maxims by way of proving conclusively, that the charges are well-founded. The first I mention is, *the direction of the intention.* A man, for example, gives or accepts a challenge to fight a duel; and may do so, and even kill his opponent, provided he *intend* not to take revenge, but to defend his honor, his goods, &c!—Sanchez, one of the Jesuit authors quoted by Paschal, himself a Papist, says—"It is perfectly reasonable to say, that a man may fight a duel to save his life, his honor, or his goods, if there be any considerable quantity of them, when it is apparent that his adversary has an evil design unjustly to rob him of them by suits at law and chicanery; and there is no other way of preserving them." Escobar says, "If your enemy be disposed to hurt you, you ought not to wish for his death through hatred, but you may do it to avoid injury." Gasper Hurtardo says, "An incumbent may, without being guilty of mortal crime, wish for the death of the person who is a pensioner upon his benefice; and a son for that of his father, and rejoice in it whenever it happens, provided that it is only on account of the property that accrues to him, not from any personal hatred."

Another principle of Jesuit morality is *the doctrine of probability.* It is this: When, on any great moral question, different opinions are entertained by any celebrated casuists, of which opinions one is more probable, and in conformity with the law—the other less probable, but more agreeable to our desires, we may lawfully put the latter in practice. Filliucius says, "The authority of *one* good and learned doctor renders an opinion probable." Henrique says, a scrupulous man continues safe, if he prefers against his scruples, that which he considers probable, although he may think that another opinion is more probable."—Paul Laymann says, "Of two contradictory probable opinions, touching the legality or illegality of any human action, every one may follow, in practice or in action, that which he should prefer; although it may appear to the agent himself less probable in the-

Digitized by Google

ory." The same author says, "A learned person may give contrary advice to different persons, according to contrary probable opinions; whilst he still preserves discretion and prudence."—Louis de Scildare says, "If a subject thinks probably that a tax has been unjustly imposed, he is not bound to pay it." Gregory of Valencia says, "If the judge shall think each opinion equally probable, for the sake of his friend he may lawfully pronounce sentence according to the opinion which is more favorable to the interests of that friend. He may, moreover, with the intent to serve his friend, at one time judge acccording to one opinion, and at another time, according to the contrary opinion, provided only that no scandal result from the opinion."

A third principle of Jesuit morality is, *the lawfulness of mental reservation.* Sanchez says, "A person may take an oath that he has not done such a thing, though in fact he has, by saying to himself it was not done on a certain specified day, or before he was born, or by concealing any other circumstance which gives another meaning to the statement." Sanchez and Filliucius say, that after saying in an audible voice, *I swear that I did not do this*, you may add inwardly *to-day*; or after affirming aloud *I swear*, you may repeat in a whisper *I say;* and resuming the former tone,—*I did not do it.* Escobar says, "Promises are not obligatory when a man has no intention of being bound to fulfil them; and it seldom happens that he has that intention, unless he confirms it by an oath or bond, so that when he merely says, *I will do it*, it is to be understood, *if he do not change his mind;* for he did not intend by what he promised to deprive himself of his liberty."

With regard to the facilities afforded by Jesuit morality for violating the *seventh* commandment, I will only quote the language of Dr. Duff. "Hitherto I have been enabled to proceed with separate quotations to show how every commandment of the Decalogue may be violated with impunity. But there is one, as to which I must beg to be excused for not entering on it at all. It is the *seventh.* How to violate it in its letter and spirit—in thought, word, and deed—in every imaginable, and, apart from Jesuit im-

Digitized by Google

aginations, every unimaginable form—is pointed out, in their writings, with a minuteness, a loathsomeness, and a pruriency, compared with which the most filthy passages in the grossest of the heathen poets and satirists bear the stamp and impress of relative refinement. It is, in fact, a bottomless abyss of obscenities, nudities, criminal liberties, and defiling turpitudes—an abyss from which I most gladly hasten away, as from one whose very brink is thickly fringed all around with pollution."

The time would fail me to do anything like justice to this dark subject. Let me earnestly request those who are willing to know the true character of the morality of the Jesuits, to read Dr. Duff's little work on this subject, and especially the Provincial Letters of Blaise Pascal, who was a Papist of the Jansenist order, and an elegant writer. From this work, says Dugald Stuart, "Voltaire, notwithstanding his strong prejudices against the author, dates the *fixation* of the French language, of which the same excellent judge has said, 'Moliere's best comedies do not excel them in wit, nor the compositions of Bossuet in sublimity.'"

And are these the men to whom American and even Christian parents are willing to entrust the training of their children? Are such men to have a principal agency in fixing in their minds those principles of action by which they are to be governed through life? It is too true, that many, unacquainted certainly with their principles, have placed their children under their withering influence. Far better would it be to commit their education to men who denounce all religion, than to those who, in the name of Jesus, teach men how to perpetrate the worst crimes without suffering from the lashings of a guilty conscience. How can such men teach mental and moral science? It may be said the Jesuits do not, in this country, avow the abominable sentiments attributed to their order. True, they are not likely to destroy their influence by an avowal of principles which are held in abhorrence in this Protestant country; but their concealment, and their pretended sanctity only enable them the more easily to destroy the morals of the youth committed to them. It is impossible that the influence of such men shall be other than most

Digitized by Google

mischievous. It has been so from the origin of the order; and it will be so, while it has an existence.

3. Roman institutions will never teach HISTORY correctly.—For more than twelve centuries past, the pope has been a temporal prince, and has used his spiritual power for the purposes of self-aggrandizement, and the extension of the power, wealth, and influence of Rome. He has been quite as busily engaged as his cotemporaries in the intrigues, civil combinations and alliances that form a considerable part of the history of the ages preceding the Reformation. The persecutions of the pope and his clergy, too, constitute a prominent part of the history of the past. Who, for example, could write the history of Spain, of Portugal, and of Italy, without giving prominence to the horrid inquisition, its officers, its dungeons, its tortures, and its *autos da fe?* Or who could write the history of that wonderful people, the Waldenses, without telling of the long-continued, exterminating persecutions of them, set on foot and kept up by the popes and general councils? Or who will ever be able to write the history of our world in the 16th century, without making the Reformation a most prominent theme, and showing how the pope and his clergy labored to crush the spirit of liberty which began then to manifest itself, and to claim the right to think and investigate, without being trammeled by the decrees of popes and councils of the dark ages? Who can write the history of England, without recording the persecutions of "bloody Mary?"

And is it to be expected that the Roman clergy will allow these things to be presented in their true light, before the minds of the youth committed to their charge? Why, the history of the past must be in the view of every man, an unanswerable refutation of Rome's pretended infallibility. No man can believe the claim well-founded, who, before his prejudices are excited, reads the history of the doings of Rome.

It may be said, Protestants, too, may have reason for concealment; because the churches to which they severally belong have not always done right. I answer, Protestants do not claim infallibility for their churches. They may admit that they have erred,

Digitized by Google

and they may record their errors as a lesson to the present, and to future generations. There is little or no temptation, therefore, to them to falsify history.

4. Roman schools will never teach the principles of civil and religious liberty, on which the free institutions of our country are founded. The fundamental principles of Popery, as I have proved in preceding lectures, are at war with liberty of conscience and the freedom of the press. Rome has ever been found the firm supporter of despotism, and the irreconcilable enemy of liberty. The Roman clergy of our country are, many of them, foreigners, who secured their education under the prevailing spirit of despotism; and those who have been educated in our own country have sat at the feet of foreigners, and imbibed their principles. They have certainly received the principles of Popery, and cannot, therefore, hold the principles which are dear to every true American. In the organization of the church of Rome there is nothing democratic; not one popular principle is admitted. In her legislation, and in the administration of her government, the voice of the people is never heard, directly or indirectly. The pope is an absolute monarch whose signature fixes upon the dogmas of the church the seal of infallibility; who dispenses those "heavenly treasures—indulgences"—to the people as to him seems good; and whose decisions are laws. The cardinals are his chosen counsellors, who aid him in carrying out the principles of despotism which characterize the system. The bishops of every grade are his lords, who meet in general council at his call, or who hold their provincial councils, and humbly submit their deliberations to be approved or condemned by "His Holiness." The priests are the humble servants of the pope and his coadjutors who move at his bidding. The inferior orders and the people hear the law, believe, and obey. How can persons, whose whole characters are moulded under such despotism, teach the great principles of civil and religious liberty? How can it be expected that men who dare not say one word against the intolerance of Italy, Austria, Spain, Portugal, France, Mexico, and South America, will boldly and sincerely advocate the fundamental

Digitized by Google

principles of our noble constitution, which guaranties to every American citizen the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience? It would be just as reasonable to expect a true American to go to Austria, and, as a teacher of youth, to inculcate the despotic principles of that government; or to Spain, and to plead for the restoration of the Inquisition. Will individual priests and nuns fly in the face of their Lord, Gregory XVI, and inculcate the principles of freedom of speech and of the press, denounced by him as contrary to the principles of the church, and ruinous in their consequences? Can men who, like Archbishop Eccleston, of Baltimore, denounce a convention, whose object is to promote the better observance of the Sabbath, as contrary to the Constitution of these United States, hold and teach the principles of that Constitution?

I have proved that the moral principles of Rome, and especially of the Jesuits, are rotten to the very core. Let me now say, that there exists not on earth a government so absolutely despotic as that of the order of Jesuits. "The grand principle," says Dr. Duff, "which pervades, animates, and cements into one firm and continuous chain the entire course of probationary exercises, is the reiterated, the incessant, the perpetual inculcation of a blind, implicit, unquestioning obedience to the monarchical general of the order, or to the superior acting in his stead or name. In every conceivable variety of shape and form his will is declared to be law, sole and supreme law—his will is virtually that of omnipotence. To him must the inclinations, the reason, and the conscience of every member be unconditionally surrendered." In the constitutions of the order, which, after being long concealed, were dragged to light in France, in 1761, the novice is exhorted to "devote himself to the service of God, leaving the care of all other things to his superior, *who doubtless holds the place of Christ our Lord.*" Again, novices are to "desire with perfect concurrence to be guided by them (their superiors), and not wishing to be led by their own judgment, except it agrees with that of those who are to them *instead of Christ our Lord.*" Again—"It is especially conducive to advancement, nay, even necessary,

Digitized by Google

that all yield themselves to perfect obedience, regarding the superior as Christ the Lord, and submitting to him with inward reverence and affection. Let them obey, not only in the outward performance of what he enjoins, entirely, promptly, resolutely, and with all due humility, without excuses or murmurs, even though he order things hard to be done, and repugnant to their own sense; but let them also strive to acquire perfect resignation and denial of their own will and judgment to that which the superior wills and judges (where sin is not perceived)—the will and judgment of the superior being set before them as the rule of their will and judgment." Once more—"Let every one persuade himself that they who live under obedience should permit themselves to be moved and directed, under divine Providence, by their superiors, *just as if they were a corpse, which allows itself to be moved and handled in any way;* or as the staff of an old man, which serves him wherever or in whatever thing he who holds it in his hand pleases to use it"—"persuading themselves that everything is just, suppressing every repugnant thought and judgment of their own in a certain obedience," &c. And lest any one might suppose, says Dr. Duff, that the *formal* introduction of any apparently exceptionary clauses, non-obligation of committing sin by way of obedience, formed any real or substantial limitation, it is expressly added, by way of explanation, that the constitution of the society does not "involve an obligation to commit sin, mortal or venial, unless the superior command them in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of holy obedience; which shall be done in those cases or persons, wherein it shall be judged that it shall greatly conduce to the particular good of each, or to the general advantage."

The Romish King of Portugal, in a manifesto addressed to his bishops in 1759, gives the following description of the principles of the Jesuits. "In order to form the union, the consistency, and the strength of the society, there should be a government not only monarchical, but so sovereign, so absolute, so despotic, that even the provincials themselves should not have it in their power, by any act of theirs, to resist or retard the execution of the orders of

Digitized by Google

the general. By this legislative, inviolable, and despotic power—by the profound devotedness of the subjects of this company to mysterious laws with which they are not themselves acquainted—by the blind and passive obedience by which they are compelled to execute, without hesitation or reply, whatever their superiors command—this society is at once become the most consolidated and powerful body, and, at the same time, the greatest and most enormous of abuses, to which there is an urgent necessity that the church and state should apply the most prompt and efficacious remedy."

Robertson gives the following account of the organization and principles of the order: "But Loyola, full of the ideas of implicit obedience, which he had derived from his military profession, appointed that the government of his order should be purely monarchical. A general, chosen for life by deputies from the several provinces, possessed power that was supreme and independent, extending to every person, and to every case. He, by his sole authority, nominated provincials, rectors, and every other officer employed in the government of the society, and could remove them at pleasure. In him was vested the sovereign administration of the revenues and funds of the order. Every member belonging to it was at his disposal; and by his uncontrollable mandate, he could impose on them any task, or employ them in what service soever he pleased. To his commands they were required not only to yield outward obedience, but to resign up to him the inclinations of their own wills, and the sentiments of their own understandings. They were to listen to his injunctions, as if they had been uttered by Christ himself. Under his direction they were to be mere passive instruments, like clay in the hands of the potter; or, like dead carcasses, incapable of resistance. Such a singular form of policy could not fail to impress its character on all the members of the order, and to give a peculiar force to all its operations. *There is not in the annals of mankind any example of such perfect despotism, exercised not only over monks shut up in the cells of a convent, but over men dispersed among all the nations of the earth.** Even Reeve, the Romish historian,

* Charles V. Book vi, pp. 288-289.

Digitized by Google

while zealously defending the Jesuits, states that "their form of government was monarchical, vested in a general chosen by the body for life;" and that "prompt obedience, when there appeared no sin in the execution, *was their characteristic virtue.*"* We have already seen how easily they perform, and teach others to perform, the most atrocious acts, without regarding themselves as sinning.

Are these the men by whose instructions the characters of American youth are to be formed? Are they to inspire them with the spirit of liberty, and prepare them to be the worthy descendants of the patriots of '76? Will they teach them, whilst themselves under the most absolute of all despotism, to prize and preserve the free institutions of our happy country?

5. *It is a fact, an important fact, that Roman schools are not designed to promote thorough education, but to make converts to popery, and to enrich the clergy and the church.* The Roman clergy are aware that their cause has nothing to gain by that spirit of free inquiry generated by a thorough education. The man who has been accustomed to inquire into reasons and evidences on all other subjects, will not readily found his religious faith upon the *dicta* of the clergy. He will desire to be able to give a reason for the hope that is in him.

But if they are indeed the ardent friends of education, why do they, to so great an extent, neglect those countries where their faith is established? With great zeal, and at great expense, they are establishing in our country colleges and schools of every grade for the education of both males and females. Why is not equal zeal manifested in popular education in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, and South America? It is a notorious fact, that in all these countries the masses of the people are uneducated and are grossly ignorant. We know that the people of Mexico, where popery has prevailed for ages past, are to this day semi-savages, possessing neither intelligence nor virtue sufficient to sustain a free government. There is not in Mexico one literary institution of a high character; and although it is very common to find the

* Hist. of Ch., v. ii. p 257

Digitized by Google

lower classes of the people able to read, there are no such institutions for general education as the Roman clergy are so zealous in establishing in our country. Waddy Thompson, Esq., says—"The only institution of any character in the city (of Mexico) is the Mineria—the College of Mines, as its name implies. * * * The professorships are very few, chiefly connected with physical science, and the chairs filled by persons of extremely moderate attainments. The philosophical apparatus is altogether contemptible. * * * The University, which was founded in 1531, is in a declining condition, if indeed it is not already extinct. There are some other colleges as they are called, but they are scarcely respectable primary schools."* The same writer says, "There are scarcely any of those charitable institutions to which we are accustomed in all our principal cities. There are more of these, I have no doubt, in either of the cities of Boston or Philadelphia than in Mexico." How shall we account for the great zeal of the Roman clergy and of their allies in Europe, for establishing schools and benevolent institutions in this enlightened country, and their entire indifference to these same things in Mexico and other Romish countries? It would not even be necessary to send to Europe, as do the clergy of the United States, for funds; for the Roman clergy of Mexico possess a large proportion of all the wealth of that country. "I have heard intelligent men express the opinon," says Thompson, "that *one fourth* of the property of the country is in the hands of the priesthood; and, instead of diminishing, is continually increasing."†

The truth is, it is not the zeal of the Roman clergy in the cause of general education, which causes them to establish in our country so many schools. But there is among us a public sentiment in favor of education. Parents will educate their children, and if they be educated by protestant teachers, few of them will ever embrace popery. This the clergy well understand. Moreover, the great principles of the Reformation are so generally received; it is so universally believed, that the Scriptures are the only infallible guide in religious faith; that the clergy find it extremely

* Recollections of Mexico, pp. 147, 148. † Ibid, p. 41.

Digitized by Google

difficult to make converts of adults by preaching. Hence, their great anxiety to monopolize, as far as possible, the education of our youth.

I have said the design of Roman schools is not to give a thorough education. I have not had the opportunity of forming a judgment of those established in this city; but I had, during *nine years*, a fair opportunity of ascertaining the literary character of their most celebrated schools in Kentucky. I have repeatedly received pupils from their nunneries, whilst myself conducting a female institution; and in every instance their minds had been injured rather than improved. I have attended their examinations, and found them, notwithstanding the special previous preparation, very superficial. I have known young men who were impatient to finish their literary course, leave other colleges and go to St. Joseph's, at Bardstown, because they could graduate there at least twelve months sooner. Some years since, two young men, after taking the course, and one of them receiving his diploma at that institution, went to an eastern college; and the young graduate was not able to enter, without first studying for several months under a tutor! Another fact it may be worth while to record. Several years ago, I had occasion, as the editor of a weekly paper, to make some remarks not very favorable to the literary character of St. Joseph's college. Those remarks were brought before a literary society of that institution; whereupon several resolutions intended to be offensive were passed, and sent to me with a request to publish them. The document which was drawn up by a committee, one of whom had graduated, and others received their diplomas a few weeks afterwards, was introduced, as a paper emanating from a literary society should be, with a Latin motto, which read as follows:

"Ii qui vivunt dominibus vitreis, caveunt quo modo lapides mittere."

To this Latin, which is not Latin, and to the resolutions passed, which were equally defective, both in orthography and syntax, I referred the public, for evidence conclusive that I had not undervalued the literary merits of the college. The affair caused some amusement in the town and much excitement in the college.

Digitized by Google

The truth is, the Roman clergy of this country have, by much boasting, gained a reputation for learning, which generally they do not deserve. I know of no denomination of professing Christians, whose clergy are educated men, that does not possess a larger share both of talent and learning.

But whatever may be the defects of Roman institutions, they are certainly adapted admirably to accomplish one chief object for which they are established, viz: *to make converts to popery.* I have said that children and youth can never be very successfully taught by instructors who fail to secure their respect and affection. The great pretensions of Roman instructors to superior knowledge, is adapted to secure the former, and their special kindness to the children of protestants, whose conversion they anxiously seek, is extremely likely to accomplish the latter. Young girls, far from their parents and friends, naturally become strongly attached to the nuns, who, never losing sight of the great object—their conversion—lavish kindness upon them; and youth of every class, inexperienced and unsuspecting, readily become strongly attached to their kind instructors. How natural for them to conclude that they are the best people in the world, and that their religion has made them so; and, of course, that their religion is the best in the world. How natural that they should set down all that is said against popery as misrepresentation and slander, and that they should feel indignant at those who oppose it, and who seem to them to persecute their respected and beloved teachers. In this state of mind, who does not see that they are already more than half converted?

And then there is in the priests and nuns such an appearance of sanctity. To those unacquainted with true religion there was something very imposing in the broad phylacteries of the ancient Pharisees, in their frequent fasts, their many ablutions, their tithing of mint, anise, and cummin, and the like. There is even a greater show of sanctity in our priests and nuns. Will your children see through all this show of piety, and reject it? If they do, as some more advanced in years may, is there no reason to fear that they will feel a contempt for all religion, and become confirmed infidels?

Digitized by Google

But the Romanists claim for their religion a venerable antiquity; and they have a thousand stories to tell of saints, and miracles, and the like, well adapted to excite the minds of youth, and make lasting impressions upon them. Why, you may tell your children stories of ghosts and apparitions, till they will be afraid to sleep alone in a dark room. There is something in human nature that lays strong hold of such things; and the impressions made by them are not readily eradicated. Then, at every turn, the images of those wonder-working saints are presented before the eyes of the pupils in Roman schools; and they see the devout priests and nuns, with awful solemnity, kneeling before them in prayer. Can all this, with all the pomp and show of Roman worship, be constantly witnessed by the susceptible minds of youth, without making a deep impression?

Another fact is worthy of special consideration, viz: the children and youth placed in Roman schools, are required to attend and assist at all the public religious exercises. In the prospectus of one of their female institutions I find the following: "Pupils of every religious denomination are admitted into the institution. No improper influence is ever to be used to bias the religious principles of the young ladies, nor will any of the scholars be allowed to embrace the Catholic religion, without a written or verbal permission from their parents. *For the sake of order, all the boarders are required to observe the general regulations of exterior worship.*"* The audience will please mark the language here employed. The conductors of this institution do not say that they will exert *no influence* to bias the religious opinions of their pupils; but "no IMPROPER influence" is to be used. What kind of influence do they regard as *improper?* On this point they are silent; and we may content ourselves with the assurance they have given, that they will use no influence for the conversion of Protestant children, *which they regard as improper!* But they assure the public that they will not allow any of their pupils to become Roman Catholics, without permission from their parents. A poor consolation this, when they have filled the minds of child-

* Cath. Almanac for 1846, p 96.

Digitized by Google

ren with their superstitions, and excited their strongest prejudices against the faith of their parents. Mark the fact, however, that "for the sake of order, all the boarders are required to observe the general regulations of exterior worship,"—to unite in their prayers and devotions.

In the prospectus of St. Gabriel's College, Vincennes, Ia., we find a similar regulation: "There is no interference whatever with the religious belief of the pupils; but for the sake of order, they are expected to comply with the external forms of Catholic worship, which is the religion professed by the members of this college." In the prospectus of St. Mary's Female Academy, it is stated, that "the members of the Protestant denominations are only required to assist with propriety and respect at the public exercises of the Catholic religion." * Such are the regulations in all Roman schools, as far as my information extends. In view of these regulations I have two remarks to make:

1st. Every intelligent Protestant believes a considerable part of the religious worship of Roman Catholics to be unscriptural and idolatrous; for example, the worship of the consecrated wafer, the worship of saints and angels, praying before images, and the like. No enlightened and conscientious Protestant could be induced to participate in such worship, even externally. The three Hebrews preferred being thrown into the fiery furnace, to conforming externally to the worship ordained by Nebuchadnezzar. Primitive Christians preferred death to throwing a handful of incense on a pagan altar. What right, then, I emphatically ask, have Protestant parents to place their children where they are obliged, at least externally, to commit idolatry? What right have they to compel their children to do what they themselves could not, and would not do? What right have they to compel them to sin against God? Is this the way to train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? I appeal to those parents who do not profess to be religious, but who do not believe the Roman worship to be scriptural. Will they not admit, that if there is any one thing in which sincerity should be

* Catholic Almanac for 1846, pp. 118-125.

Digitized by Google

preserved, and in which our external conduct should accord with the convictions of the mind, the worship of God is that thing? Why, then, will you compel your children to conform to religious worship which you feel constrained to tell them is not true and not right? Can such a course be adopted without serious injury to the moral principles of children? Can parents who place their children under such influences, wonder if they become decided Papists?

2d. The children of Protestants are not only compelled to unite in religious worship which is unscriptural and idolatrous; but they are obliged to hear all that may be said against the religion of the Bible, and in favor of Romanism—all the gross misrepresentations of the Reformers and the Reformation, and all the wonderful stories about saints and ghosts, which may be introduced at the religious services they attend. Are their minds sufficiently stored with religious instruction to resist all this? Is there no danger that convictions will be fastened on their minds that can never be eradicated? The Sabbath, too, which their parents have taught them to remember to keep it holy, is now to be spent in idolatrous worship and in hearing the worst religious errors plausibly set forth and defended. I know not how Protestant parents, who have any regard for their own religious obligations, or for the moral and religious training of their children, can place them in the midst of such influences. I can account for their conduct only by supposing them unacquainted with the real character of Roman institutions.

Another important fact which I must not omit to mention, is this: Whilst every possible influence is thrown around the children of Protestants to convert them to popery, they are as carefully guarded against every influence that might serve to strengthen early impressions in favor of the religion of their parents. They are, to a great extent, cut off from all intercourse with Protestants; and they are not permitted to have a single book which has not been approved by the president or superior. In the regulations of Georgetown College, District of Columbia, I find the following: "All books, of whatever kind, must, however, be submitted

Digitized by Google

to the supervision of the prefect of the schools, without whose permission none will be allowed circulation in the college."* In Mount St. Mary's college, near Emmitsburg, "No books are allowed to circulate among the students which have not received the president's approval." † In the Academy of the Ursuline Nuns, the Prospectus says, "The scholars will not be permitted to bring any books, except such as are used in the school, and books of devotion." ‡ Among the rules of St. John's college I find the following: "No books will be allowed circulation among the students, which have not been previously submitted to the supervision and received the approval of either the president of the college, or the prefect of studies." §

The children of Protestants, you perceive, especially if they are boarders, are wholly under the influence of Romanism. Parents cannot put in their hands such religious books as they desire them to read, such, for example, as Doddridge's Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul, Baxter's Saint's Rest, D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation. Such books could never receive the approbation of presiding officers in those schools. And it is extremely questionable whether the Bible is not a prohibited book. Certainly the Protestant Bible is. Some years ago, Dr. Henry Riley, a most excellent man, with whom I am well acquainted, who had been a student in Georgetown College, published a particular account of his stay in that institution, and of his conversion to Popery. Among other things he stated the following facts: "Previous to my leaving home, my mother (she was a Presbyterian) gave me a small Bible, with the hope that I would make good use of it. But her hopes were all in vain—for on reaching the college our trunks were subjected to rigid inspection, and every thing removed beyond our control, except such books or things as they in their wisdom saw fit to entrust us with. Several of my books I never afterwards saw—what became of them is better known to others than to me. Fathers Grassie, Kohlman, McElroy, &c., can, no doubt, give some account of them. Restitution of *unlawfully borrowed* property is enjoined by these

* Cath. Almanac for 1846, p. 77. † Ibid., p. 78. ‡ Ibid., p. 97. § Ibid., p. 111.

Digitized by Google

spiritual fathers, on those who in their confessions acknowledge the commission of such a crime. * * * But it may be said, the books were of a demoralizing character. They were such as a solicitous parent had given me, and one was what God had given to a ruined world for its salvation. I occasionally saw one of these books in the hands of a novice (candidate for Holy Orders, or rather for full admission into the society), and though I recognized it as mine, I dared not whisper that it was." Instead of the books which a pious mother had put in the hands of her son, he says, "prayer-books, catechisms, &c., were put into my hands; and it was but a short time before I avowed myself a decided, determined Catholic." Ere long, he tells us, he "had fully imbibed the sentiments which the officers of the college so industriously endeavored to impress on the minds of all, that out of the pale of the Catholic church, there is *no possible salvation*, and my purpose now was *fully* formed to become a priest—a thorough Jesuit." Dr. Riley was greatly troubled at the thought that his parents were Protestants; but so completely infatuated was he, that he felt confident of being able at once to convince them of the truth of his new creed, when he should return home. He says, "It was my purpose, however, notwithstanding any opposition I might meet with, to remain firm in my determination to live, to labor, and to die, a Jesuit, for I had been taught not to heed the admonitions and the opposition of parents and friends in the prosecution of so good a cause." He mentions several others, sons of Protestants, who, like himself, soon became confirmed Papists.

The officers of Roman schools, it is possible, may sometimes deem it wise to allow the child of Protestant parents to retain a Bible; but are young persons likely to read that sacred book, when they know the opposition of their teachers, and that perseverance in such a course will necessarily expose them to ridicule and reproach, if not to unkind treatment?

To show what reliance is to be placed on the pledges of Roman institutions not to interfere with the religious opinions of Protestant children, I must state another fact. A Protestant la-

Digitized by Google

dy who resided in one of the southern states, several years ago, sent her adopted son to St. Mary's college in Kentucky, an institution under the care of the Jesuits. About twelve months after she visited her son, and was surprised and exceedingly troubled when she ascertained that he had been already received into the Romish church. She immediately removed him from the college, and placed him under my care. I afterwards published the facts as she stated them to me. The President of St. Joseph's college, situated at Bardstown, made a publication in reply, in which he asserted that the boy's mother was a Roman Catholic, whose dying request to his adopted mother was, to have him trained in that faith; that he had learned this from the adopted mother herself; and that her son, a gentleman of high standing, had so directed the professors of St. Mary's college; and he even obtained from one of those Jesuits a certificate to this effect.—Providentially it so happened, that whilst the subject was exciting public attention, the gentleman who was said to have directed the boy to be taught the Romish faith, reached the town (Bardstown, Ky.), and immediately gave me a certificate that he had given no such direction; that the boy's mother was not known to have been a Roman Catholic, and had never made such a request as the President of St Joseph's had pretended. * Thus did those Rev. gentlemen abuse the confidence placed in them, and then fabricate stories to shield themselves from merited reproach. Many similar facts might be stated; but it is unnecessary. It is a fact, that the schools established in our country are regarded as a most important part of that machinery by which the Roman clergy hope to promote and establish their faith.—Will they not, then, do their utmost to bring about the desired result? They may not, in all cases, make direct efforts to convince the children of Protestants, that the religion of their pa-

* These facts, and others connected with the case, were published in the *Western Protestant*, then edited by the author of these lectures, in Bardstown, Ky., in the summer of 1836. The Protestant was the first paper in the West, so far as the editor is informed, devoted to the Romish controversy.

Digitized by Google

rents is heresy; for often they will see that indirect influences are likely to be the most effectual.

Some years ago, Bishop Flaget, of Bardstown, Ky., wrote to his friends in Europe, as follows: "Still, had I treasures at my disposal, I would multiply colleges, and schools for girls and boys; I would consolidate all these establishments, by annexing to them lands or annual rents; I would build hospitals and public houses: in a word, I would compel all my Kentuckians to admire and love a religion so benevolent and generous, *and perhaps I should finish by converting them.*" The editor of the Annals of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith, comments as follows on Bishop Flaget's communication: "Mgr. Flaget has established in his diocese many convents of nuns, devoted to the education of young females. These establishments do wonderful good. Catholics and Protestants are admitted indiscriminately. The latter, after having finished their education, return to the bosom of their families, full of esteem and veneration for their instructresses. They are ever ready to refute the calumnies which the jealousy of heretics loves to spread against the religious communities: *and often, when they have no longer the opposition of their relations to fear, they embrace the Catholic religion.*" In the publications made by the Roman clergy in this country, concerning these schools, Protestant parents are assured that no influence will be exerted on the minds of their children, to change their religious sentiments, or to convert them to Popery. But in their communications to their patrons in Europe, they boast of the number of Protestant children converted, who, so soon as they can do so, openly embrace the Romish faith. Representations so contradictory, can never be reconciled with truth and candor; and none but a corrupt system of religion would seek to sustain itself by such means.

But even if the conductors of Roman schools should strictly regard their pledge not to interfere with the religious sentiments of Protestant children, it would still be most unsafe to commit to them their education. They cannot give such an education as American parents should desire their children to have; and the

Digitized by Google

various influences brought to bear upon them, directly or indirectly, would still secure the conversion of many of them to Popery. It will be found, on examination, that the large proportion of the youth educated in Roman schools, if they are not decided converts, are decidedly prejudiced in favor of their teachers and of their religious faith. There are in the minds of all of us, pleasing and hallowed recollections connected with our school-boy days; and it is most unwise in parents to allow those pleasing recollections to be associated with religious error and a loose morality.

The very best that Protestant parents hope for their children, when placed in Roman schools, is, that they will not be seriously injured as to their moral and religious principles. They do not expect them to receive correct religious instruction. But what right have parents to place their children beyond the reach of scriptural instruction and Christian influence, during that most interesting period of life, when the deepest and most permanent impressions are made upon them? What right have they to expose them to dangers which more mature minds often fail to resist? When they pray for themselves—"Lead us not into temptation"—what kind of a prayer do they offer for their children whom they have placed in Roman schools?

I cannot close this lecture without saying something particularly concerning those *nunneries* in which so many Protestant children are educated. The nuns all take the vow of *poverty*, *chastity*, and *obedience*. However rich the institution with which they are connected, they possess nothing. Separated from friends and relatives, they must yield the most implicit obedience to their superiors. They are the best *slaves* in the world. Their vows are more potent than the legal claims of slaveholders; and as they are taught to believe that sufferings endured in this life will shorten their stay in the fires of purgatory, they deny themselves the comforts of life, and endure the greatest hardships most willingly. Or, if they discover their error, and deplore the folly committed in taking such vows upon them, there is no escape from their gloomy prison. It is so disreputable in the view of Roman-

Digitized by Google

ists to return to the world, that they prefer suffering even unto death, to such a course.

Nunneries are *money-making* establishments. Some of the nuns are employed as teachers; some are house and kitchen servants; and some labor in the fields! In Kentucky they have been seen in the harvest fields, driving the ox-cart, making a fire for the priest, saddling his horse, and the like. All their labors are performed, as already intimated, without hope of pecuniary compensation. There is a nunnery near Bardstown, Ky., located on a farm of several hundred acres, the number of whose female boarders has averaged from one hundred to one hundred and fifty. The charges for each, including *extras*, would not be less than one hundred and fifty dollars. The annual income of the institution is not less than *fifteen thousand* dollars. The outlay is not very considerable, since their provisions are mainly raised on the farm. If I were to set down the clear annual profit of the institution at *ten thousand* dollars, I should probably be below the mark. Almost the whole of this money is earned by the nuns; but no part of it goes to them. Their coarse fare and clothing is all they receive. The clergy are enriched by the degradation of these poor women, whom they have succeeded in deluding. I know not how others may feel, but it appears to me, that every Christian and every American should set his face against those prisons, where females are incarcerated and degraded from the sphere they are destined to fill.

But what is the real character of the nunneries of our country? Are they as pure in morals as they should be? Who knows? The nuns are unmarried females. Unmarried men have access to those establishments at all times; and the inmates are expected to confess all their sins to them. The affairs of the institution are concealed from the eye of the public. Most of the nuns are not known, perhaps, to a human being within hundreds of miles of them. Some may be removed to a distance, and others take their places, and the change may never be known to the community in which the nunnery is located. There is every possible facility for concealing vices which can scarcely be committed by

Digitized by Google

others without detection. It is a fact, admitted even by Roman writers, that multitudes of the priests and bishops, and even some of the popes, have disregarded their vow of chastity. It is admitted, as I proved in a preceding lecture, that many, very many priests, whilst hearing confessions, have fallen into gross vice and ruined their penitents. It is notorious, that in other countries, vice has fonnd its way into nunneries; and they have become corrupt. What evidence, then, have we, that those secret establishments among us are what they should be? Suppose a number of unmarried Protestant ministers should conclude to establish institutions of a similar character, and should collect from all quarters unmarried females, secluded from public view; would they be tolerated in such a course? And suppose that some of those women should live in their houses with them, as they do in the houses of the Roman bishops—houses not by any means so public as those of other men, but removed from the street, and surrounded by a high wall; what would be thought of such men? And what right have the Roman clergy to claim public confidence, when pursuing a course that would be considered most disreputable in other men of equal claims to confidence?

I must here take leave to give you a very brief history of a case in point. Some twelve years ago, a nun in Kentucky left the institution with which she was connected, and returned to her father's house, alleging as her reason the improper conduct of the presiding priest towards her. Her father and relatives were ignorant and bigoted Papists. They regarded her as guilty of a horrid crime in preferring charges against one of the *holy priesthood;* and she was driven from home with threats of violence. She went to the house of a Baptist minister, a near neighbor, to whom she told her story. The report soon spread through the neighborhood, that this woman was charging the priest with immorality. A large proportion of the people were Papists; and, of course, there arose much excitement against her. She remained a short time in the neighborhood, and was suddenly missing; and from that day to this, she has never been heard of!

Digitized by Google

The present speaker was then editing a paper in Bardstown; and he published the facts in the case. A suit for libel was instituted against him, by the President of St. Joseph's college, in behalf of the priest implicated in the affair. The damages were laid at *ten thousand* dollars. The suit was pending twelve months. The Roman clergy of Kentucky fully identified themselves with the suit. The weight of all the nunneries in that region, of which there were several, was thrown into the scales. Eminent lawyers were employed on both sides. The priests had every motive to explain the mysterious absence of the nun, and to produce her before the public. The court decided that the defendant was bound to prove the actual guilt of the priest, and that the missing nun was the only competent witness in plea of justification. Much testimony was taken, and many facts not previously published were proved. The verdict of the jury gave the priest damages to the amount of ONE CENT! The character of the jurymen was assailed by some of the friends of the priests, or by the priests in disguise. In consequence of which *nine* of them (two others resided at a distance) made a publication from which I read the following: "He [the writer of the charges against them] again states, that one of the most intelligent of the jury has stated publicly, since the trial, that he was for damages, or heavy damages. If there was any such juror on that jury, he kept his opinion to himself—he did not make it known to the other jurors, as he ought to have done. We do affirm that *one cent* was the highest damages named by any one on that jury in our hearing; and we further state, that every one of the jury, who was for finding a verdict for the plaintiff [the priest], did state that he would glory in making each one pay his own costs, if it were in his power to do so. And we also state, that under all the circumstances, but for the instructions of the court, we would have been compelled to find a verdict for the defendant" [Rice]. The testimony was taken down at the time, signed by the court, and filed among the records of the Nelson County Circuit Court. I immediately published in the Western Protestant, and afterwards in a small volume, a full account of the trial, with the testimony

Digitized by Google

in the case. And it is a fact, that the priests, though they instituted suit professedly for the purpose of obtaining the testimony and laying it before the public, never have published one line of it, nor even the verdict rendered! The public would have remained ignorant of the verdict, but for the Protestant press.

I have given this brief history of the only law-suit in which I was ever involved, because it is the only suit of the kind which has occurred in our country; because it shows the estimation in which the character of a priest and his nunnery were held, where they were well known, where the legal testimony was fully heard, and where the most powerful influences were brought to bear by the bishop and his clergy to sustain the suit.

The fate of MILLY MCPHERSON, the lost nun, is still involved in profound mystery. Many believe, and will believe, that she was murdered to prevent further exposures of the priests and nunneries!

Prudent parents will pause and consider, before they place their daughters in Roman nunneries to be educated. It cannot be, that nuns, the most superstitious of all people, who never think for themselves, are the persons to discipline the minds of female youth to vigorous and independent thinking. It will be found, I apprehend, that the education given in nunneries is far more ornamental than solid. But if they were, what they are not, the best literary institutions in the land, they are not the places for the daughters of Protestant parents. I have in my possession other evidences most conclusive, that the nunneries of our country are not all pure. Some years ago, a Roman priest, who, in consequence of some difficulty with his bishop, had ceased to officiate, though not deposed, placed in my hands several letters of nuns, one addressed to himself, and the others to another priest, which leave no room to doubt, that corruption had found its way into the nunnery with which they were connected. As this nunnery had connected with it a female school to which Protestant parents were sending their daughters, I deemed it my duty to publish them, which I did in the Western Protestant. The Roman

Digitized by Google

clergy preserved a profound silence, never publishing one word by way of vindication.

In the letter addressed to the priest who placed it in my hands, the nun says—"I did not see F. David (the bishop) until the next Tuesday after we got home. I went then to speak to him. He told me he had received my letters in due time, but that I had not opened any secret to him whatever—that he knew these things long before, and that he was not at all astonished at anything that had happened, from the experience of former years.—I do not mention these things to excuse my own faults; neither have I any reason to regret the manifestations I then made, though at the time so repugnant to my feelings. * * * Then let me entreat you, as a friend to virtue, not to let your mind be prejudiced by what is past with regard to the little community now under your pastoral care. [This priest had just taken charge of the nunnery.] If some have had the misfortune to be implicated by them, all have not, to my certain knowledge." &c. Another nun addresses her priest in the following style: O! do come and see your *poor sacred dog*—if only to spend a few hours with her. Pray much for your *poor sacred dog*, and favor her with a few lines." This same nun after her priest had turned with scorn and contempt from her, addressed him another letter, in which she says—"Since you have found out the unknown blessing of my being removed from this place, I shall not give way to excessive grief on the occasion. * * * I am very far from wishing to stay with a confessor, that avails himself of every provocation, real or imaginary, to express his aversion to my person, and his regret for my coming back. If I stay it will be through compulsion. * * * If I wished the appellation of *wife*, *sweet-heart*, or *lovely dear*, as you told me I did, I certainly would take some means to gain them."

I take no pleasure in making such developments as these; but nunneries are public institutions, where Protestant parents are invited to educate their daughters; and it is the solemn duty of those who know something of their true character, to lift a warning voice. There may, possibly, be nunneries free from such

Digitized by Google

scandals; but there is so much concealment about them, that it is impossible for the public to know them. And those who know anything of human nature, we would think, would never confide in them.

In conclusion, I must express my deep conviction, that Protestant denominations have committed one capital error in the important matter of education. They have established and endowed colleges for boys and young men; *but they have left female education almost wholly dependent upon individual enterprise.* The consequence has been, and is, that their female schools have been generally short-lived. Teachers, generally, have not funds to erect suitable buildings, furnish apparatus, and place schools on a solid foundation. There have, therefore, been constant efforts and constant failures; and the public, losing confidence in Protestant schools, have turned to those permanently established by Papists.

And why should such a difference be made in providing for the education of the two sexes? Is female education less important, either to church or state? It is not. The earliest and the deepest moral impressions ever made on the mind by human instrumentality are those made by mothers. If the mother of a family be an ignorant, sluttish woman, it matters not what is the character of the father, *the family is ruined.* If the mother be a Roman Catholic, the children will not probably be Protestants.

I should like to say much more on this important subject; but I have already occupied much of your time. Allow me to say, that the Roman clergy understand this subject. They have seen the error of Protestants; and they have multiplied female institutions in every part of the country. They are far more numerous than their colleges and schools for boys. I trust the day is at hand when Presbyterians and Protestants generally will awake to the incalculable importance of this subject, and will establish permanent female institutions of a proper character, and so endowed as to place a good education within the reach of the poor, as well as the rich.

My friends, I now close this series of lectures on Popery and

Digitized by Google

Protestantism, which has occupied the attention of large and intelligent audiences for a number of evenings. I commenced them with the purpose of avoiding *personal abuse*, and yet of speaking with much plainness of speech against the dangerous errors of Rome. I am conscious of no unkind feeling toward Roman Catholics. I sincerely believe that I should do them the greatest possible kindness, could I convince them of their errors, and prevail on them to take the Word of God as "a lamp to their feet and a light to their path." The authors I have quoted are almost exclusively Roman Catholics, of high standing in their own church. I have examined this whole subject, with great care, for years past. I have read, not the writings of Protestants, but of Papists. My conclusions have been formed after due deliberation. I have now discharged an important duty; and I leave those who have heard me, to judge of the arguments adduced. I do not complain of the Roman clergy, when they pursue a similar course. In the cathedral in this city they have freely, and often in offensive language, preached on the points of controversy between Protestants and the church of Rome. I only wish they were less afraid of meeting us fairly on these great questions. Truth has everything to gain by fair discussion.

May the God of all truth teach us, that we may know and obey the truth, through Jesus Christ, our glorious Redeemer. Amen.

Digitized by Google

DAY AND THOMSON'S SERIES:

BEING A NEW AND COMPLETE COURSE OF MATHEMATICS FOR SCHOOLS AND ACADEMIES, BY JEREMIAH DAY, LL.D., LATE PRESIDENT OF YALE COLLEGE, AND JAMES B. THOMSON, A.M.

The following is a summary of the General Plan:—

1. The series is *practical* in the fullest sense of the term.
2. *Unity of design* runs through the whole series; while it embraces all the subjects necessary for a *thorough mathematical* education.
3. Great care is taken never to *anticipate* a principle, and never to use one principle in the explanation of another, until it has itself been *explained* or *demonstrated.*
4. It abounds in examples for practice. Without *much practice* it is impossible to make the application of the rules *well understood and remembered.*
5. The definitions are designed to be *simple* and *exact*, yet free from *redundancies* of expression.
6. The arrangement of subjects is *systematic* and *natural.*
7. The mode of reasoning is *inductive*, *clear*, and *logical.*
8. The rules are *plain* and *brief.*
9. Every principle is carefully *analyzed*, and the *reason* of the rules fully explained.
10. One principle is explained at a time, and a sufficient number of examples is given under it, to make its *application well understood.*
11. When a principle or term has been defined in one part of the series, if that principle or term occurs in a different part, the same definition is used.
12. The explanations are *simple*, *direct*, and *clear*; and the examples for illustration, are *practical* and *apposite.*

NO. 1.—MENTAL ARITHMETIC,

Or First Lessons in Numbers for Children, by JAMES B. THOMSON, A. M. New edition, revised and enlarged. 18mo, 108 pages, half bound. 15 cents.

This work commences with the simplest combinations of numbers, and *gradually* advances, as the mind of the learner expands, and is prepared to comprehend more difficult questions.

"Thomson's 'Mental Arithmetic' I think is much the best I have ever examined. It seems to me to be the very thing needed by the youthful mind, when first entering upon the science of numbers."—*James M'Giffert, A M., Sup't. Com. Schools, Greenport, N.Y., late Prof. Mathematics, city of New York.*

"I take pleasure in stating that the plan and arrangement of the work are superior to any with which I am acquainted The directions for using that almost indispensable piece of apparatus, the *Numeral Frame*, and the notes for the aid of the young teacher, contribute greatly to its usefulness and value, and are sufficient to commend the work to every teacher of Common Schools."—*W. F. Phelps, Esq., Principal of the Experimental School attached to the New York State Normal School.*

NO. 2.—PRACTICAL ARITHMETIC,

Uniting the Inductive with the Synthetic modes of Instruction, also illustrating the principles of Cancelation, for Schools and Academies. By JAMES B. THOMSON, A.M. New edition, revised and enlarged. 12mo, 342 pages, half bound. 38 cents.

The design of this work is to lead the pupil to a knowledge of Arithmetic by *induction*, to *analyze* every principle separately, and to make him thoroughly acquainted with the *reason* of every operation which he is required to perform. It abounds in examples, and is *eminently practical.*

"Thomson's Practical Arithmetic will commend itself to Teachers for the *clearness* and *precision* with which its rules and principles are stated, for the number and variety of examples it furnishes as exercises for the pupil, and especially for the *care* which the author has taken to present appropriate suggestions and observations wherever they are needed, to clear up any difficulties that are likely to embarrass the learner. In recommending the work as a class-book for pupils, it is not unimportant to state, that the author has him-

Digitized by Google

self had much experience in the business of instruction, and has thus had occasion to know where there was room for improvement in the elementary treatises in common use. Without such experience, no one can be qualified to prepare a class-book for schools — *A. D. Stanley, A.M., Prof. of Mathematics, Yale College.*

"I am particularly pleased with the practical character of your Practical Arithmetic, the *systematic* and *natural* arrangements of its parts, the *exactness* of the definitions, the *clearness* with which the *principles* are explained and illustrated, and the concise, yet explicit language with which the *rules* are stated. You have done a good service by removing from the tables of Weights and Measures all denominations *out of use*, and by introducing those adopted by the General Government. The work, in fine, is *well adapted* to the purposes of instruction."—*Samuel Green, A.M., Principal of the Philips' Grammar School, Boston, Mass.*

"*New York, June*, 1847.

"The undersigned, Commissioners and Inspectors of Common Schools of the Thirteenth Ward, take great pleasure in stating that after a careful and prolonged examination into the relative merits of a great number of Arithmetics, presented for their consideration, (which number embrace all the most popular ones in present use,) have unanimously adopted *Day and Thomson's Mental*, and *Practical* Arithmetics for use in *Ward School, No* 19., recently organized and opened under their supervision. These books being considered for *perspicuity* of arrangement, and *adaptation* to the comprehension of the pupil, with, or in the absence of a teacher, preferable to any books on the same subject, which have come under their consideration."—*William A. Walters, William Tyler Anderson, Charles D. Field. (One vacancy in the Board.)*

NO. 3.—KEY TO PRACTICAL ARITHMETIC

Containing the Answers to all the Examples; with many suggestions, and the solution of the most difficult questions. 12mo. 88 cents.

*** The Mental Arithmetic has been published about a year, and the Practical Arithmetic about a year and a half. They have been adopted by the State of Rhode Island; Ontario, Livingston, Onondaga, Greene, and Oswego counties, N. Y.; the City of New Haven, Connecticut; Springfield, Mass; Buffalo, N. Y., and a large number of Academies and Schools. No school books have given more entire satisfaction than these Arithmetics. Their success, it is believed, has been unparalleled.

NO. 4.—HIGHER ARITHMETIC,

Or the Theory and Application of Numbers, combining the Analytic and Synthetic modes of Instruction, adapted to Scientific and Commercial purposes. By JAMES B. THOMSON, A.M. Large 12mo, full bound in leather. 75 cents. Just published.

This work is complete in itself, commencing with the fundamental rules, and extending to the highest department of the Science. It is constructed on the principle, that in Arithmetic, "there is a place for everything, and that everything *should* be in its *proper* place;" that there is a *reason* for every operation, and the learner should *understand* it. It is designed for advanced classes in Schools and Academies, who are preparing for the important office of *Teaching*, or *extended mercantile pursuits.*

NO. 5.—KEY TO THE HIGHER ARITHMETIC:

Containing the Answers to all the Examples, with many suggestions, &c

NO. 6.—ELEMENTS OF ALGEBRA,

Being a School Edition of *Day's Large Algebra.* 75 cents. (Durrie & Peck.)

This work is designed to be an *easy* and *lucid transition* from the study of Arithmetic to the higher branches of Mathematics. It is highly recommended by Prof. Olmsted, and the Faculty of Yale College; also by Bishop Potter, Presidents Nott, Wayland, Hopkins North, and others.

NO. 7.—KEY TO THE ELEMENTS OF ALGEBRA.

Containing all the Answers, with numerous suggestions. 75 cents. (Durrie & Peck.)

NO. 8.—ELEMENTS OF GEOMETRY,

Being an Abridgement of Legendre's Geometry, with *Practical* Notes and Illustrations. Bound in leather. 75 cents. (Durrie & Peck.)

This work has received the warmest approbation of many of the most *eminent Teachers* and *practical Educators.*

NO. 9.—ELEMENTS OF TRIGONOMETRY, MENSURATION, AND LOGARITHMS. In press.

NO. 10.—ELEMENTS OF SURVEYING;

Adapted both to the wants of the Learner and the Practical Surveyor. (Pub. soon.)

Digitized by Google

GALE'S NATURAL PHILOSOPHY AND ASTRONOMY,

Embracing the general principles of Mechanics, Hydrostatics, Hydraulics, Pneumatics, Acoustics, Optics, Electricity, Galvanism, Magnetism, and Astronomy. Illustrated by several hundred engravings. Designed for the use of Schools and Academies. Twentieth edition. By LEONARD D. GALE, Professor of Geology and Mineralogy in the city of New York, and Lecturer on Chemistry and Natural Philosophy. 63 cents.

This book is extensively used in the State of New York, and is the only text book on Philosophy and Astronomy in use in the Public Schools of Cincinnati. It is highly recommended.

GRAY'S ELEMENTS OF CHEMISTRY.

Revised edition. Containing the principles of the Science both Theoretical and Practical; intended as a text book for Academies, High Schools, and Colleges. Illustrated with numerous engravings. By ALONZO GRAY, A. M., of the Teachers' Seminary, Andover.

Mr. Gray has a happy faculty of communicating instruction in this useful and interesting study. The book is in very general use in the Academies and High Schools in the States,—the present revised edition contains all the improvements in the science.

HALL'S CHILD'S INSTRUCTOR IN READING.

HITCHCOCK'S GEOLOGY.

A new and revised edition of "*Elementary Geology.*" By EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D.D., L.L.D., President of Amherst College, and Professor of Natural Theology and Geology, with an Introductory Notice by JOHN PYE SMITH, D.D., of London. Copiously illustrated. 362 pages, 12mo, Sheep. $1 25.

This is the most able and satisfactory work for a student of Geology, to be found in this country The book was reprinted in London, and highly recommended by that able Geologist and scientific gentleman, John Pye Smith, D.D.

"I have obtained a copy of your Treatise on Geology. It is an admirable work. It has been my carriage companion for some time."—*Gideon A Mantell, LL.D. F.R.S. F.G.S., &c &c., London. Author of Wonders of Geology, &c.*

"I thank you sincerely for a copy of your work, and yet more for presenting us with an Elementary Treatise on Geology, in a form so well adapted to the wants of instructors. Having for several years past felt the want of just such a book for my Class in the University, I hailed its appearance with real satisfaction."—*Prof. Henry D. Rogers, of the University of Pennsylvania.*

"Your elementary book on Geology has afforded me great pleasure; and I have, since our Catalogue was printed, adopted it as a text book."—*Prof. C. B. Adams, Middlebury College.*

"Prof Hitchcock has been too long and favorably known to scientific men, both of the new world and of the old, to make it necessary for us to say, with what ample qualifications he undertakes the task before him His work is no 'secondary formation,' based on the published works of European writers, but in every part bears the impress of acute and original observation, and happy tact in presenting the immense variety of subjects treated in the following Sections into which the book is divided.

"The fifth Section is devoted to Organic Remains. It occupies one-fourth of the whole work, and is illustrated with the best cuts in the book. We venture to say there is not in our language so neat and compressed, yet so clear and correct, an account of the 'Wonders of Geology.' "—*North American Review.*

McELLIGOTT'S ANALYTICAL MANUAL.

Manual, Analytical and Synthetical of Orthography and Definition. By JAMES N. McELLIGOTT, Associate Principal of the Collegiate School, and late Principal of the Mechanics' Society Institute, New York. Fifth edition, 216 pages, 8vo. 75 cents.

McELLIGOTT'S YOUNG ANALYZER:

Being an easy outline of the course of instruction in the English language presented in McElligott's Analytical Manual, designed to serve the double purpose of Spelling Book and Dictionary, in the younger classes in Schools. By J. N. McELLIGOTT.

The design and value of these books will be sufficiently shown in the following recommendations:

Digitized by Google

"I have examined with some care the 'Manual of Orthography and Definition,' prepared by Mr. J. N. McElligott, of this city, and take pleasure in commending it to the favorable consideration of the friends of education.

"There is a fund of good sense, practical wisdom, and useful arrangement in this work, not often combined within the same limits. It will, I am persuaded, greatly facilitate the study of our language; and teachers, as well as learners, will find cause for thankfulness to the meritorious author."—*Hon. Theo. Frelinghuysen, Chancellor of the New York University.*

"'Manual, Analytical and Synthetical, of Orthography and Definition,' by J. N. McElligott, Principal of the Mechanics' Society School, New York. Having been for many years personally acquainted with the author of this book, we were prepared to expect the evidences of sedulous industry, sound judgment, and practical skill which its pages exhibit. In his volume will be found not only the completion of the object aimed at, but most imperfectly reached in Oswald's Etymological Dictionary, Tor n's Analysis, and several other works of the kind, but also, such modifications, additions and improvements of the design itself, as cannot fail to render it a far better substitute than any of these, for a knowledge of Greek and Latin in the study of English orthography and definition, and a much more serviceable Manual for the teacher in the business of instruction. One of the most valuable additions consists in tracing, in a systematic way, the connection between the primary and metaphorical meanings of words,—a design hitherto scarcely attempted in school books. The scholar who faithfully studies it, will become critically versed in the formation and comparison of words, and will seldom be in danger of misspelling a derivative, or misunderstanding its proper meaning."—*Baptist Advocate.*

NEWMAN'S PRACTICAL SYSTEM OF RHETORIC,

Or the Rules and Principles of Style, inferred from examples of writing, to which is added a Historical Dissertation on English Style. By SAMUEL P. NEWMAN, Professor of Rhetoric in Bowdoin College. 312 pages, 12mo, Sheep. 63 cents.

This Book has been extensively introduced into the schools of this country; it has also been republished in England, and is in general use in the schools of that country.

The Plan of the Book is Philosophical and Practical.

NEWMAN'S ELEMENTS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.

324 pages, 12mo. 63 cents.

The undersigned is happy to express his high opinion of the elements of Political Economy prepared by the late Prof. Samuel P. Newman. I think it has all the plainness and simplicity which characterizes the treatise on Rhetoric by the same author, and which are so indispensable in a text book for schools; while a scientific arrangement and the many technical terms have been preserved, the style is so perspicuous, and the illustrations are so pertinent, as to render the book attractive to the young scholar. Another excellence of the work is its adaptation to the habits and institutions of our countrymen. On this point the author bestowed special pains, and, as it is believed, his success was corresponding. It is not a compilation from an European work, based on usages and a state of society which have no existence here, but it is throughout "an American production."

The great principles of the science are stated with as much fulness and detail as is consistent with the size of the book and its adaptation to its contemplated topics. The author has exhibited great liberality of views—the interests of one class are not represented as hostile to those of another, but a measure which is really promotive of the prosperity of one part of the country must exert a favorable influence upon other parts. The work is cordially commended as an excellent text book to teachers and all who are interested in the great cause of education.—*B. B. Edwards, Prof. in Andover Theological Seminary.*

PACKARD'S XENOPHON'S MEMORABILIA.

The Memorabilia of Socrates by Xenophon, with English Notes by ALPHEUS S. PACKARD, Professor of Rhetoric, Oratory, and Classical Literature in Bowdoin College. Third edition. 256 pages, 12mo, Muslin. $1 00.

As affording an introduction to the Greek Philosophy and Morals, no one of the Greek Classics is more valuable to the student than the Memorabilia of Xenophon; while at the same time, on account of the matchless simplicity and elegance of its style, and the variety and spirit of its matter, no one is more attractive. In the grammatical Notes and comments by Professor Packard, he has sought to excite the pupil to observe and to inquire for himself, rather than to relieve him from the necessity of labor.

PARLEY'S UNIVERSAL HISTORY.

PARLEY'S YOUNG AMERICAN.

Digitized by Google

SANDERS' SERIES

OF

SCHOOL READERS,

CONSISTING OF

SANDERS' PRIMARY SCHOOL PRIMER;
SANDERS' PICTORIAL PRIMER;
SANDERS' SPELLING BOOK, 168 pages.
SANDERS' SCHOOL READER, 1st Book; 120 pages.
SANDERS' SCHOOL READER, 2d Book; 180 "
SANDERS' SCHOOL READER, 3d Book; 250 "
SANDERS' SCHOOL READER, 4th Book; 364 "
SANDERS' SCHOOL READER, 5th Book; (in press.)

These books constitute the most valuable series ever published—a fact fully evinced by the generous patronage which they have received from the Friends of Education throughout the country. More than two millions have been sold, and the demand is increasing. Their leading advantages are as follows:

1st. The child is taught to read by the use of INTELLIGIBLE WORDS ONLY—beginning with the least, as those of *two* letters, and gradually advancing to those of greater length.

2d. All the words in the first book, or Primer, are learned by the scholar in the spelling lessons, before they meet with them in the reading lessons. Also, the difficult words of each reading lesson, in all the Readers, are *previously* formed into spelling lessons.

3d. In the 3d and 4th Readers, the difficult words are DEFINED in a general and literal sense.

4th. The Primary books contain more lessons of easy reading than other works—there being about NINETY PAGES made up of MONOSYLLABLES.

5th. The PROGRESSION from one book to another, is more regular, gradual, and philosophical than usually found.

6th. The lessons are adapted to INTEREST as well as INSTRUCT.

7th. The practical and judicious use of PICTURES is calculated to ASSIST, and not retard, the efforts of the teacher.

8th. The PRACTICAL INSTRUCTIONS in the Rhetorical principles of reading and speaking, contained in the 4th Reader, constitute a distinguishing characteristic of the work.

9th. At the end of each lesson for reading, questions are asked, with reference to the proper inflections, emphasis, &c., which should be adopted in reading the lesson with propriety.

10th. In connection with the questions, are references to the instructions in other parts of the work.

11th. The PRINT is large and distinct, gradually diminishing from the

Digitized by Google

large print of the Primer to that of the ordinary size, contained in the 4th Reader.

12th. A greater VARIETY, both in style and subject, is found in this series than is usual in books of the kind.

13th. The SPELLING and PRONUNCIATION throughout the series are uniformly in accordance with those of Dr. Webster.

14th. The INSTRUCTIONS in the SOUNDS and POWER of letters, as well as the "GENERAL RULES FOR SPELLING," are more clearly presented in "Sanders' Spelling Book," than any other work of the kind.

The Convention of State and County Superintendents of Schools in Vermont, held pursuant to adjournment in the State House, Montpelier, Oct. 14, 1846, unanimously recommended SANDERS' SERIES OF SCHOOL BOOKS, consisting of Sanders' Spelling Book, Pictorial or Primary School Primer, and Sanders' Readers, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, for the uniform adoption in the Common Schools of the State. Of this Convention HON. D. M. CAMP was President.

From the Rev. J. C. Young, D. D. President of Centre College, Danville, Ky.

From the examination which I have given to Sanders' Series of School Books, I feel warranted in recommending them to the public as works of merit. *In some important points I consider them superior to any books of the kind which I have ever seen.*

JOHN C. YOUNG.

Extract from a letter from Rev. Stephen Martindale and Dr. Nathaniel Ives, the County Committee on Reading Books for Rutland Co., Vt.

To Mr. C. W. Sanders:—

Sir—Comparatively it is but light praise to say that the lessons are admirably arranged to give the necessary healthful exercise to the opening and expanding intellect of the pupil; gradually increasing from the simpler forms of ideas to those that are complex, and by easy gradations, progressing to even the initiatory forms of profound ratiocination, all in a clear, pure, and at times even an elevated style, that cannot fail to be of essential service to pupils using these books. The grand crowning excellence of this series, is the rich vein of sound philosophy and truly Christian morality, that pervades the whole; uncontaminated by even an appearance of that sickly pseudo imitation of Christianity, with which we have found some works of this class to be unhappily replete: and which, under the specious mask of an outward respect for the principles of our holy religion, artfully inculcate the idea that man, unaided by divine grace, is perfectly able to render himself all that God requires; and that, as a necessary consequence, the Christian religion, being in reality unnecessary, is, in truth, but a useless and burdensome form of superstition.

In conclusion, allow us to assure you that it will afford us unalloyed satisfaction, to learn that the public appreciate your works in a degree commensurate with their merits.

We are, sir, respectfully and truly yours,

STEPHEN MARTINDALE,
NATHANIEL IVES.

Wallingford, Rutland Co., Vt., September 18, 1846.

Digitized by Google

From the Rev. P. B. Wilber, President of the Wesleyan Female College, Cin'ti.

Mr. Sanders,—Dear Sir,—I have examined, with as much care as circumstances would permit, your series of School Books consisting of the Primary School Primer, Spelling Book, and the First, Second, Third and Fourth Readers; and think them well calculated to accomplish the end for which they were severally intended—indeed I consider them superior in several important respects to any similar works with which I am acquainted. We shall introduce them after this quarter into this institution.

I am, dear sir, very respectfully yours, &c., P. B. WILBER.

St. Louis English and Classical High School.

Mr. Sanders,—Dear Sir,—I have examined with some care your Primer, Spelling Book, First, Second, Third and Fourth Books of Reading; and in expressing an opinion upon their merits, need only say that I concur with the general testimony of those whose recommendations of the series are already made public. It is my intention as soon as expedient to introduce them into my school.

Respectfully, EDWARD WYMAN, Principal.

An extract from a communication to the Board of Trustees and Visitors of the Common Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio, signed by the SEVENTY TEACHERS of that city.

After examining such reading books as we have had access to, we are of opinion that the Series of Readers, known as Sanders' Series, have merits which highly recommend them to your favorable notice—some of which are peculiar. We believe that the important object of gradually progressive lessons, both in subjects and language, is more nearly attained in that series than any other with which we are acquainted.

Signed by SEVENTY TEACHERS, Cincinnati.

From John Griscom, Town Superintendent of Schools, Burlington, N. J.

Having carefully looked over the Series of Reading Books for Schools, prepared by Charles W. Sanders, I have no hesitation in regarding them as compilations exceedingly well adapted to promote in our common schools correct and enlightened habits of intonation, inflection, pauses, emphasis, and fluency of utterance. The Spelling and Definitions which precede each lesson, will facilitate the pupil's understanding of the meaning of his lessons,—and a point of more consequence than all, is, that the lessons are so selected as to imbue his mind with the love and the spirit of Christian morality, and enlightened views of social duty. Without instituting a comparison with other books, I think the guardians of youth will hazard nothing in adopting this series of Readers into their schools.

JOHN GRISCOM.

Burlington, N. J., 12mo. 18th, 1845.

SANDERS' FIFTH READER—in Press.

The repeated and urgent solicitations of Teachers who have used Sanders' Readers, already published, and have expressed their unqualified approbation of their merits, have induced the author to prepare a FIFTH READER which, it is believed, will sustain the reputation acquired by the previous Numbers.

The work will be ready for the market the ensuing season.

Digitized by Google

PORTER'S RHETORICAL READER.

The Rhetorical Reader, consisting of Instructions for regulating the voice, with Rhetorical Notation, illustrating Inflection, Emphasis and Modulation, and a Course of Rhetorical Exercises designed for the use of Academies and High Schools. By EBENEZER PORTER, D.D., President of the Theological Seminary, Andover. 304 pages, 12mo. 63 cents.

It would seem superfluous to say anything, by way of introduction, to this popular and highly useful School Book; the fact that it has already passed through more than *three hundred editions* and is yearly increasing in sale, speaks for itself as to the merit of the book, and to the high estimate placed upon it as a Reading Book, among the most intelligent Teachers. It is used in every State of the Union.

WILLSON'S HISTORICAL SERIES.

WILLSON'S JUVENILE AMERICAN HISTORY.
WILLSON'S HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.
WILLSON'S AMERICAN HISTORY.
WILLSON'S COMPREHENSIVE CHART OF AMERICAN HISTORY.
WILLSON'S "OUTLINES OF GENERAL HISTORY.

NO. 1.—WILLSON'S JUVENILE AMERICAN HISTORY.

For Primary Schools; on the same general plan as the History of the United States. Embracing the most interesting and morally instructive incidents and events in American History, commencing with the Life of Columbus. Handsomely Illustrated. 160 pages.

"This work is designed for younger classes in Schools; commencing with the discovery of this Continent, it gives a sketch of our history down to the present day. Hitherto much difficulty has been encountered in introducing the study of History into Schools, from the marked deficiencies of the works compiled for use in juvenile classes, as well in point of accuracy, as in their imperfect adaptedness to the wants of the young. Mr Willson has compiled this work with the blunders of his predecessors before his eyes, and has evidently done what man can do, to avoid their errors; that is, he has investigated closely, has faithfully collated and verified his facts and dates, and as a natural consequence, has produced a most accurate work. The accuracy of his work, however, is by no means its sole excellence; his narrative is given in a clear, simple style, comprehensible to the very young; his biographical sketches of distinguished men, as of Washington, or Franklin, are in language forcible and vividly descriptive, holding up to our view, a distinct picture of the man, as if we had him face to face. These biographies form no unimportant portion of the work, for with us, the history of our eminent men, is in a great degree, the history of our country.

"Many of the lessons are accompanied by judicious pictorial illustrations, and to the description of each State is affixed a neat engraving of its seal, or armorial device. Allusion is continually made, throughout the work, to the geography of the parts described; in recording any important event, its place of occurrence is presented in a marginal map, thus associating the event with its locality, and more deeply impressing both on the mind of the pupil.

"So far as Historical truth will permit, the author has excluded that constant allusion to scenes of bloodshed, so generally, and that too in terms of admiration, laid before the readers of History: this characteristic of the work, should alone recommend it Such descriptions can only tend to vitiate the taste of the child,—their moral effect is such, that no place should be allowed them in any school book; unless it be in reprobation of them.

"As a means of impressing upon the young correct views of our past history, we have seen no equal to this work of Mr Willson, and from our own high opinion of its merit, supported as it is, by that of many distinguished critics and instructors, we do not hesitate to commend it to the public, as well fitted for general use."—*Western School Journal.*

NO. 2.—WILLSON'S HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Commencing with the discovery of America, and brought down to the 4th of March, 1845. This work presents the following claims to public favor:—1st. Superior Accuracy. 2d. Chronological Arrangement of Dates—wholly in new style. 3d. Illustrative Maps and Charts, and copious Geographical Notes, exhibiting to the eye, and describing all important localities referred to. 4th. Marginal Arrangement of the Questions. 358 pages, 12mo.

Digitized by Google

The Publishers invite the critical attention of teachers and others interested in education to the merits of Willson's History of the United States, for Schools. It has been introduced, after a rigid examination, into the Public Schools of New York City—the State Normal School at Albany—the Public Schools in Newark, Brooklyn, Rochester, Buffalo, Cincinnati and St. Louis—it is in use also in many of the best Male and Female Academies and Seminaries in the country We ask its farther introduction *on its merits alone*, firmly persuaded that it has merits possessed by *no other* School History. Its peculiarities are—superior accuracy, both in facts and dates—geographical Notes at the bottom of the page, and small Maps and Plans, illustrating and having direct reference to the facts recorded on the same page—Chronological arrangement of dates wholly in "New Style"—Marginal arrangement of the Questions, forming a complete Analysis of the History; the book also contains a miniature Chart of American History, with dates from 1509 to 1845. Three maps, showing by means of light and shade, the progress of civilization and settlement. The history embraces a period of three hundred and fifty-three years, dvided into four periods, beginning with the discovery of America by Columbus The best historians have been consulted, public documents searched, errors in other histories corrected, and the whole adapted with admirable skill to practical use in the schoolroom. The Publishers invite a comparison with any other history for schools extant. The book is printed on good paper and substantially bound, and is furnished to schools at as low a price as any of the inferior histories containing the same amount of reading matter. Teachers and School Committees will be furnished with copies for examination by the Publishers.

Read the following from Cincinnati: "The Text Book Committee having examined Marcius Willson's History of the United States, would hereby recommend it as a suitable book for the use of the Common Schols of the city. We would suggest that hereafter it should be used in the place of Mrs Willard's Abridgment. The work now recommended is one of great accuracy, clear, and forcible style, embracing a period from 1492, the discovery of the country, to 1845, the opening of the administration of James K. Polk. This History, we think, is well adapted to the use of Schools The miniature Chart of American History shows at a glance, by means of light and shade, the progress of civilization and the settlement of the Anglo-Saxon race upon this continent. The arrangement of the work into four several parts is natural, and renders the work easily remembered. *Period I.* Embraces the History of Voyages and Discoveries till 1607, the first settlement at Jamestown, Virginia, a period of 115 years. *Period II* Extends from the settlement of Jamestown to the American Revolution in 1775, 168 years *Period III* From the commencement of the American Revolution to the administration of George Washington in 1789, a period of 14 years. *Period IV* From George Washington's administration in 1789 to James K Polk in 1845, a period of 56 years The marginal dates, (new style,) as here arranged, we consider of great importance to a school book, when dates are taught as a part of Common School instruction All which is respectfully submitted."—*Chas. S. Bryant, John A. Warder, Wm Phillips, Jr., Text Book Committee.*

"I concur in the recommendation of Willson's History as a Text Book."—*Peyton S. Symmes.* Jan. 18, 1847.

On the 22d Feb., 1847, the Board of Trustees and Visitors of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the United States History, by Marcius Willson be, and the same is hereby adopted by the Board of Trustees and Visitors, as the Text Book to be used in the Common Schools of Cincinnati, in place of the Abridgment by Mrs. Willard."

NO. 3.—WILLSON'S AMERICAN HISTORY.

School Edition and Library Edition, comprising—BOOK I.—Historical Sketches of the Indian Tribes, with a Description of American Antiquities, and an Inquiry into their origin, and the Origin of the Indian Tribes. BOOK II.—History of the United States, (same as the above,) with Appendices additional, showing, 1st, Our relations with European History during our Colonial existence—an Account of the Reformation—History of the Puritan sects, &c.; 2d, An Account of Parties in England during our Revolution, and the European wars in which England was involved by that Contest; 3d, An Examinatien of the Character, Tendency, and Influences of our National Government, and an *Historical* Sketch of the Parties that divided the Country from the close of the Revolution to the termination of the Second War with England. BOOK III.—*Part* 1. History of the present British Provinces, from their Early Settlement by the French to the present time—comprising: History of the Canadas—of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton—Prince Edward's Island—New Brunswick and Newfoundland. Also, the Early History of Louisiana. *Part* 2. History of Mexico from the Conquest by Cortez, to the commencement of the War with the United States in 1846. *Part* 3. History of Texas, from the time of its discovery by La Salle in 1684, to the time of its admission into the American Union in 1845.—One vol. large octavo, 672 pages.

Digitized by Google

The following from the *Poughkeepsie Journal & Eagle* of May 5, 1847, is a just tribute to the merits of "Willson's Historical Works:"—

"These valuable productions, consisting of Juvenile History, a History of the United States, an American History, and a Chart of American History, will readily commend themselves to the intelligence of the public In rendering more reliable and permanent the great monuments of American Freedom, and in erasing those false inscriptions which have long misled the young tourist in his laudable attempts to familiarize himself with the story of our fame—these works will confer a lasting benefit upon our country.

"The Author, unwilling to take anything on trust, has pushed his inquiries into every explored and unexplored region; has drawn his facts from original sources, and they may be relied on as correct in the numerous instances in which he differs from his contemporaries.

"It is stated in some of our text books that the first land discovered by the Cabots was Newfoundland; that the Cabots sailed in 1494 or '95; that they discovered land on the 11th, or as others say the 14th of June; that De Soto's survivors sailed down the Mississippi, and directly to Cuba; that the Cherokees belong to the Mobitian family; that Port Royal was the oldest Christian settlement, &c.

"It is a surprising fact that these Histories correct more than two hundred and fifty errors found in text books, now in daily use in our schools, and it is a matter of grave inquiry whether teachers are not bound immediately to arrest the farther progress of error.

"The introduction of maps on the same page to denote the localities of places not found on ordinary maps, is a valuable improvement. The learner will lose all interest in a place or an event connected with a place, of which he knows not even the locality."

Willson's History for Schools has also received the unqualified recommendation of John Griscom, L L D. of New Jersey; Joshua Bates, Boston; Charles Bartlett, of Poughkeepsie, and other influential and excellent teachers It is also the text book in History in the Public Schools of New York City, Brooklyn, Newark, Albany, Rochester, Buffalo, Cincinnati and St. Louis.

NO. 4.—WILLSON'S COMPREHENSIVE CHART OF AMERICAN HISTORY. On Rollers and Varnished.

This is an elegant Chart of our Own Country's History, neatly engraved, colored, varnished and mounted on rollers, and measuring about four feet by five and a half It is arranged on a plan essentially different from any other historical chart; and yet it is so simple that any intelligent child can readily understand it It embraces the History of all the Countries, Colonies, States, and Provinces of North America: from their first discovery and settlement down to the present time. The Chart, with an accompanying Epitome and Questions, is designed for practical use in the business of instruction, and not for reference merely. Competent teachers who have used it, express the opinion that it will be found as serviceable in teaching History, as maps are in teaching Geography. No description can give any adequate idea of its value.

The following selected from numerous commendatory notices of the Chart, are submitted to the attention of those interested in the cause of education:—

"This Chart is original in its plan, comprehensive in its details, and very perspicuous in its arangement. It teaches *to the eye*, and, by the eye, must greatly aid the reader and student of History An examination of the Chart must be satisfactory to every teacher; and its use in all the higher schools, if not indeed in the common schools, must prove a great accession to the means of education."—*Rev. Chester Dewey, Principal of the Rochester Collegiate Institute, and President of the New York State Teachers' Association.*

"This is a splendid Chart, most admirably adapted to the purposes for which it was designed; and I believe that an individual, or a class, aided by it, would obtain more available knowledge of American History in one month than could be obtained without it in six months. This Chart ought to find a place in every Academy and Common School in the United States"—*Charles Bartlett, Esq., Principal of the Poughkeepsie Collegiate School.*

In a letter to the Book Committee of the Public School Society, *Mr. Wm A Walker, formerly Principal of Public School No. 15, New York City, and now City Superintendent of Schools*, thus speaks of the Chart:—

"It is to the study of History precisely what a map is to the study of Geography; and the writer considers one quite as necessary as the other. With the use of the Chart, I verily believe that as much might be taught to a class in a month, as by present means in a year; and that where a class of forty at present, in a period of some two years, is taught a vague notion of the outlines of History—by the use of Mr. Willson's Chart a whole School might, in two months' time, receive a much fuller knowledge: more comprehensive, much more systematic, and about as precise as the impressions of the senses"

NO. 5.—WILLSON'S "OUTLINES OF GENERAL HISTORY,"

Or "Universal History," is in the course of preparation, and will, when completed, be the most perfect book of the kind ever published. The Work will be on the same General Plan and Arrangement with Mr. Willson's other Histories.

Digitized by Google

DUFFIELD'S REPLY TO PROF. STUART'S STRICTURES

On his recent work, on the Second Coming of Christ, in which his (Prof. Stuart's) false assumptions are pointed out, and the fallacy of his interpretation of different important passages of Scripture is both Philosophically and Exegetically exposed. 183 pages, 12mo, Muslin. 50 cents.

EDWARDS ON THE WILL.

An Inquiry into the Modern prevailing notions respecting that Freedom of the Will, which is supposed to be essential to Moral Agency, Virtue and Vice, Rewards and Punishments, Praise and Blame. By JONATHAN EDWARDS. With an Index. 432 pages, 12mo, Sheep. $1 00.

ERNESTI ON INTERPRETATION,

Accompanied by Notes, with an Appendix containing Extracts from Morris, Beck, Keil, and Henderson. By MOSES STEWART, of Andover. Fourth edition. 142 pages, half cloth, 12mo. 50 cents.

This is the standard work on Bible Interpretation, and is the text book in our best Theological Institutions.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH in the United States of America. 1 vol. 18mo, Muslin. 31 cents.

THE GREAT AWAKENING.

A History of the Revival of Religion in the time of Edwards and Whitfield. By JOSEPH TRACY. 1 vol. 8vo, 433 pages, Muslin. $2 00.

GURNEY ON THE SABBATH.

Brief Remarks on the History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath. By JOHN JOSEPH GURNEY, with Notes by MOSES STUART, D.D., of Andover, Mass. 25 cents.

This is an able and manly defence of the Christian Sabbath, by a prominent member of the Society of Friends. It cannot fail to be read with interest by every friend of the Lord's Day.

HISTORY OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES.

By JAMES HETHERINGTON, Author of the History of the Church of Scotland. 12mo, 312 pages. 38 cents.

This is a true and faithful History of that able body of Divines, by whose labors were produced, the Confession of Faith, the Directory of Public Worship, the Form of Church Government, and the Catechisms which have so long been held as the Standards of the Presbyterian Church in all parts of the world. It is a book worthy of a place in the library of every Evangelical Christian.

HUG'S INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Translated from the Third German Edition, by DAVID FOSDICK, Jr.; with Notes by M. STEWART, Prof., &c., Andover. 780 pages, octavo. $3 00.

This work has long been held in the highest repute in Germany. Gesenius says of the Author: "He excels all his predecessors in deep and fundamental investigations." The translator has well performed his task.

KITTO'S CYCLOPÆDIA OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

A Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. By JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A., &c. Assisted by numerous able Scholars and Divines—British, Continental, and American, whose Initials are affixed to their respective Contributions. Complete in 2 vols. of 700 pages each, and substantially bound. $6 50.

This work contains such information as is indispensable for the right understanding of the Bible and its historical interpretation. It comprehends Criticism, Geography, Natural History and Antiquities, in all their branches, religious, political, social and domestic.

The works of Horn, Calmet and others are now found to be wholly inadequate to the wants of the student. Theological science is progressive, as well as every other; and the "old learning" of the "Bible Dicitionaries" which have for so long a time been in use, is felt to be unequal to the advancement of mankind at the present time.

The efforts of the German Rationalists of the Strauss-school, to resolve all the facts of Bible History into *myths* and fables, has awakened a corresponding spirit of research among sound and Christian scholars; a determination to place the Scriptures upon a basis

Digitized by Google

of indisputable evidence. The result has been, the discovery and accumulation of a mass of information from every portion of the field of biblical learning. A multitude of new, striking and most useful facts have thus been placed at the disposal of the editor of this work He has accordingly availed himself of all the latest discoveries down to the very year of its publication.

Nor is the Cyclopædia compiled by one man alone. Dr. Kitto distributed the subjects discussed, to more than *forty different individuals*, of the first eminence in those departments Their names are attached to their articles, and they are thus individually responsible for them. The Natural History of the Bible was written expressly for this work, by two distinguished Naturalists. The Botany of Scripture by Dr. Royle, of King's College, London. The articles on Scriptural Zoology, by Hamilton Smith, President of the Devon and Cornwall Natural History Society. The articles in the department of Criticism, by Dr. Davidson, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Lancashire Independent College. Those on the Books of the Old and New Testament, by Havernich, Hengstenberg, Dr. Wright of Dublin, and others.

The articles on the New Testament were furnished by Dr. Tholuck, Dr. Alexander, and others.

Various subjects are discussed by Dr. John Pye Smith, Dr. Woods of Andover, and others.

The Scriptural Geography exhibits the results of Dr. Robinson's biblical researches in Palestine.

It will be seen therefore, that the work is a compilation of biblical learning, by the ablest biblical scholars of the age.

The departments which the Editor reserved for himself were those of Antiquities, Religion, Social and Political, together with Geography; each of which he has well and ably filled. It only remains to add a few extracts from the numerous able reviews, criticisms and notices, which have appeared respecting this great and valuable work.

"This Cyclopædia surpasses every Biblical Dictionary which has preceded it, and leaves nothing to be desired in such a work which can throw light on the criticism, interpretation, history, geography, archæology, and physical science of the Bible."—*Horne, Author of "Horne's Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures"*

"The limits of a notice, like the present, forbid such a description of this learned work as its merits deserve, or sufficient to give the reader a just idea of its plan. We regard it a most important and practically useful contribution to the cause of sound biblical learning, and have no doubt that it will soon take the place, in the estimate of scholars, of every compilation of the kind."—*Biblical Repository.*

The publishers ask the attention of students of the Bible to the Cyclopædia, in full confidence that no one acquainted with its character will suffer himself to be without a copy. The low price at which it is offered, (less than half the price of the English edition,) places it within the reach of all.

PORTER'S HOMELETICS.

Lectures on Homeletics and Preaching, and on Public Prayer; together with Sermons and Letters. By EBENEZER PORTER, D.D., President of the Theological Seminary, Andover. Second Edition. 418 pages, 12mo, Muslin. $1 25.

A book that should be in the hands of every Student of Theology and every Clergyman.

ROMANISM NOT CHRISTIANITY;

A series of Popular Lectures, in which Popery and Protestantism are contrasted; showing the incompatibility of the former with Freedom and Free Institutions. By N. L. Rice, D. D., Pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati. Embellished with a fine Portrait of the author, engraved on steel, by Jewett. 1 vol. 12mo. $1.

*** This work has received the highest praise from the Religious papers throughout the Union. It has been published less than two months, yet over two thousand have been disposed of, and the demand is on the increase.

TYNDALE'S TESTAMENT.

The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By WILLIAM TYNDALE, the Martyr; printed from the original edition, 1526; being the first vernacular translation from the Greek: with a Memoir of his Life and Writings. To which are annexed, the essential variations of Coverdale's, Thomas Matthew's, Cranmer's, the Genevan, and the Bishops' Bibles, as Marginal Readings. By J. P. DABNEY. 12mo. $2 00.

This original book is highly valuable to every Clergyman. Often the translation of Tyndale is so lucid and vigorous as to afford an excellent commentary on the common translation. The text is from the London edition of Bagster, and the additions of the variations by Mr. Dabney add greatly to the value of this edition.

Digitized by Google