





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2016 with funding from  
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

---

APRIL, 1833.

---

No. II.

---

---

ART. I. *The Life of William Farel, prepared from original authorities*, by Melchior Kirchhofer, Minister at Stein on the Rhine, in the Canton Schaffhausen, &c. Vol. I. Zurich, 1831. 8vo.\*

THE lives of some men are an integral part of history; and of none is this statement more emphatically true than of the Reformers. Notwithstanding its immediate and ulterior effects, the Reformation is an event which has not yet been fairly estimated by the world. The time is coming when this mighty revolution will be seen to surpass, in every attribute of grandeur, all political convulsions put together; and when those who were the instruments of bringing it about, will, by general consent, take precedence of all who have been recognised as heroes. In the mean time, it is pleasant to extend our knowledge of their personal history, especially in the case of some, with the details of whose biography we have not been familiar. Among these we may reckon that impetuous thunderbolt, and terror of the papists,

\* Das Leben Wilhelm Farel's, aus den Quellen bearbeitet, von Melchior Kirchhofer, Pfarrer zu Stein am Rhein, Cantons Schaffhausen, Mitglied der Schweizerischen geschichtsforschenden Gesellschaft in Bern und korrespondirendes Mitglied der Gesellschaft zur Beförderung der Geschichtskunde zu Freyburg im Breisgau.

Guillaume Farel. The accounts of his life, which we have seen before, are lamentably meager, yielding just enough to kindle a desire of knowing more. We were, therefore, not a little, pleased to find, that his biography had fallen into able, diligent, and friendly hands. The volume now before us was a contribution to the solemnities of a *Reformationsfest* at Neuenburg in 1830. We at first intended to defer our notice of it, till the work should be complete; but as the preface leaves it doubtful whether the public authorities would suffer its completion, we shall present our readers with an abstract of the information thus far furnished.

Our author has been able to add very little to the facts already known respecting Farel's infancy and early education. That he was born at Gap, in Dauphiny, of respectable parents, in the year 1489, and brought up in the strictest principles of popery, is about the sum of what we know in relation to this period of his life; to which we may add the conjecture of our author that the physical peculiarities of Farel's native region helped to form the distinctive features of his character.

In 1512 we find him studying at Paris, where his religious prejudices gained new strength. It is well known, that the philosophy then taught was suited rather to darken than enlighten. The theologians of that famous University appear to have waged perpetual war against refinement, taste, and elegant literature. The great principle, which they inculcated, was submission to the church. Under such instruction, Farel's prepossessions soon became more deeply radicated. To all the monstrous superstitions of the papacy he was devotedly attached. The worship of the saints and monastic austerities he looked upon as fundamental parts of Christianity. In these delusions, he was encouraged and confirmed, not only by the precepts, but the uniform example of his instructor, Jacob Faber. It was in vain, however, that the young man sought, in midnight darkness and absurd observances, for something to satisfy his undefined desires. He felt the need of knowledge, which was furnished neither by the subtillies of Aristotle, nor the Legends of the Saints. This vague feeling of dissatisfaction drove him to the Scriptures; but the light which they imparted was too painful for him. Startled to find how widely his teachers differed from the oracles of God, he tried to banish his uneasiness by a belief, that the true sense of Scripture was not obvious, but latent. This device, however, though sufficient to retain him in his shackles, could not make him love them as he did before. The duties which he once performed with enthusiastic cheerfulness, he now merely toiled through, with a doubtful mind. The glimmering spark had been enkindled, which was soon to shoot up in a strong, clear flame.

This consummation was accelerated by the secret influence of his revered instructor Faber. Even while they continued to unite in their addresses to the Virgin and the Saints, the old man would sometimes say with solemn significancy, "God is about to renovate the world, and you are to be a witness of it." Faber's very devotion to the Saints had begun to correct itself. In his zeal for their honour, he resolved to write their lives. The close contact into which this brought him with their history was made the means of opening his eyes. Rejecting in disgust these childish forgeries, he addressed himself with ardour to the study of the Bible. The similar pursuits of some, and the opposition of others among his colleagues, only quickened his progress till he reached the conclusion—"We will hold fast to the *certain*, and let the *doubtful* go." This change in the teacher could not be without its influence upon a pupil, who had been confirmed in error by respect for him. It was not long before Farel had obtained a satisfactory conviction of that fundamental truth, that God alone is to be worshipped. It was in reference to this auspicious change in his opinions, that he uttered that memorable sentiment, confirmed by all experience: "To a devotee of popery the discovery of its corruptions is so bitter and unbearable,\* that it would drive him either to despair or madness, were it not for the delightful doctrine of redemption through a Saviour, which begins to dawn upon him." There is something deeply affecting in the struggle which succeeded these discoveries. We have read of seamen, who, though giving satisfactory proofs of their conversion, were long unable to renounce their awful habits of profanity, but went on swearing, and weeping over every oath, till they were brought off conquerors. We were forcibly reminded of this fact, by the touching simplicity with which Farel tells how difficult he found it to exclude the Saints from all his supplications, and address them all to God. In process of time, however, he renounced every vestige of idolatry, his new opinions gaining strength with every step of his researches into ecclesiastical history. He now applied himself with ardour to the study of Greek and Hebrew, and his biographer here directs attention to the erroneous statement made by certain writers, that Farel was illiterate. This is so far from being true, that Calvin proposed him as a Professor at Lausanne on the ground of his proficiency in Hebrew learning.

As might have been expected, his rejection of popish idolatry was soon succeeded by an entire rejection of all pomp and ceremonial in the worship of God. The mummeries of the mass and

\* "—so bitter and unerträglich," p. 8.

other public offices, began to appear in their true character, as mere juggling tricks and incantations; and his soul now thirsted for the beautiful simplicity of undefiled religion. The natural result of these momentous changes was an express abandonment of popery, attended with a deep abhorrence of its abominations, and a bitter repentance on account of his own participation in them. The very depth of his previous devotion to the Apostate Church increased his subsequent hostility, and, by calling forth the native strength of his emotions, made him the Boanerges of the Reformation. With such views and feelings, when he looked at the condition of society around him, and as yet had no conception of the means by which a change could be effected, nothing less than the faith of an apostle, and the courage of a martyr, could have saved him from despair. The influence of Faber, and the reputation earned by Farel's diligence, procured him a situation in the college of Le Moine at Paris; an appointment highly creditable from the fact, that none but men of merit were promoted to it. Among his successors in the college may be mentioned the distinguished names of Muretus, Turnebus, and Buchanan. On leaving this situation, which he filled with credit for a short time, he accepted an appointment offered him by Briconet, Bishop of Meaux, who had made himself conspicuous by his avowed attachment to evangelical doctrines, and the zealous discharge of his pastoral functions. The venerable Faber had already been driven, by the vexations which he suffered from his colleagues, to take refuge with the Bishop, and had been followed or accompanied by other men of learning, who were likewise suspected of heretical opinions. The difficulties in which Farel was involved at Paris, in consequence of the notorious change in his belief, made him very willing to assist the Bishop in his churches and his schools. He here enjoyed the society of many zealous and sincere inquirers after truth, some of whom were afterwards distinguished labourers in the work of reformation. In this society, the Scriptures were acknowledged as the only infallible standard of religious truth, and the Bishop, as well as his co-adjutors, preached, without reserve, that any doctrine not there taught was false. It was at this time, and in this situation, that Faber translated the Gospels into French; which, in conjunction with the effect produced upon the income of the mendicant friars by the labours of Briconet, excited an opposition on the part of those religious swindlers, which resulted in a serious persecution. One of the *heretics* was branded in the forehead, and the rest were scattered. A chasm of some months in the chain of documentary materials leaves it doubtful whether Farel went from Meaux to Paris, or to Metz, or to his native country. He is

known to have been in Dauphiny not long after this event, proclaiming the new doctrines in the teeth of an episcopal interdict, though not himself a priest, nor indeed even a member of the church. It was not till afterwards, however, that he assumed the character of a regular public preacher. Nor was he the first to introduce the evangelical doctrines into Dauphiny. One of his pupils and two of his own brothers had planted them there before him. This pupil, the Chevalier Anemund de Coet, was now gone into Switzerland, to escape persecution, and visit the Reformers there. He was soon followed by Farel, leaving the incipient Reformation to be prosecuted by a Minorite, named Peter de Seville, priest at Grenoble, who, in spite of threats and opposition, continued, with a heroic spirit, to sustain the banner of the cross.

The fame of Zuingli and the other Swiss reformers, and the kind reception which they gave to foreigners, encouraged the persecuted heretics of France to take refuge in a country where conscience and opinion were comparatively free. Farel's first visit was to Basle, which enjoyed great reputation, from the presence of Erasmus, some of whose writings were at this time in the press there, as well as from the successful labours of Oecolampadius in behalf of Gospel truth. The fame of Farel went before him, so that on his arrival he was recognised at once as a Reformer, and cordially received by Oecolampadius into his own family. In Basle, he had the happiness to meet with many refugees from France, and among the rest his friend the Chevalier Anemund, whose visit had confirmed him in his resolution to devote his property and talents wholly to the service of religion.

The state of things in Basle, at this juncture, was extremely interesting. The calmness and gentleness displayed by Oecolampadius in his disputations, had exalted him in public opinion and increased his influence. There were two other circumstances which excited a deep interest in his polemic, or rather apologetic, exercises. One was that they were wholly free from scholastic subtilities; the other that they were performed, not in Latin, but in the vulgar tongue. A number of the people, and a majority of the magistrates, appeared disposed to favour his opinions. On the other hand, the members of the University were violent and bitter in their opposition. So far however had the Reformers gone, that in a public disputation they had vindicated the marriage of priests before a numerous assembly. Encouraged by these examples, Farel modestly requested leave from the Regents of the University to defend certain theses, which he had prepared, but was refused. He then applied to the Council of the city, who at once gave him leave to hold a public disputation. The Regents

now prevailed upon the Vicar of the diocese to forbid the attendance of any priest, student, or office-bearer in the University, at Farel's exhibition. The council, regarding this as an encroachment on their powers, issued a counter-manifesto, not inviting merely, but requiring, priests and students to be present at the time and place appointed. Farel's theses, though they recognised all the fundamental principles of the Reformation, had reference chiefly to religious freedom and the paramount authority of Scripture, which they asserted in modest but intrepid language. The details of this debate are not on record; but we know that the impression, which it made upon the people, was powerful and lasting. The learning and piety, combined with zeal and courage, which appeared in Farel upon this occasion, gained him the confidence of all who loved the truth. Oecolampadius speaks of him to Luther as fully competent to fight the whole Sorbonne. From this contest we may date his intimate and uninterrupted friendship, not only with Oecolampadius, but with Conrad Pelican, and other kindred spirits, who, while they warned him of his characteristic faults, regarded him as an invaluable addition to the little band of champions for the truth.

For some months after his public appearance as a disputant, Farel was occupied in visiting different parts of Switzerland, forming acquaintances and friendships which continued till his death. But in proportion as he rose in the estimation of one party, he of course lost the favour of the other. Between him and Erasmus, in particular, there arose a strong dislike. That distinguished character, although he affected moderation and neutrality, had been alienated from the friends of reformation, by the chastisement which he had received from one or two of them in print. The indifference, therefore, which he might have felt towards Farel on his first arrival, was not likely to be turned into regard, by the neglect with which the latter treated him. The truth is, that Farel came to Basle strongly prejudiced against him. The treatment which his own instructor Faber had received in a literary controversy with Erasmus, had made an unfavourable impression, which was much increased by his equivocal position in relation to the church and the Reformers. Farel was never able or desirous to disguise his feelings, and he therefore paid no court on his arrival to Erasmus. The great man's pride was wounded by this seeming superciliousness, and not much soothed by what he heard of Farel's private conversation through his gossiping acquaintances. It seems that with a characteristic recklessness, the open hearted Frenchman uttered sarcasms, which were afterwards reported to the subject of them. He said once, for example, that Erasmus knew less of theology

than the printer Froben's wife; and more than once asserted, that Erasmus knew the truth, but was afraid to own it. A still greater offence was his comparing Erasmus to the prophet Balaam, who was bribed to curse God's people, in allusion to the treatise *de Libero Arbitrio*, which was written at the pope's request, against the author's will and judgment. This last was so galling to Erasmus, that he personally asked an explanation, and on learning that this bitter jest did not originate with Farel, he turned the conversation, and began to dispute about the invocation of saints, and other controverted matters. Of this conversation, the two parties gave accounts entirely different, each charging the other with misrepresentation. It seems, however, that Erasmus got so little satisfaction from it, that he sorely repented of his having given rise to it, and even attempted to make others believe, that he had never honoured Farel with his notice. It soon appeared, that his influence at Basle was too strong for the resistance of a stranger, and the quarrel ended in Farel's departure, by direction of the magistrates. It deserves to be mentioned, as a characteristic circumstance, that Erasmus, even while affecting great indifference to Farel, laboured hard to blacken and belittle him in his correspondence; whereas Farel, though he spoke so unadvisedly with his lips, seldom mentioned Erasmus in his letters, and at no time disrespectfully. This single fact speaks volumes.

After a short visit to Strasburg, and a vain attempt to return to Basle, Farel obtained permission from the Duke of Wurtemberg to preach the gospel at Montbelliard (or, as the Germans write it, Mumpelgard,) where that Prince resided after his ejection from his own dominions. So far as history affords us any light, it would appear that Farel was a mere lay preacher. It was in compliance with the strong solicitations of Oecolampadius, that he undertook to preach at all, but that wise and holy man does not seem to have considered any outward ordination either requisite or proper in the existing state of ecclesiastical affairs. His ministrations were not long without effect upon the people, and the Duke himself appeared completely won. He had very soon, however, to encounter opposition. A dignitary of the order of Franciscans rose in the church at Montbelliard, gave the lie to Farel's statements, and accused him of damnable heresy. In the contest which ensued, and which our author records with some minuteness, both Prince and people were on Farel's side, so that it ended in the Franciscan's making a public recantation and apology before the congregation, and subscribing a paper to the same effect. This result very naturally quickened Farel's zeal and courage, so that all the influence of his wiser friends at Basle

was not able to restrain him from occasional excesses. The correspondence on this subject presents Oecolampadius in a highly favourable point of view. The beautiful conjunction of devoted zeal, with heavenly wisdom and the milk of human kindness in his character, are set off to advantage by the tempestuous ardour of his bolder, but less prudent friend. Farel's intrepidity and promptitude, however, often wrought the best effects; as was seen in the discomfiture of a juggling friar who came among the people with an assortment of choice relics, but soon found it prudent to transfer them to some other market.

In the midst of his pastoral labours, Farel not only maintained a constant correspondence with his friends at Meaux and Basle, but, in compliance with the wishes of Oecolampadius, he became an author. His first publication\* was designed for the instruction of his flock, and was shortly followed by a number of small treatises, the most of which have perished. His friend and colleague Gailling, the court preacher, having been removed in consequence of an application from the Swiss confederacy, Farel was under the necessity of doing all the duties of a minister himself, though even his friends were dubious with respect to the propriety of his administering the sacraments. He continued to do so, however, with the approbation of Oecolampadius, till he left Montbelliard, which he did not long after the departure of the Duke. The immediate cause of his removal is said to have been a violent attack upon a procession in honour of the relics of St. Anthony, though most of the circumstances stated by some writers, as, for instance, his throwing the image of the saint into the water, seem to rest upon a mere tradition. One thing is certain, however, that he continued ever after to cherish a warm affection for his ancient flock.

The sixth chapter of the work before us contains a very interesting statement of the effects produced upon the French and Swiss reformers, by Luther's violent opposition to the Zuinglian doctrine with respect to the Lord's Supper. The extracts from the correspondence show that on the part of those who rejected consubstantiation, there was a moderation and desire of unity very unlike the bitter zeal of their opponents. Of this disposition nothing could be stronger proof than the fact that even the impetuous Farel, in his letters to the adverse party, was conciliatory, moderate, and mild. At the same time, he was exceedingly dissatisfied with those of his own party who continued to connive at popish idolatry in any form or measure. With increased ear-

\* Sommaire; c'est une brève déclaration d'aucuns lieux fort nécessaires à un chacun Chrestien, pour mettre sa confiance en Dieu et à ayder son prochain.

ness, he urged Conrad Pellican to lay aside his sacerdotal vestments, and give over saying mass, until he finally prevailed.

After a short visit to Basle, Farel turned his attention to the district of Aelen, which extends from the Alps to the vineyards of the Rhone. In this region, which was at that time under the government of Berne, he had an opportunity of preaching in his own tongue to a people who had never heard the unadulterated Gospel. He accordingly procured a temporary appointment to instruct the people, which was afterwards rendered permanent by the authorities of Berne. While here, he wrote three letters to Natalis Galeot, of Lausanne, for the purpose of gaining him over to the side of Reformation. His first two letters were unnoticed, and the third received a bitter and contemptuous answer. Soon after he assailed a mendicant friar, who had denounced him and his hearers from the pulpit, and insisted on his uttering a public recantation; and about the same time made an attempt, by letter, to convert the Nuns in the convent of St. Clare, at Vevay, but without effect. In the mean time, he diligently studied all the controversial writings of the day, still adhering to Zuingle on the sacramental question, though he did not hesitate to find fault with the scholastic style of his arguments, as likely to impair their popular effect. He also corresponded with Bucer, Capito, and Bertold Haller, on the leading topics of dispute at that time, freedom of will, and the abrogation of the law. On the latter subject he appears to have used unguarded language, perhaps in consequence of his desire to counteract the undue stress laid by the Anabaptists upon mere external rites.

In 1528, the famous conference of Berne took place between the Reformed and Popish clergy. The immediate result was a determination by the magistrates of Berne to reform the Church within their territory. The disorders which ensued appeared to place Farel in his congenial element. Oecolampadius, who had held the reins of friendly influence so tight while Farel was at Montbelliard and Basle, relaxed them altogether when he saw him placed in circumstances, where decision was essential, and timorous discretion could do little good. He exhorted him, therefore, to be very courageous, and his counsel was not slighted. Through a series of conflicts and commotions almost ludicrous, the fearless missionary fought his way to conquest. Though we cannot approve of the despotic measures which were used in this case to reform religion, it is impossible not to admire the spirit with which Farel acted his part. With all the zeal of an old Iconoclast, he broke down images, subverted altars, and swept away every vestige of idolatrous observance. This violence the

bigoted commonalty repaid with interest. Not only was he rudely interrupted in his preaching, but the very pulpit was thrown down in which he stood, and more than once he was severely flogged by parties both of men and women. With our ideas of religious freedom, it is impossible to look upon his conduct with unmingled approbation, for it must be remembered that he was not aiding his own converts to resist oppression, but compelling those who would not be converted, to submit. The wonder is, that his attempts were so successful. His impetuous onset having broken the courage of the popish clergy, and removed the outward insignia of corruption, the more prudent measures of the government succeeded in disarming animosity and restoring peace. This victory was no sooner known abroad, than coadjutors poured in from the adjoining countries, so that Farel in a short time found the district into which he had introduced the Reformation, supplied, in a great measure, with religious teachers. As might have been supposed, however, these were not all faithful shepherds, and the zealous Reformer had occasion to speak bitterly of many, who, instead of feeding the flock of Christ, had only trodden down the pastures and defiled the waters.

One chapter of the work before us is filled with a detailed account of Farel's missions, or excursions into adjacent districts, for the purpose of promoting the Reformation, under the patronage of the magistrates at Berne. The latter seem to have entertained far juster views than he with respect to freedom of conscience, and the proper mode of propagating truth. It was not without reason that they plied him continually with admonitory letters. For, notwithstanding their repeated directions, that he should only preach where a majority were willing to hear him, and shake off the dust of all other places from him, his native disposition very often got the better of his judgment. He not only preached without permission, and in the face of opposition, both popular and ecclesiastical, but in one case burst forth even while the priest was saying mass, in such a powerful appeal, that the people, papists as they were, rose and threw the altar down. The light in which he was regarded by the popish priests and people, may be gathered from the fact, that his familiar name among them was *Der Luther*,\* a title which the fame of the German heretic and popular credulity had invested with more terrors at a distance, than it wore in Wittenberg. The particulars of Farel's labours at this period scarcely admit of any abstract or abridgment. The eleventh chapter exhibits a most ex-

\* The Luther.

traordinary picture of his deeds and sufferings in the cause of Reformation. Under the patronage of the government of Berne, he undertook a sort of *general agency* throughout the circumjacent region, for the purpose of decrying popery and recommending truth. His *modus operandi* seems, to modern eyes, extremely strange. It appears to have been his practice to ascend the pulpit whenever he could, often in the very midst of some religious ceremony, and never to preach in private houses or the open air when he could possibly get access to the church. On the other hand, he did not hesitate, when popish priests were preaching, to interrupt the sermon, and refute them on the spot. These extraordinary measures very naturally led to extraordinary remedies. When he could not be prevented from mounting the pulpit, it was usual, in those places where the opposition was zealous, to prevent his being heard by means of hissing, shrieks, and loud vociferation. His policy, in such cases, was very calmly to continue his discourse without appearing to be conscious of the least disturbance, till the people, weary of exertion, or astonished at his self-command, gave over their attempts to silence him. As soon as he perceived that the assembly was comparatively tranquil, he gave vent to his emotions in a thunder storm of eloquence. When allowed to proceed thus far, he seldom failed to influence the mass of those who heard him. But in many cases, when the tumult was found insufficient to arrest his progress, bodily violence was resorted to; and he was dragged from the pulpit, beaten, kicked, and trampled on. In these strong defensive measures (for, in almost every case, Farel was, according to our notions, the aggressor,) women and children were actively employed. The latter were employed to sing, shout, scream, and hiss. The former did a large part of the personal violence. More than once our reformer was in danger of destruction by the hands of female bigots, who tore his hair from his head, and disfigured him by furious laceration. After one of these engagements he returned to his home, at Murten, vomiting blood, and almost destitute of strength. Yet, strange to tell, instead of growing weary or dispirited, he seemed to gather courage from defeat, and solemnly declared, that, if the friends of Reformation would be as brave in its behalf as papists in behalf of popery, the work would soon be done. In some of the places visited by Farel, during the period in question, his efforts seemed to be entirely unsuccessful; yet, in almost all of them he reaped, eventually, an abundant harvest. As in one case, the blood which he lost in an encounter, stained the walls of the cathedral where it happened, and continued there for years, so, in many others, the impression of his preaching, though not visi-

ble at first, was deep and permanent. He afterwards enjoyed the satisfaction of embracing, as his brethren and helpers in the Gospel ministry, some of his most bigoted and virulent opposers. Sometimes, indeed, he had the happiness of finding, in the midst of darkness, those who already loved the light. At Orbe, where he had well nigh lost his life, and where his labours seemed entirely ineffectual, he succeeded in prevailing on a young man who had embraced the new opinions, while a student at Paris, and was now living in retirement, to become a preacher. This man was Peter Viret; and we might add other names, though less distinguished, to the list of those whom he was the means of introducing to the Gospel ministry, during this eventful period. One unpleasant consequence of his incessant labours and unsettled life, at this time, was the interruption of his correspondence. "If my father were alive" said he, "I could not write to him." His friends, however, did not cease to write to him, particularly Zuingle. One circumstance in his correspondence with this eminent reformer has a melancholy interest for all who love his memory. He wrote to Farel, charging him not to expose his life without necessity, but rather to preserve it for the service of his Master. Farel, who seems to have been wholly without fear of any fatal issue, thanked him kindly for his advice, but added, "My life is in less danger than your own." When the letters which contained these words reached Zurich, he, to whom it was addressed had fallen, and, by a singular providence, had fallen in battle. All the details of this eleventh chapter would be deeply interesting to the Christian public, and are highly worthy of an English dress.

Early in the year 1531, Farel attended the Synod held at Berne, where he had the pleasure of meeting with many of his friends and fellow labourers, and of co-operating with them in the work of Reformation. At this Synod, it was resolved that a deputation should be sent to visit the Waldenses, who had previously manifested a desire to know what the recent revolution in the Church of Rome might mean. To discharge this duty, Farel was appointed in conjunction with another, and they accordingly went into the valleys of Piedmont, caused a Synod to be assembled, and delivered the message with which they were entrusted by the Swiss reformers. In compliance with their urgent exhortations, the Waldenses determined to abandon every semblance of popish corruption, both in doctrine and worship. And to this resolution they adhered, notwithstanding the expostulations of the Bohemian brethren, occasioned by the unfair statements of a few dissatisfied Waldenses. Convinced that true religion could not flourish in Piedmont, without the means of education, Farel

urged them to establish schools, and undertook to send them teachers, which he afterwards performed.

The next attempt of the adventurous Reformer was upon Geneva. Zuingle had before directed his attention to that city, and he was resolved to take it in his way as he returned to Berne. Though the doctrines of the Reformation had already been embraced by some among the Genevese, and though a few were labouring in secret for their propagation there, the public sentiment was all the other way. The members of the Senate were opposed to change, and the people were kept in darkness by the influence of a clergy, unsurpassed by any throughout Europe in bigotry, ignorance, and disgusting profligacy. Though the credentials, which the strangers brought from Berne, commanded some respect among the members of the government, they had no such effect upon the clergy. Such, indeed, was their malignant dread of the famous *Priest-Scourge*,\* that, in order to get rid of him, they formed a plot so dark and diabolical, that, in the absence of strong proof, it would be thought incredible. Under the pretext of an amicable conference, they invited Farel and his comrade, Saunier, to the house of the vicar of the Diocese. There they were received with gross abuse and malediction by a company of ecclesiastics, every one of whom was secretly provided with a weapon. His escape from the foul ambush, the particulars of which are minutely stated by our author, can only be referred to that wise Providence, which still had great things to accomplish by his agency. It was evident, however, that mere courage was of no avail against perfidious malice, and that, therefore, in the existing state of things, Geneva was no place for Farel. His friends succeeded in sending him away by stealth, defeated, it is true, but not discouraged. He went, only to return in due time, with far different success.

Soon after these events, Farel established meetings or conferences of the Reformed pastors in his region, out of which by degrees grew regular Synods, which ordained ministers, and would have stationed and transferred them likewise, had the government of Berne been willing to relinquish these prerogatives.

The next scene that presents itself in this graphic series, is undoubtedly the one in which Farel appears to most advantage. In his efforts to promote the Reformation at Geneva, he displayed, not only the devoted zeal and inflexible perseverance which his previous exploits had given reason to anticipate, but a consummate self-command and prudence, which redeem his charac-

\* Geissel der Pricster.

ter from the imputation of mere headlong rashness. He felt, no doubt, that this was not a case to be adjusted by brute force; and that the events suspended on his own proceedings were too serious to warrant rash experiment. Having gained admission to the city for himself and Viret, under the wing of certain envoys sent from Berne, to make complaint of the contempt which the letters of that government had met with in Geneva, he proceeded cautiously to teach the doctrines of the Reformation in his own lodgings, and at private houses. Through the influence of the envoys, he procured from the Senate an order for his safety, and soon after, a requisition that the clergy should teach nothing in the church which they could not prove from Scripture. It was in vain that the infuriated priesthood wrought the mob into a phrenzy by absurd accounts of Farel's dealing with the devil. He stood firm, though he still made no attempt to occupy the pulpit, or to interrupt the services of the church. By way of antidote to his pestiferous influence, a doctor of the Sorbonne, Guido Fürbity, of the order of St. Dominic, was brought to preach in the cathedral of Geneva. Instead of offering direct opposition to him, Farel charged him before the council with teaching what was contrary to Scripture. The monk long refused to answer for his opinions to a secular tribunal; but at last, goaded by Farel's taunts and accusations, he consented, in an evil hour, to submit his doctrine to the test of Scripture. On the 29th of January, 1533, a *Gespräch*, or conference, (for so they called their fiercest disputations,) began in the presence of the Council, the Senate, and a large assembly of ecclesiastics, jurists, and physicians. In this debate, Farel seems to have exhibited uncommon calmness, self-possession, and good temper; while, at the same time, he was perfectly bold and fearless in the maintenance of truth. And here we may remark, by the way, that in the Swiss Reformers, and especially in Farel, there was a sort of full assurance with respect to doctrine, very unlike the sceptical diffidence which seems in these days to be thought a virtue. It was not blind bigotry or pedantic dogmatism; but a calm, clear, full persuasion of the truth. In almost every case, Farel offered and desired to die, if he should fail in proving what he taught from Scripture. So strong at least was his own conviction of his being in the right. Another circumstance in this discussion which has given us pleasure, is the clear views which he entertained upon the subject of church government, and his promptness in rejecting the absurd analogy between the Jewish priesthood and the Christian ministry, which some Episcopalians have unwisely copied from the church of antichrist. This fact sufficiently refutes the foolish statement of some heady

prelatists, that the Presbyterian doctrine on this point was forged by Calvin, who, when this debate took place, had never visited Geneva, and was unknown to Farel. The unfortunate Dominican appears to have been utterly amazed at what he heard. The idea that the Church, yea the Holy Apostolical Roman Catholic Church, could be in the wrong, was so new to him, that he found himself, at last, reduced to say by way of answer, "Let me send your doctrine to Paris, and Lyons, and the other universities, and see whether they will not condemn it." "You may send it to an angel," was the brief reply, "and if an angel preach any other gospel, let him be accursed." This was too much for the poor monk, and he fairly acknowledged that he could not vindicate himself by an appeal to Scripture. This unexpected issue served to open many eyes. The Council ordered the Dominican to recant his errors in the church, but when he got into the pulpit, he embraced the opportunity to make complaints of unjust treatment. He was then thrown into prison, where he refused either to make a recantation, or to bear a part in any subsequent disputes.

The defeat of this champion soon brought matters to a crisis. The Council were distracted, not in their own opinions merely, but by foreign influence. Freyburg and Berne pressed equally upon them, but in opposite directions. The former urged the banishment of Farel, and the suppression of his heresy. The latter insisted that he should be suffered to prosecute his work. Each threatened to dissolve the league, and the distracted Genevese knew not how to choose between them. Events relieved them from this painful perplexity. Farel, believing that the time was now arrived when he must use more vigorous measures, resumed his former method of attacking popery in the church itself, and denouncing the mass whilst the priest was celebrating it. The Council, alarmed, required him to desist. But it was now too late to check the master spirit. He continued his efforts till the people themselves, unexpectedly called for him to ascend the pulpit in the great cathedral. The disclosure of a horrid plot to murder the reformed, and change the government, turned popular feeling all against the clergy. The bishop's fulminations and the pope's decree of excommunication struck a final blow to the papacy at Geneva. The Council at last consented to convoke the people. Farel harangued them, in an admirable strain of calm but overpowering eloquence, and on the memorable twenty-first of August, just three centuries ago, the Reformation was established in Geneva, by a vote almost unanimous. This glorious revolution sets the man, who was

the instrument of bringing it about, upon a lofty elevation among heroes, sages, and the friends of human happiness.

The advantages thus gained, Farel was careful to secure by unequivocal and formal expressions of the public will. From similar motives he was unwilling to leave any thing that could serve as a memorial of the exploded superstition. In a short time, every vestige of idolatry had vanished, and the worship of God was reinstated in its original and beautiful simplicity. Another change still greater, and to many more offensive, now took place in the discipline of the church. The odium incurred by Farel's vigorous theory and practice, as to morals, shows how far he was from meriting the charge of antinomianism. The Reformation being now established in the city of Geneva, efforts were made to give it extension in the surrounding territory. These attempts succeeded in some places, but in others the opposition was too strong, through the influence of the monks, who, at one place, acted a farce in which Farel was a conspicuous personage.

The want of coadjutors in the city now pressed heavily on Farel. Viret had been induced to make an attempt upon Lausanne, and Fabri, who was stationed at Geneva for a time, had been transferred to Thonon. While things were in this posture, a young man took lodgings in Geneva for a night, and being known to Caroli, who was there at that time, Farel heard of his arrival. This young man was Calvin, who had already gained some reputation as a scholar and a friend of evangelical religion, and was now on his way to Basle and Strasburg, where he designed to pursue his studies. Convinced that God had sent him there to help him, Farel insisted on his entering at once upon the work. When he persisted in declining it, Farel adjured him, in an awful voice, and in the name of God, not to disobey so manifest a call, assuring him that God would curse the studies which seduced him from his duty. Calvin felt, according to his own account, as if the hand of God was laid upon him, and immediately consented, to become a preacher and a teacher of theology. In him Farel found, not only an efficient helper, but a wise instructor and a faithful friend, relations which continued to subsist between them till the end of life.

The effect of the public disputations which had already taken place, led Farel to desire a repetition of that measure. The greatest obstacle was the want of persons, on the popish side, who either could, or would, maintain the cause of superstition in the face of an assembly. This backwardness was not at all surprising on the part of clergymen, among whom, Farel once solemnly asserted, there was scarcely one who could repeat the

ten commandments. At length, however, the famous disputation at Lausanne took place, in which Farel and Viret defended ten theses against all the popish priests who could be gathered in the diocese, assisted by Blancherose the king's physician. Calvin scarcely spoke at all, except upon the doctrine of transubstantiation, which he refuted with such cogency and clearness, that one of his opponents was converted on the spot, and very many of the audience went home with deep impressions of the truth as he declared it. Farel was the chief speaker, and displayed great readiness in argument, and intimate acquaintance with the Scriptures and the fathers. In answer to the objection, that the doctrine of justification by faith was subversive of morality, he assailed the morals of the popish priesthood with indignant eloquence. Some of his sarcasms were extremely galling. While exposing their gross ignorance, he represented them by a two-edged sarcasm, as knowing less about religion than their own illicit offspring, the young beggars of Geneva. These undisputed and indisputable charges gave an irresistible effect to his triumphant question, "Who are you that dare to talk about good works and Christian morals?" The effects of this debate upon the people were immense and durable.

The Confession of Faith, which soon after this debate was published at Geneva, raised up many adversaries. Three sorts of persons in particular made opposition; first, those who adhered to popery; secondly, those who disliked and dreaded the new system of church discipline; and lastly, the Anabaptists, who had sprung up in Geneva, or been brought in from abroad. Liege and Benoit, two Flemish Anabaptists, challenged Farel and his colleagues to a public disputation, and being found unable to maintain their ground by argument, were banished from Geneva. The seed which they had sown, however, took deep root, and in the end brought forth abundantly.

Another enemy, with whom the Reformers had at this time to contend, was their former associate, the conceited and changeable Caroli. This singular character had repeatedly changed sides since the beginning of the Reformation. His ruling passion, the desire of notoriety, had led him, while a Doctor of the Sorbonne, to espouse some of Luther's doctrines, but without abjuring popery. In consequence of this, he was expelled from Paris; but no sooner did he find a place as parish priest at Alençon, than he renounced his heresy, and became in his turn a persecutor. It was not long before he was again upon the side of Reformation, and in this second paroxysm, found his way to Geneva, where he made himself conspicuous at the public disputations, sometimes as an advocate of the evangelical doctrines, and sometimes as a cham-

pion of his Mother Church. Two circumstances, over and above his native fickleness, appear to have prevented his uniting heartily with the Reformers. One was his finding it impossible to set himself in public estimation higher than his colleagues. The other was the strictness of the discipline adopted by the Reformed churches, which was any thing but pleasant to so loose a liver. Farel said, from the beginning, that Caroli needed something more than a change of his opinions, and that unless he became a new man he would only do them harm. So little were these feelings relished by the Doctor himself, that on one occasion, he arose and left the church when Viret was preaching against lewdness, saying, "These fellows are forever aiming at me. I will have my revenge;" a speech which furnishes an equal proof of his malignity and weakness. Soon after this expression of his spite, he delivered, from the pulpit at Neufchatel, where he and Viret were collegiate pastors, a written discourse in vindication of the doctrine of purgatory and of prayers for the dead, at the same time giving out that so young a man as Viret, (who was absent at the time,) should no longer dictate or prescribe to him. The difficulties, which of course ensued between them, brought the affair before the Council of the canton (Berne), by whom Caroli was condemned and ordered to recant. This he did with great humility, but instantly proceeded to discharge a burden which, he said, had long been lying heavy at his heart. The curiosity which this excited was succeeded by amazement when he gravely accused Farel, Calvin, Viret, and some others, of being Arians. Calvin and Viret, who were present at the time, demanded proof of his assertions, the former asking him with great contempt whether he made this discovery at the dram-shop. As he refused to produce his evidence before a civil court, the Council called a Synod which was held at Lausanne in the spring of 1537. There Caroli succeeded in proving the Arianism of Claudius, a Savoyard preacher, who recanted publicly. All that he could say against the others was, that in their writings (and especially in the Geneva Confession of Faith) the word *trinity* was omitted. This, with respect to Calvin, was untrue, for he had himself defended the adoption of that word, though not a Scripture term. Nevertheless he took the same ground with his brethren, and insisted that the rejection or omission of mere technical expressions, cannot possibly be heresy. On the same principle they all refused to subscribe the Nicene and Apostle's creeds on this occasion. The Synod, which consisted of a hundred and twenty ministers, unanimously agreed that the Confession was orthodox and the accused sound in the faith. This led to further proceedings, which we cannot detail, but

which resulted in Caroli's deposition as a slanderer and a man of corrupt morals. As he would not comply with the requisitions of the government, they ordered his arrest, but he escaped from their territory and then wrote to them, thanking God for his deliverance from such connexions, and announcing his determination to defend the doctrines of the Trinity and Purgatory in the face of the world. He then went to Rome, renounced his errors, declared his abhorrence of the Reformers and their damnable heresy, was absolved from his marriage (or, as he called it, his concubinage) and recovered all his privileges as a Doctor and a Priest. Whether he found in the bosom of the church that rest which he had elsewhere sought in vain, may be conjectured; but we have no doubt, that the evil spirit found his old abode well garnished, and that the last state of this, as of all apostates, was far worse than the first.

But although these proceedings freed the Swiss Reformers from a treacherous associate, they led to some unpleasant results among themselves. The authorities of Berne, apprehensive that the rejection of the terms in which the orthodox doctrines had for ages been expressed, would bring reproach upon the Reformers, and give colour to Caroli's statement in his letter to the Pope (that they were bringing back the old exploded heresies) resolved that no one should be admitted to the office of the ministry, without an explicit recognition of the doctrine of the Trinity in the usual form. This produced a division of opinion among the clergy, some regarding it as a prudent regulation, others condemning it as an encroachment upon Christian liberty, and tending to obscure the truth. A similar difference arose about the same time, in relation to the compromise between the Lutherans and Zuinglians respecting the Lord's Supper. These divisions depressed Farel more than all his former conflicts, insomuch that Calvin was afraid of losing him, when he saw him affected in a way of which he had thought his iron frame incapable.\* He soon became himself however, and prepared a new edition of his *Summary*, the unguarded phraseology of which had given colour to some of Caroli's charges.

Our author well observes, that to the people of Geneva, freedom of conscience was too new a thing to be enjoyed aright. May we not add, that even the pastors of Geneva were in the same predicament with respect to ecclesiastical authority? The disturbances and divisions which form the subject of the closing chapter in the volume now before us, are referred by the author, it would seem, entirely to the factious disposition of the people, and the malig-

\* "Pectus illud ferreum." Calvin's Epistles.

nant arts of malcontents. Without detracting in the least from the pernicious tendency of these two causes, we are fully of opinion, that the mad attempt to use civil authority as an engine for the promotion of truth; or, in other words, the universal error of the Reformers with respect to *Church and State*, yields the best explanation of these lamentable strifes. It is astonishing to see how pertinaciously this error was maintained, in spite of all the practical refutations which the Providence of God arrayed against it. The history of the Church of Geneva at this period is alone sufficient to explode it. The discontents occasioned by enforcing the Confession raised a strong, though in some degree a secret, opposition to the persons who prepared it. This was spreading by degrees among the people, when a new and more disastrous difference arose between the ministers and magistrates of Berne and Geneva, with respect to uniformity of usages and rites. Those of the former city cherished the chimerical idea of complete external unity in form as well as doctrine, and maintained it with such warmth, that the senate of Geneva found it politic to side against their own religious teachers, who it seems had gone a little further in simplifying than their neighbours relished. Berne insisted with a foolish zeal upon the observance of Christmas, new year, and some other festivals, and also upon certain non-essentials as to the method of administering the sacraments. These had been discarded at Geneva, or perhaps referred to individual discretion. This was the beginning of sorrows. The disaffected of all parties now combined in bold resistance to the pastors, who, deserted by the magistrates, were forced to wage a most unequal contest with the many who disliked their persons or detested the restraints which they were anxious to impose. After a year not only of vexation but of danger, from the violence of partisans and the remissness of the government, matters reached a crisis. Farel and Calvin were directed by the council to administer the communion on the approaching Easter, in the manner practised and enjoined at Berne. This they not only refused to do, but, on the ground of the unhappy and disgraceful state of things, determined not to administer the ordinance at all. They were then forbidden to preach, but with a spirit, not exactly in accordance with their sentiments respecting civil authority in matters of religion, they refused obedience. On Easter Sunday, Calvin preached in the cathedral and Farel in the church of St. Gervais. They preached too on the subject of the existing difficulties, but omitted the communion. Such was the state of public feeling that drawn daggers were displayed in church, and on the next day Farel and Calvin received orders from the government to leave Geneva. A series of conferences

and negotiations now took place, with a view to the restoration of peace. Farel and Calvin frankly admitted in a conference at Zurich, that they had perhaps gone too far in their attempts at discipline, as well as in their refusal to comply with harmless ceremonies. They continued, however, to urge certain requisitions as essential to the welfare of the church. Among these were the division of the city into parishes, and the appointment of pastors and ruling elders over each; the introduction of psalmody into the church service; the ordination of ministers by ministers, without the interference of the magistrates or others; the monthly administration of the Lord's Supper; and lastly, the exclusion of offenders from the church. The government of Berne interfered at last, and sent one of their own magistrates to procure the restoration of the exiled pastors. The latter went with him, but were met by an imperious prohibition from Geneva, and on still advancing, found the gates of the city actually guarded by a military force! They returned to Berne, and there our author leaves them at the close of this first volume.

It will be perceived, that this biography possesses a historical interest, for which reason we have been more minute in our account of its contents than we should otherwise have been. To us many parts of it have proved as entertaining as the liveliest romance, with the addition of that charm which no romance can boast, the charm of truth. If the foregoing abstract should afford our readers any pleasure or instruction, our design will be accomplished; and in that case, should another volume come into our hands, we shall embrace the opportunity to finish our analysis.

---

## ART. II.—THEORIES OF EDUCATION.

IT is a curious fact, though not an unaccountable one, that the wildest speculations are, and always have been, upon practical subjects. Religion, ethics, civil government, derive their importance altogether from their practical relations. Yet who can enumerate the imaginary commonwealths, the theories of virtue, and the schemes of false theology, which have been generated by the human fancy? The same may be said of education. If there is a theme within the range of human thought, which might be safely classed among the things of real life, and considered safe from the incursions of romance, it is the art of teaching children. We are abundantly aware of the propensity in some minds to

belittle this employment, and underrate its difficulties. But we also know that there is more than one extreme, in this as well as every other case. Because the instruction of the young is not a mere mechanic art, consisting in a blind routine of formal usages, it does not follow that it is a subject for wanton experiment and the vagaries of a wild imagination. Yet such it has, in fact, become to a deplorable extent. Amidst all the zeal which has, of late years been exerted, and the real improvements which have been adopted, it remains a truth, that education has been trifled with. A large proportion of the public have been gulled. Many young minds have been impaired in power, or retarded in advancement, by empirical imposture. If this be so, and we must leave it to the reader to convince himself of it, we see no reason why an attempt should not be made to remedy the evil. Why should the quack in medicine be scouted as contemptible, or denounced as dangerous, for vending his inoperative mixtures, while the quack in education is allowed to tamper with the delicate texture of our children's minds? It is unreasonable, it is wrong. Let us look, then, for a moment at the true state of the case, not with a view to the suggestion of expedients, or the vindication of peculiar doctrines, but for the simple purpose of detecting sophistry and disabusing those whom it has duped.

Before we enter on a subject which may seem to have somewhat of an invidious aspect, we wish to preclude misapprehension. It is not the specific scheme of this or that man that we quarrel with. In relation to this matter, it is almost as hard to find a person wholly wrong, as to find one wholly right. Some innovations which have been suggested are extremely plausible. Some have been proved by fair experiment to be genuine improvements. The instances of error are detached, and for the most part trifling, as they seldom affect the *tout ensemble* of a plan, but only some of its details. Of such minutiae, we, of course, can take no notice. The tone of censure, which we have assumed, and which we cannot honestly abandon, has relation, not to actual arrangements, or the details of any given system, but to certain circumstances which are characteristic, in a greater or less degree, of nearly all novel schemes of reformation and improvement in the method of instruction. A few of these characteristics we shall now attempt to specify.

I. The first is a preposterous disposition to exaggerate the vices of existing modes, and the necessity of new ones. That the methods of instruction which have prevailed in former times are imperfect, may be readily admitted. That the general progress of improvement should produce a change in this as well as

other things, is a very plain and very harmless proposition. The state of feeling which induces men to question both or either of these doctrines is a state of unenlightened prepossession. We are aware of very few things more unfavourable to the progress of knowledge, than a superstitious attachment to the forms which happen to exist, in combination with substantial excellence. As such an attachment always springs from inability to draw the line between substance and shadows, it is of course a blind attachment; and we need not say that blind attachments only grow more violent and obstinate when their objects are convicted of futility and worthlessness. Against this spirit those should guard with very special vigilance, whose interest it is to hold up ancient institutions in their primitive integrity. The great mass of those who receive a college education, form a traditional attachment to their Alma Mater, which is fortified at first by emulation with regard to other seminaries, and made stronger and stronger, as the man grows older, by the influence of memory and association. As it cannot be supposed that one in fifty of our ordinary graduates ever enters very deeply into the rationale of instruction while himself the subject of it, we can scarcely think it strange, that this attachment to the place of education should be rather an instinctive than a rational affection. As little can we wonder that the views, with which the student leaves his college, do not gain, in depth or compass, by the lapse of time. Those especially who pass at once, or very soon, into active life, are apt, not only to retain their views unaltered, but to lay increasing stress upon them year by year. Such persons, therefore, are extremely apt to look upon the course of mental discipline through which they passed in youth, with a partiality exclusive of all others. As it is from this class that the legislators of our public institutions are for the most part taken, we have no doubt that there is a leaning towards undue tenacity in many of our learned bodies, and that of course there ought to be a corresponding effort to control and counteract it.

We have said thus much about inordinate attachment to established forms and usages, in order to evince that we have no morbid antipathy to change, but are strong believers in the possibility and need of very great improvement in our modes of education. We now proceed to say, that even this blind zeal for what is ancient, is less hurtful in its tendency and actual operation than the mania of experiment. The latter, moreover, springs from a false assumption. We deny the charges which are urged in general terms against the methods of instruction that have hitherto prevailed. We dispute the claim to philo-

sophical exactness and superior conformity to the laws of human intellect, on the part of many pompous innovations. It is scarcely possible to read the prospectus of a school at present, without lighting upon some explicit or implied assertion of peculiar skill in the philosophy of teaching. Now, we are not satisfied with passing these things over as mere bagatelles. One by one they are such; but the obvious tendency of all united is to blind the eyes and warp the judgment of the public. The most wary and judicious cannot grow familiar with these arrogant pretensions in the public prints, without sooner or later yielding tacit credence to at least a part of them—without receiving the impression that some great discovery has certainly been made, and that education is no longer what it was. We have two strong reasons for disliking this effect. One is that it insensibly engenders a contempt for the great men and great performances of former times. The moral unworthiness of such a feeling is sufficient to condemn it; but it has other crimes to answer for. It encourages the notion, always current among ignorant and self-conceited people, that the only useful knowledge is contained within the limits of the present generation, and that any recurrence to the wisdom of the past is arrant pedantry. This is the prolific parent of a thousand schemes for getting rid of what is thought to be a plethora of learning. Hence the rigid process of depletion which the course of study in some schools has undergone. Hence the strong solicitude to purge out from a liberal education such malignant elements as classical learning and its kindred branches. Hence the outcry against pedants, raised by half-bred caterers for the public press. No man, who understands the character and aspect of the present age, can fail to have observed, that there is a very strong and growing spirit of aversion among some to genuine learning, and a disposition to apply that name to something altogether different. This we regard as one legitimate result of these exaggerated statements with respect to old-fashioned education.

But besides the unhappy influence of these exaggerations upon public feeling, they produce effects more practically and directly hurtful. The suspicion or belief, that what is antiquated is absurd and useless, cannot fail to push the process of amendment to extremes. A rational persuasion that all human systems are imperfect, and to some extent erroneous, will, when applied to education, serve to awaken vigilance and quicken invention; while at the same time it will hold in check the feverish propensity to mere capricious change. A conviction, on the other hand, that there are essential and pervading vices in established systems, that the whole science of instruction is a recent discovery, and that its very fundamental principles are just undergoing the pro-

cess of development, can lead to nothing but disorganization. Those who maintain, and act upon, these doctrines, are the Jacobins of learning. We say those who act upon them; for we know that there are many who indulge themselves in harmless speculation, though their common sense is too preponderant, to let them err in practice. But still, it may be asked, what, after all, is the practical result of these appalling heresies? Their practical result is the rejecting, or a proneness to reject, under the name of obsolete absurdities, a number of principles and expedients, which have received the sanction, not of great names only and of lofty patronage, but of abundant fruit, of rich success. This result is, of course, most obvious in men of narrow minds and very partial cultivation; the soil of whose intellect is, at best, but shallow, and has scarcely been indented by the ploughshare of instruction. It is a fact deserving observation, that the more expanded and profound men's views become, the less are they likely to appear before the public in the character of levellers. It requires no small amount of personal improvement to enable one to estimate the real value of existing institutions. To the eye of the upstart and the ignoramus, that may wear the aspect of a privileged absurdity, which, in the view of one more deeply versed in human nature and the bonds which hold society together, is an invaluable safeguard of man's happiness and rights. We do not wish this to be viewed as a gratuitous assertion. Let the reader bring it to the test of observation. Let him candidly determine for himself what class of men are most intemperately fond of innovation, and most active in the overthrow of all that time has sanctioned. Let him observe among his neighbours whether the loudest brawlers against ancient usage are the most profound and most enlightened in regard to other matters. A little folly and a little self-conceit suffice to raise a suicidal opposition to establishments and systems which owe their existence to the accumulating wisdom of successive generations. Now it happens to be true, most unfortunately true, that the profession of teachers as a body (we need scarcely say that there are great exceptions) is by no means what it ought to be. The average ability expended on the arduous and momentous business of instructing youth, is notoriously far less than the interests of society demand. The office of a teacher is regarded by many as a *pis aller*, and by still more as a stepping-stone to other walks of life. This opens the door of that employment to a multitude of sciolists and smatterers wholly incompetent to estimate the value of those principles and plans which have in past times regulated this important business. We need not wonder, therefore, at the increasing disposition to have novelty in every thing, and to banish every vestige of the

old regime, or at least to transmute its base metal into gold by the pretended alchemy of some new Paracelsus. We are not now enumerating the particular effects thus brought about. All that we have to do with here is the procuring cause of these effects; an extravagant contempt for ancient methods, and an exaggerated estimate of new ones.

II. The second circumstance that strikes us as a characteristic of too many recent theories, is an apparent misconception of what education is. There are some, very many, who appear to think that they have gained a great advantage, when they have excluded from their course of elementary instruction whatever does not bear directly upon some form of active business. The cant phrase with theorists of this class is "practical utility." We need scarcely say, that the expression, thus applied, is grossly perverted, or at least unfairly limited. Until it can be proved, that a foundation must consist of the same materials and be constructed in the same way as the superstructure, we shall maintain that this confounding of professional with preparatory studies has as little pretensions to practical utility as it has to philosophical exactness and consistency. Such as have had it in their power to compare this mushroom vegetation with that sure, though tedious growth, which has a sound root to depend upon, need not be told where lies the difference.

Of this mistake the practical result is rather felt than seen. It is felt by the community, when it finds men pressing into public stations, with minds subjected to no other discipline than that which is likely to result from this false principle. It is felt by teachers, when they find their plans of subsequent improvement all defeated, by the radical defect of the incipient stages, or their efforts hampered by the prejudice of parents against every thing which they do not perceive to be directly conducive to the making of money or the gaining of distinction. Above all, it is felt by students, to their lasting detriment. It is hard enough, at best, to bring the feelings of young men into concert with their judgment, even when that is right. The utility of abstract study is so far from being obvious before it is experienced, that without great authority upon the teacher's part, and great self-command upon the pupil's, it is very unlikely to have justice done it. Now when to this repugnance there is superadded a suspicion that these studies are in fact unprofitable, and when this suspicion is encouraged by parental sanction, or the current slang of fashionable circles, it affects the nerve and muscle of the students' diligence, so far as the branches in question are concerned, with incurable paralysis. Having once been taught to estimate preparatory studies, in proportion to their obvious and ultimate con-

nexion with professional employments, he very naturally applies the test with rigour. What some would think a close connexion he regards as a remote one; and what is really remote he considers none at all. Even those parts of learning which, on his own false principle, are worthy of attention, though as mere preliminaries, he postpones without reluctance as inferior in importance to the rudiments of medicine, theology, or law. These last, thus learned, can never be learned well, though this premature study may afford a fair pretext for neglecting or omitting them, when they become the proper objects of attention. And hence it comes to pass that the exclusion of whatever does not bear upon its surface, the proofs of its "practical utility," instead of giving ampler depth and compass to professional acquirements, helps to make them immature and superficial. We appeal to the leading men of all the liberal professions, whether we are not warranted by facts within their knowledge, in asserting that professional accomplishments are gained with far less ease by those who antedate the study on their principle of "practical utility," than by those who let "practical utility" alone, till their minds have been prepared for it by thorough-going discipline. Such discipline is out of the question, when practical utility, in this perverted sense, is made the test and standard of preliminary study. The only test which ought to be applied to any subject, as a part of elementary instruction, is its adaptation to develop and improve the powers, which are afterwards to act upon the affairs of real life. There can be no doubt, indeed, that where there is equality in this important point, those studies ought to be preferred which will be afterwards available in business. But to make this the sole criterion is a gross absurdity, the *πρῶτον δεῦδος* of this utilitarian theory.

Thus far we have proceeded on the supposition, that there is a course of study introductory to professional employments, but that this course is interrupted and disfigured by the exclusion of some branches and the anticipation of others, on the mistaken principle of "practical utility." It is possible, however, that in the progress of improvement, the idea of a general preparatory course of mental discipline may be discarded altogether. Assuming such a change, (we hope it never will be more than an assumption,) the foregoing arguments will still be relevant, but with redoubled force. And in addition to them all, there is another certain consequence of such a revolution, which appears to us alarming. Who does not know the tendency of what are called "professional studies" to disturb the equilibrium of intellect, to narrow the views, and to produce a partiality of judgment upon general subjects? Who does not know, moreover, that the danger

of this consequence is just in proportion to the exclusive zeal with which the study is pursued? What then? Is professional learning to be sacrificed in order to escape this evil? Not at all. The wisdom of past ages has provided us a check upon this hurtful tendency, and taught us to fortify the mind against it by a wise preparatory discipline. The virtues of this antidote need no certificate. It has living testimonials in the persons and performances of many, who have mastered the lore of their professions with the grasp of giants, and yet show no signs of intellectual distortion. Look, on the contrary, at those whose first transition was from boorish ignorance to the details of law, theology, or medicine, and you will learn to what extent one power may be strengthened at the expense of others, and how little mere professional accomplishments, even combined with genius, can supply the lack of discipline and culture. Such examples, and they are not wanting even in high places, are a practical comment upon "practical utility."

III. Another prominent feature in some new plans of instruction is the disproportionate regard to forms and mere external regulations. In some cases, this degenerates into a paltry ostentation and attempt at pomp. As might be expected, it occurs in close connexion with the exaggerated estimate of modern improvements spoken of before. The fact that parading advertisements are growing every day more common, is an alarming one to us; for it evinces, that the interested parties find a growing disposition, on the part of parents, to be governed by such influence. In very many cases, it is scarcely possible that parents, or their substitutes, should make an election upon any other principle than that of weighing rival claims against each other. It is a necessary result of the peculiar state of things with us at present, that a multitude of persons who have themselves received but little education, are most laudably desirous of affording that advantage to their children. In this very numerous and respectable class, there is a liability to errors just the reverse of those which we have mentioned as unfortunately common among educated men. While the latter are prone to be unreasonably prejudiced in favour of the forms and methods practised on themselves, the former are as likely to be duped by the pretence of striking novelty and original invention: With such, the display of uncouth terms and strange conceits is very apt to pass for evidence of vast superiority to antiquated systems; and on such, no doubt, the puffs which we allude to, are primarily designed to operate. We wish we could say that they extend no further. But unhappily we know it to be true, that even these paltry artifices take effect in minds of higher order. It is a melancholy

fact, that some whose taste and judgment are offended by such nonsense, are actually ashamed of their attachment to old usages, and, for fear of being obsolete, are fain to swallow the absurd concoctions of capricious innovation. We might say more, much more: though not perhaps without relinquishing our purpose of avoiding all specification and detail. We shall, therefore, content ourselves with an expression of our fears, that the usual tendency of ostentation and undue attachment to mere form, will not be varied or reversed in this case.

IV. We trust that we shall not be misapprehended when we mention, as a fourth characteristic of too many novel schemes, that they tend to encourage superficialness of study and acquirement. This may be thought by some to belong to the practice, not the theory of teaching, and therefore, to be incident to all plans, good or bad. To some extent this is unquestionably true, and we are willing to exclude from our description all that falls within the limits of mere practice, and is therefore chargeable on careless or unskilful operators. We refer at present to no other superficialness than that which is the legitimate result of an erroneous system, and which cannot fail to flow from such a system, be the faithfulness and skill of the performer what it may. The fact that such a tendency exists in many systems, we shall not attempt to prove; but content ourselves with simply assuming and asserting it. The causes of it we consider twofold.

In the first place, it arises from the passion for new methods and devices. Whatever education may have gained by innovation, we are sure that nothing has been gained in depth. The advocates of novelty may say what they will about the conformity of their plans to the laws of mind and the practical utility of their expedients. They may amplify *ad libitum* the superficial area of study and acquirement, and indefinitely multiply the individual objects of attention. But the very act of doing so confirms our strong belief, that in regard to one grand attribute, all modern speculations are diverging vastly further from the standard of truth than any former systems. This one attribute is nothing else than thorough-going accuracy. The crying sin of old fashioned methods of instruction is the sacrifice of time, and ease, and "practical utility," in order to secure profound and solid acquisition. The most plausible objections to existing systems will be found upon inspection, to involve an admission that they make too much of mere correctness and provide too little for the pleasantness and swiftness of the students' progress. We are far from saying that there has been no excess in these respects, or that among European scholars of the olden time there was not a strong propensity to overdo the matter; but we do say, that at present,

there is very little ground for such complaints. The age of scrupulous and sifting study has, we fear, gone by. The current sets, at present, in an opposite direction, and those who are at all disposed to favour the old methods, find it hard enough to save themselves from being overwhelmed in the prevailing freshet. If these statements be correct, it follows that at least the greater part of the improvements now proposed, have some other end in view than an increase of depth and accuracy. They are rather designed to soften the harsh features of the ancient discipline; to sweeten the edge of its bitter cup; to oil the articulations of its ponderous machinery. It follows, of course, then, that these new expedients not only may, but must, have a tendency to generate the habits of superficial study.

This fault, however, is not wholly chargeable on the mere rage of novelty. There is another cause which mightily contributes to the same effect. The multiplicity of objects now included in the course of study, is sufficient, of itself, to render depth and accuracy as to any one, impossible. We have no idea of attempting to define the boundary between inexpedient and expedient subjects of preparatory study. After all that could be said, much must, of course, be left to individual discretion; and a better test of judgment in a teacher could not be desired. Thus much, however, we are prepared to say, that there are indications of a disposition to enlarge the field of study, or more properly the number of things studied, to a preposterous extent. And to make bad worse, this rage for multiplicity of topics, is too often attended by a woful lack of judgment in selecting and arranging them. The specifications necessary to confirm this statement must again be left to private observation. So strong, however, is our own conviction of the fact and of its probable results, that we are almost tempted to estimate an institution or a teacher in the inverse ratio of the bill of fare which they exhibit to the public.

V. The features which we have portrayed may, we think, be readily recognised in almost every novel scheme of education that has been given to the public, not equally prominent in all cases, but in all sufficiently discernible. To these we may add another not quite so common, nor so likely from its nature to become so. There is a fondness, among some whose zeal for learning and endeavours to promote it merit high applause, to mystify the subject of instruction by removing it from the class of sober, practical realities, to that of metaphysical refinements and conceits. The theories broached by some of these philosophers require more time, in order to be fully understood, than would be necessary for the practical development of many other plans. This sort of speculation is extremely captivating to ill-

balanced minds; for, as it gives indulgence to the imagination under the pretext of profound intellectual operation, it enables men to earn the reputation of deep thought without the toil of thinking. As minds of the highest order are but little exposed to the fascinations of this philosophic trifling, it is practised, for the most part, by the shallow, the erratic, and the half informed. It is not surprising, therefore, that the fruits of this philosophy, so far as they have yet been imparted to the world, are as unsubstantial as they are pretending. We are not unwilling to see education brought into conformity with scientific principles; but we are unwilling to see time expended and the public mind amused by a mere flourish of trumpets. The effect of this philosophising mania is to divert attention from the essentials and realities of actual instruction to the unprofitable subtleties of empty speculation, and by necessary consequence to expose the minds of youth to the hazardous process of conjectural experiment. Both these effects, however they may seem in contemplation, are proved by experience to be always hurtful, and not seldom ruinous. Those who subject their children or themselves to this empirical procedure, very seldom fail to pay dearly for their whistle.

We do not think it necessary to go into the inquiry, how these evils may be remedied; because they have begun already to correct themselves. The morbid appetite for novelty has sickened, and we trust, will ere long die. As its disease, however, seems to have reached a crisis, we are anxious to determine it in such a manner as will best insure a fatal termination. This has been our aim in the preceding strictures, and we shall certainly be gratified to find, that they have in any degree contributed to a consummation so devoutly wished for. But while we honestly believe that there is common sense enough remaining in society to crush all mere impostures, we are far from thinking that there is no occasion for discussion or inquiry with respect to education. There are some questions strictly practical and highly important, in regard to which the public mind is still unsettled. Most of these have, from time immemorial, been subjects of dispute among the friends of education, in a greater or less degree. Some of them, however, which were once warmly agitated, now attract less attention, as a large majority have formed conclusions in relation to them. Others, on the contrary, which in former times were canvassed only by a few, have of late become more generally interesting. With regard to some in both these classes, we would say, that the existing doubts respecting them arise not so much from any intrinsic difficulty in the subject, as from the unwise zeal of party disputants. The truth lies on both sides, and

a just conclusion can only be reached by compromise. An extended illustration of this statement, in its application to specific points of controversy, would transcend our limits and the reader's patience. We must be contented with a glance at one or two of these vexed questions.

1. Take, for example, that respecting the comparative advantages of public and private education. In the controversies once kept up among the learned on this subject, the golden mean of truth appears to have been utterly lost sight of. The advocates of public institutions spared no terms of strong contempt in speaking of domestic instruction. Not contented with insisting on the obvious facilities afforded by colleges and schools, beyond the means of individual teachers, with respect to books, varied methods of instruction, and collision of mind among the youth themselves, these zealous champions virtually denied those negative advantages which are implied in the very idea of a fire-side education. They pertinaciously maintain that education in a public institution was more favourable to the students' morals—a paradox too gross for refutation. Those, on the other hand, who were afraid of schools and colleges, endeavoured to justify their preference of private education, by denying to the other system the possession of those merits which result from the very constitution of a public seminary. At present, we believe, these extreme opinions are but little prevalent. No one seems now to question, that it would be a happy thing if the advantages of public schools could be combined with the incommunicable privileges of domestic discipline. Nor, on the other hand, would it be easy to find any one extravagant enough to think such a combination, in its full extent, practicable. The utmost that is now expected, by the sober-minded, is such an arrangement of our public institutions as would make them approximate, in all important points, as near as may be, to the economy of families. This we regard as a desirable and feasible improvement. We have no doubt, that expedients might be easily suggested which, if fairly carried out in execution, would produce a most surprising metamorphosis. We cannot here enlarge upon the subject, but we may, at some future period, communicate our thoughts upon it to the public in detail.

2. Another question of the same general class, though far from being equally adjusted, is that respecting the value of classical learning as a part of general education. This subject is, in fact, a more perplexed one than the other; and although our own views in relation to it are distinct and fixed, we shall not run the risk of injuring the cause which we espouse, by attempting even an outline of the arguments on either side. A fair presentation of

the subject is impossible, without a sufficiency of time and space to present it in detail. There is nothing, however, to prevent our entering an earnest protest against ultra sentiments and language upon this point. There is more occasion, it is true, for such a caution on the part of those who vilify than of those who patronise the study of the classics. There are few, we apprehend, among ourselves at present, who are disposed to give classical learning that extravagant preponderance assigned to it in the practice of the Grammar Schools of England. But whether there be any such or not, there can be no doubt that the general current sets decidedly against them. We have reason now to fear, not that too much time will be bestowed on Greek and Latin, but that these antique acquirements will be soon lost sight of, in the growing multitude of more refined accomplishments. We have already hinted at one cause which operates in this direction, while animadverting on the mistaken principle of "practical utility," considered as a rule for determining the value of particular studies. We have seen this sophistical and hurtful doctrine preached and practised too, by men who owe all their distinction to the very system which it aims to overthrow. And on the other hand, we have heard it trumpeted by men of no distinction, as a justification of their own deficiencies, upon the same sound principle which led Esop's fox to recommend the amputation of his brethren's tails. It might *a priori* be supposed, that such assaults upon the citadel of learning would be wholly futile. But experience teaches that even the prate of gossips, if vivacious and incessant, may affect the strongest and most guarded intellect. *Gutta cavat lapidem non vi sed saepe cadendo*. This is our only fear, as well as our only reason for alluding to the subject here. If the public can be put upon their guard against a foe which seems too paltry to be feared, there is but little danger of a disastrous issue.

3. The only other specimen that we can afford to give of these unprofitable controversies, is, to use a bold expression, the absurd dispute about *parental discipline*. This phrase is now entitled to the unenviable honours of a regular cant term. Advertisements or lectures, and colloquial twaddle, have conspired to render it disgustingly familiar. Those who use it in the fashionable manner would appear to have attached a novel meaning to the epithet 'parental.' We could not possibly enumerate the instances in which we have observed its application as the opposite of authoritative, rigorous, or harsh. It seems to be regarded as peculiarly appropriate, when corporeal punishment is disavowed. "No bodily chastisement or other harsh expedients will be used, the discipline of this school being entirely parental." "The age of

flogging and imprisonment is past. No discipline would now be tolerated, but that which is strictly parental."

A more puerile confusion and abuse of terms we never met with. Is the use of the rod so entirely foreign from domestic government, that its exclusion from a school must be denoted by the term parental? The truth is just the other way. Corporeal punishment is so delicate and hazardous a thing, that, as a general rule, it is perhaps expedient no where but at home. And whatever may be thought of the propriety of practising this method of correction in a school, the right to practise it is clearly vested in the head of every household. The father who never whips his son may be perfectly right; but the father who sets out with the determination not to do it, come what may, is most indubitably wrong. The term "parental," therefore, far from denoting the exclusion of the rod, implies distinctly the authority to use it. We beg the reader to observe, however, that we find no fault with the phrase 'parental discipline' when properly interpreted. On the contrary, we think that it expresses fully the true principle of government in public institutions. There discipline should always be parental. We have already hinted that the organization of our literary seminaries would be much improved by an approximation to the internal regulations of a well-ordered family. It follows, of course, if this be just, that the controlling and directing power in such an establishment, should be analogous in operation to the corresponding power in a family. In other words, the discipline should be, as far as possible, parental. We do not mean, however, by parental discipline, that sickly, fondling and old-womanish cajolery, which bribes and coaxes children to behave themselves. We mean a firm, kind, steady exercise of that discretion, which Providence allows to every parent, and which every parent, when he sends his son to school, transfers, so far as it admits of transfer, to the teacher whom he trusts. This, and this only, is parental discipline.

Most of these remarks have been suggested by the perusal of the London Quarterly Journal of Education, though we have not intended them as a formal review of that work. The plan of the Journal renders it extremely difficult to give a bona fide criticism of its contents in such a way as would be interesting to the general reader, though at the same time its design and scope might bring it legitimately before us. We feel it due, however, to the respectable character and standing of this journal, to disclaim all intention of charging its conductors with any peculiar bias towards the errors and absurdities which we have undertaken to expose. The faults of that periodical are almost wholly of another kind;

and though it could not be expected that in such a work, there should be no departures from the line of strict sobriety, we must confess that we have found as few in this, as in any contemporary publication. And on some points which we have adverted to in terms of disapprobation, it should be distinctly stated that the Quarterly Journal very strenuously advocates what we consider as the cause of truth and common sense.

We cannot dismiss the subject without hinting at some topics, which we wish to see presented in their true light to the public, as a means of rectifying false impressions, and exciting well directed efforts for the promotion of true learning in our midst. Besides some of those which have been slightly touched in the present article, we attach great importance to the question, how the profession of teachers may be raised to a higher point upon the scale of actual merit and of public estimation? Nothing to us appears more evident than that there is an urgent call for some peculiar and effectual expedients, corresponding to the peculiar circumstances of American society. There are safeguards and provisions in the old world, which are here unknown; and we do honestly consider that the man who shall devise a method of supplying this defect and of raising the business of instruction to its proper elevation in the public eye, will merit far more gratitude than many deep-mouthed demagogues, whose apotheosis is the order of the day. Next to the character of teachers, we desire to see the influence of the press on elementary instruction brought before the public mind. While public-spirited and enterprising publishers are showing themselves willing to do much for education by the supply of books, we are anxious to see learned men and authors duly sensible of their obligations to co-operate in this important work. America possessing, as she does, so many highly gifted sons, will have no excuse for coming short, in this respect, of other nations. Though we do not mean to give any pledge to that effect, it is our present purpose to attempt such an exhibition of these subjects as we think agreeable to truth, and likely to produce a good effect.

ART. III.—*The Racovian Catechism.*

IT is known to all students of ecclesiastical history, that Poland, and the neighbouring states of Transylvania, Bohemia, and Hungary, were the theatre of the Unitarian churches, during a considerable part of the sixteenth century. The reason why the propagators of heresy chose this region for the dissemination of their opinions, is easily explained. In all other countries of Europe, they were restrained by the laws, but here liberty of conscience was enjoyed. It may also be mentioned, that with the doctrines of the Reformation was introduced a spirit of free, unshackled inquiry into all opinions; and as was natural, from the imbecility of man, this liberty degenerated into licentiousness, and frequently terminated in downright infidelity. At first, the heterodox of Poland professed to be either Arians or Sabellians; they did not, indeed, adopt these denominations, but they held the opinions which are commonly so denominated. There were, however, numerous shades of difference among these Unitarians, and they separated into a great number of petty sects, which were usually denominated from the town or province in which the leading members respectively resided. One writer asserts, that at a particular time, about the middle of the sixteenth century, the number of Unitarian sects was above thirty, but he does not inform us in what points they differed from each other.\* According to the custom of the times, many public disputations were held, and many synods were convened, by which means it was attempted, but unsuccessfully, to settle the points in controversy, between the Trinitarians and Anti-Trinitarians.

In the midst of this confusion of sects and prevalence of heresy, Faustus Socinus visited the country. His uncle, Lælius Socinus, had been there many years before; but though he left his opinions as an inheritance to his nephew, he was himself either too timid or too prudent to avow and defend the Unitarian opinions which he held. But Faustus, with equal talents and address, possessed that courage which is requisite to appear openly as the advocate of unpopular tenets. When he first came to Poland, all parties seemed to be afraid of him; for they were aware that he had pushed his Unitarianism to consequences which they were not prepared to admit. None of the sects were disposed, therefore, to receive Socinus into their communion. No doubt he was displeased at being expelled from the communion of Unitarians; but he disguised his feelings, and artfully turned all to his own

\* Maimbourg.

advantage. He now professed an unwillingness to be connected with any particular sect, but declared himself to be the friend of all; and by intercourse with the leading ministers and teachers, he in a short time brought them all into one harmonious body, and induced them to embrace his peculiar opinions, which have ever since been called *SOCINIANISM*. One dispute, however, arose, which Socinus, with all his address, could never bring to a favourable conclusion. Francis Davidis, a man of learning and abilities, who had passed through many changes of theological opinion, was a leading minister among the Unitarians in Transylvania, and now began to teach and preach, that Jesus Christ being a mere man, had no more claim to divine worship than any other saint; a most legitimate conclusion from the acknowledged premises. But the broaching of this doctrine excited much uneasiness and alarm. Blandrat, who was now physician to the young prince Sigismund II., over whom he had a decisive influence, sent to Poland for Socinus, as being the only man who, by his skill and address in managing men, would be likely to prevail with Davidis to renounce his dangerous opinion. Accordingly, Socinus came, and for several months was lodged in the same house with the heretic, as he was considered by the Unitarians. But all his arguments and persuasions were ineffectual to convince Davidis of his being in an error. How could they, when the doctrine which he held is so manifestly correct upon Unitarian principles, that it is probable there is not now a Unitarian in the world who does not adopt the opinion of Davidis as correct, and dissent from that of Socinus as most unreasonable? But light does not break upon the world all at once. Even Unitarians may for a while remain in gross error and idolatry; and what to their successors is still more mortifying, they may proceed so far as to persecute those who differ from them. The young prince of Transylvania was induced to cast Davidis into prison simply on account of his pertinacious adherence to his opinion. Here the persecuted man died. We ought not, however, to be too severe in our censures of such conduct; for the doctrine of toleration was not yet well understood, even by those who pleaded for it in their own case, when they needed its shelter. We think that this case may fairly be placed as a parallel to that of Calvin. It is not clear, however, that Socinus advised this measure, although it is very certain that Blandrat directed the whole affair, as in all religious matters the prince was governed by him. So far as Socinus' own declaration will go to exculpate him from all concern in this transaction, we must acquit him of being accessory to the death of this learned man; for we recollect to have seen in some history of the churches in Poland,

that when at a large synod Socinus was accused of participating in the persecution of Davidis, he publicly denied that he had advised his imprisonment, or had any concern in the matter. But although the leading advocate of the obnoxious opinion was thus put out of the way, the doctrine of Davidis prevailed more and more. Socinus not only never changed his opinion respecting the worship of Christ, but he would hold no communion with any one who denied that Christ should be worshipped, and publicly taught and published, the opinion that those who received the doctrine of Davidis, had no just claim to the name of Christians.

The Unitarians of Poland cultivated biblical learning with assiduity and no small success, as appears from the volumes, entitled "*Poloni Fratres, &c.*" Most of the writings of Faustus Socinus were at first anonymous; and he strongly expressed his opinion in favour of that mode of publication, because men are so prone to be influenced in forming their opinions, by prejudices arising from the name of the author. His principal work was on the person and offices of Christ, entitled "*DE CHRISTO.*" It was in answer to a treatise in support of the divinity of Christ, written in the Polish language, by a Jesuit, whose name was Wiek. This work of the Pole was, indeed, nothing else than the treatise of Bellarmine on the deity of the Saviour, translated into the Polish tongue. Socinus' book received many answers, of which it is not our purpose at present to speak. The Racovian Catechism, of which we propose to treat somewhat particularly in this article, received its name from the town of RACOW, where it was first published. It was not written by Socinus, nor published during his life, but was compiled by SMALCIUS, from his writings, and at first appeared in the Polish language, A. D. 1606. It was not long, however, before this Catechism was published in Latin by MOSCOROVIVS; and also in the German language, by Smalcus himself, who sent a copy of it to the professors of Wittenberg. Among the fathers in this cradle of the reformation, it was a matter of serious deliberation, whether an answer should be given to it or not. At length, however, it was determined, that it would not be expedient to neglect it, lest the Socinians should consider silence as a sign that they had achieved a victory, and should be led vainly to triumph in the strength of their career. In conformity with the resolution now adopted, a pious and solid theologian, Frederick Baldwin, was requested to undertake a refutation of this Catechism. An able answer was also published by that consummate theologian, Wolfgang Crellius. The attentive reader will be in no danger of confounding this orthodox theologian with another of the same name greatly distinguished among the Socinians. This work of Crellius

was unfortunately left unfinished, in consequence of the distinguished author having been called to be court preacher to the duke of Brandenburg. But there was no lack of Polemics to contend for the faith, against this summary of all heresy. Alsted, Alting, Maresius, Tarnovius, Hornbeck, John Gerhard, and others, undertook its refutation; but no refutation was so full and satisfactory, as that of N. Arnold, professor in the University of Franeker; in which he sets down the questions and answers of the Catechism, without abridgment, and gives a solid answer to each, as he goes along. Arnold took a deep interest in this controversy, not only because he considered the questions in dispute as involving the essence of Christianity, but also because he himself was a native of Poland, and was intimately acquainted with the condition of the reformed church in that country.

It is our object to give a faithful translation of a part of this work, principally for the purpose of showing by what sort of argument and exegesis the old Socinians defended their cause; and that our readers may have the opportunity of observing the similarity between the neology with which we are threatened, and the heretical opinions of those who lived two centuries ago.

The part of this work which we have selected for translation is the first part of the tenth chapter, *De Libero Arbitrio*.

Quest. 1. "IS IT IN OUR POWER FULLY TO OBEY THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD?"

Ans. "Certainly: for it is evident, that the first man was so formed by God, that he was endued with free will; and no reason existed why he should be deprived of this power, after the fall: nor was it consistent with the justice of God that man should be deprived of free will. Accordingly, in the punishment inflicted on his sin, there is no mention made of any such loss."

#### *Refutation by Arnold.*

To obey the commandments of God, to put off the old man, to desist from sinning, not to walk after, but to mortify the flesh, to contract no evil habits, but only such as are virtuous and good, this writer asserts, is altogether in our power. But we affirm, that these things are not at all in our power; according to the declaration of our Saviour, "Without me ye can do nothing," (John, xv. 5,) and that of the apostle, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." (Phil. iv. 13.) And the same apostle says, "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." (Phil. ii. 13.) Why should these things be ascribed to God and to Christ, if they are completely in the power of man?

It is true, indeed, that man when created by God was endowed with free will; but a distinction must be made between man in a state of integrity, and man as fallen. In the former, he possessed free will, and also the power of obeying all the commandments of God, and of avoiding all that was forbidden. Not that man by the fall was entirely deprived of liberty, but he became depraved, so that in things pertaining to salvation he labours under an entire blindness of intellect. "For the natural man receiveth not the things of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Cor. ii. 14.) And the will of man has become so rebellious, that it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. (Rom. viii. 7.)

When this author says that there was no reason why God should deprive man of free will, he errs, not knowing the Scriptures, which clearly teach, that God, as a just Judge, denounced to man on account of his fall, the punishment of interminable death. And this was not merely eternal death, as the Socinians pretend, but the threatening comprehended corporeal and spiritual death also; so that man is not only liable to eternal death, but to death temporal and spiritual; and is declared to be dead in trespasses and sins. Now since every kind of death is a part of the penalty incurred by sin, which a just God inflicts; who does not see, that man in just judgment is deprived of the right exercise of free will?

Hence also we may understand, what is to be thought of that declaration, that it is inconsistent with justice for a man to be deprived of free will. It certainly belongs to justice to inflict deserved punishment on the disobedient; but this deprivation is a part of the punishment. Neither have you a right to say, that other men are not chargeable with the sin of Adam; that as they never committed that sin they cannot be punished for it; for undoubtedly Adam should be considered as the head of the whole human race, and so his sin was not *personal* but *universal*. As the father and head of the whole family of man did he perpetuate this crime, and so he involved all his posterity in guilt; and thus spiritual death has come upon them, as the merited punishment of this sin, and this includes the depravation of the free will of man.

In regard to the last words of the answer to the question stated above, that there is no mention of any such punishment inflicted on Adam, it is false; for we know that the punishment of the sin of Adam was death; but death is fourfold; temporal, spiritual, eternal, and the afflictions of this life. These several species of death, it is true, are not distinctly mentioned, yet they should all be considered as comprehended in the general denunciation; and

this is rendered manifest where spiritual death is mentioned as the state of man, by reason of which he is declared to be dead in sin. But if man be dead in sin, how can his will remain upright and uninjured?

In the primeval state, the judgment of man in regard to things natural, civil, and spiritual, was correct; and the inclination of his heart was pure in the choice of the highest good; not only possessing freedom from necessity and coercion, but also an immunity from every degree of depraved disposition, and from all moral and physical evil. And this is that goodness and rectitude in which God is said to have created man. But although man in a state of integrity was in fact inclined to that which was good, nevertheless by the sovereign dispensation of the Creator, and from the very nature of a dependent creature, his will was mutable; so that it could be turned to either of two opposites, and was liable to be deceived by the false appearance of objects presented, so as to be led to embrace that which was apparent, instead of the true good; of which mutability the event furnished a certain demonstration.

But in man's fallen state, his will is despoiled of its rectitude; and although his judgment in other things may be to a certain degree correct, yet in spiritual things it is entirely blind; and his inclination is so averse to all spiritual good, and so determined to evil only, that he must be considered as entirely depraved. And, accordingly, the Scriptures represent him as being blind in his understanding, perverse in his will, and rebellious in his affections; nay, as being "dead in sin;" labouring under a complete impotence as to all spiritual good. Gen. vi. 3. Matt. vii. 13. Rom. viii. 7. 1 Cor. viii. 4. Ephes. ii. 1.

Now, although man in this state is free from the necessity of nature, and also from that of coercion, yet he is not free from the servitude of sin and death. Before his conversion, he is not only impotent, as it relates to spiritual good, but is turned away from it with aversion. The fact, therefore, is, that man can contribute nothing towards his own conversion, but simply the natural faculty of the will, without which he would neither be a man, nor would he be capable of conversion.

Quest. 2. "BUT IS NOT THE WILL OF MAN VITIATED BY ORIGINAL SIN?"

Ans. "There is no such thing as original sin; the Scripture teaches no such doctrine; and the will of man could not be vitiated by a cause which had no existence. The sin of Adam being a single act could not corrupt his own nature, much less had it power to deprave the nature of all his posterity. That this sin should be charged on them, is, as has been said, a doctrine

unknown to the Scriptures; and it is utterly incredible, that God, who is the fountain of equity, should be willing to impute it to them."

### Refutation.

That the will of man is depraved by original sin, we have already declared to be our belief. Our opponent denies this, because, in his opinion, original sin has no existence, and could of course be the cause of no such depravity. The affirmative, however, is capable of being demonstrated by an appeal to facts and to the testimony of Scripture. From both these sources we shall therefore now endeavour to show, that original sin exists in every man who has derived his nature from Adam, by natural generation.

It is true the Scriptures do not express the inherent and habitual stain of our nature by using the technical phrase *original sin*; but they clearly designate the same thing, by words which have the same import. By a metonymy, it is called *flesh*. (John iii. 6.) It is called by way of eminence, *sin*, which reigneth in our mortal bodies. (Rom. vi. 12.) And *sin* that dwelleth in us—evil present with us. (Rom. vii. 17.) So also it is denominated, *the old man*, as indicating its origin from our first father, and to designate its vileness and corruption; as it is contrasted with the *new man*, which signifies something precious and excellent. It is called, "a law in our *members*," that is, a principle which binds with force like a law. It is also denominated, "*the body of sin*," by which strength and cohesion are represented as belonging to this evil principle. It is also termed "*the old leaven*," and by James, *lust*, (*επιθυμία*), by a metonymy of the subject for the adjunct. But original sin is not any one faculty, habit, or art, but a general disorder or *αταξία*.

With the fathers, original sin has various names, such as *malitradux*, a hereditary evil, *malum domesticum*, a domestic evil—*infusum et coagulatum delictorum contagium*, the concentrated contagion of all crimes. Augustine called it *naturæ vitium*, the vice of nature; also, *peccati contagium ex origine*, the original contagion of sin; and finally, *peccatum originale*, original sin; which last name, as most conveniently expressing the thing, was retained in the schools, and has been in common use till this day. The word *original* has no relation to God as the author of our being, and the first cause of all things, but altogether to the second cause, namely, our sinning first parent.

But to deny the existence of original sin altogether is the madness of the Socinians; and to assert that it cannot be proved from Scripture, is the dotage of reason. What then is that which is

said, (Gen. iii. 5.) where Adam is said to have begotten a son in his own image? In which passage we should carefully attend to the antithesis between Adam and Seth; that is, between the image of God in which Adam was created, and the image of Adam in which Seth was begotten. For as *the image of God* designated the moral excellence in which Adam was created, the wisdom of his understanding and the sanctity of his will; so the image of Adam, now fallen, signified the blindness of his mind and the depravation of his will. Adam, by his apostacy, transformed himself from the image of God to the opposite character. He could not, therefore, beget a son in the image of God in which he was created, but *in his own image*; that is, in a state of corruption.

It will not do to say, that Adam begat Seth a man like himself, as to his species, for that idea was fully expressed, when it was said, "he begat a son;" nor will it answer to say, that he begat a son in figure, form, and external lineament, like himself; for it is supposed, not proved, that such a likeness existed between the father and the son; and if it had been the fact, this was not a matter of so much consequence as that to designate it, the Holy Spirit should use the twofold expression of *similitude and likeness*, as had been done before, when it was said that Adam was made in the image of God. Certainly, in that case, the sacred writer had no respect to any external image or likeness; neither, therefore, should we suppose he had here, where he uses the same terms.

Another evasion is, that we should here understand the moral image of Adam as regenerated by the Holy Spirit; so that Seth was the heir of that renovated image; but that renovated image did not pertain to man's nature, but was altogether the effect of supernatural grace, which is never communicated by physical generation, but by a mystical regeneration.

Again, does not Job prove the doctrine of original sin, when by the Holy Spirit he says, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." (Job xiv. 5.) To which Socinus has nothing to except but this, that believers are not unclean, but washed and sanctified. It is true, believers are holy, but not as they are natural men, for "whatsoever is born of the flesh is flesh." The same doctrine appears evident from the necessity of regeneration, concerning which Christ says, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." From this it is clear, that our first birth is corrupt; for what need would there be for regeneration, if our first generation were holy? And how does it happen, if depravity is not born with us, that there should not be found a man, who by the tendency of his own nature does

not rush into the commission of sin? And if the whole mass of human nature had not become corrupt, it would never have been said of Christ that he was in all things made like to us, *sin* only excepted; for if this be not the fact, then all infants dying in infancy are as free from sin as Christ himself was.

But finally, infants die, and death is the punishment of sin; yet it cannot be the punishment of actual sin, for infants dying in infancy are incapable of committing it; they are destitute of the use of reason, and of the exercise of free will; and those who are our opponents in this question, consider it a cardinal point, that there is no sin which does not consist in the exercise of the will. Since, then, the punishment of death is not inflicted on infants for actual sin, it must be for original sin.

There is no truth nor force in what is next asserted, "that the fall of Adam did not corrupt his own nature, and therefore, could not corrupt that of his posterity." For they admit that eternal death was the punishment incurred by the sin of Adam; and why should it seem strange, that that act which subjected the transgressor to so great a penalty, should at the same time work a corruption of his nature? Surely that which could effect the greater might also produce the less. But the reason why the sin of Adam corrupted the nature of his posterity was, because it was not the sin of an individual, as your sin or my sin, but it was the sin of a whole race. It was a *universal* sin. For Adam was the stalk, the root, the head of the whole family of man.

That this corruption of nature came upon man as the punishment of sin, is evident from this, that every thing which properly comes under the name of death is the punishment of sin; for this was the penalty of the law, and it comprehended every kind of death; and this depravation of nature is expressly called by this name, by the Apostle Paul, (Ephes. ii. 1.) wherefore original sin is the punishment of the first sin.

The conclusion of this answer, "that because God is the fountain of all equity, it is altogether incredible that he should punish the posterity of Adam on account of his sin," is a mere assertion totally incapable of proof; for why should God cease to be the fountain of equity, when he punishes the posterity of Adam on account of his sin, when he has constituted him the head and representative of the whole race? The legitimate course of reasoning is, that because God does punish the posterity of the first man on account of his sin, therefore, it must be just, and should be so considered, whether we can understand it or not. Whatever he does is just, because he does it; for his will is the rule of justice.

Quest. 3. BUT ARE THERE NOT SCRIPTURE TESTIMONIES WHICH TEACH THE CERTAIN EXISTENCE OF ORIGINAL SIN, SUCH

AS THAT IN GEN. iv. 5. "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually;" and that in Gen. viii. 21. "For the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth?"

Ans. "These testimonies treat of voluntary sin; therefore, from them original sin never can be proved. For as to the text first cited, Moses teaches that it was sin of that kind, which caused God to repent that he had made man, and which provoked him to bring a deluge upon the world; but who would venture to assert that this was done on account of original sin inherent in the nature of man? And in the other passage, it is declared that the sin of man should not again be the cause of the destruction of the world by a deluge, which certainly cannot relate to original sin, or inherent depravity."

#### *Refutation.*

That the doctrine of original sin is inculcated in these kindred passages, is evident from several considerations. The corruption of man is represented as being universal, habitual, and unceasing. What could more clearly indicate that the principle of human actions was vitiated? What sort of proof could be more convincing, that this depravity was born with us? Our opponent, however, replies, that the sacred historian is here speaking of actual sins, on account of which God overwhelmed the world with a deluge. I grant that actual sins are referred to in these passages, but I deny that they alone are intended to the exclusion of original sin: for the Holy Spirit makes a plain distinction between the wickedness which was external and actual, and the imaginations of the heart which are internal and habitual; otherwise there would be here a mere tautology, and the very same thing, without necessity, would be repeated. Another decisive evidence that inherent natural depravity is included in the account is, that infants who were incapable of actual sin, were nevertheless swallowed up in the deluge as well as adults. Now this judgment was sent upon them justly or unjustly; if the first, then they are chargeable with sin, and grievous sin too, to deserve such a punishment; but this of necessity must be original sin, for as we have seen, they are not capable of actual sin. But if this punishment should be pronounced unjust, then we do no less than accuse the Governor of the world of acting the part of an unjust judge, in bringing such a calamity unjustly upon his innocent creatures; which would be blasphemy.

In these passages, it was the design of the Holy Spirit not only to indicate actual sin, but to trace it up to its internal cause; namely, original sin. For the declaration is universal, in relation

to all the thoughts and imaginations of the heart; and to give it the greater force, it is exclusive of every thing of an opposite kind. "Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil, and that continually." Surely, if this be a just description of the moral condition of man, his whole soul must be depraved. Total depravity could not be more emphatically represented. The evil is universal—*every imagination of the thoughts of the heart*. It is exclusively of all good—and *only evil*. And it is the same at all times—and *that continually*. The true source of evil thoughts of every kind is designated by Christ, where he says, "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts." When, therefore, we refer the second cause to the first, the stream to its fountain, the effect to its cause, the Socinian has no right to complain. To the eye of God both the cause and the effect are equally manifest; the evil tree as well as the bad fruit. This last was, indeed, the immediate cause of the deluge, but the former was the cause of this. As infants perished in the deluge, and God is here giving the reason why the deluge was sent, it must be comprehensive enough to include them, and therefore must include original as well as actual sin; unless any one will choose to maintain that infants were punished without any fault; which, as was before shown, would be an impious impeachment of the character of God. But if it be alleged that they could not be guilty of actual sin, then it follows, that they were punished on account of original sin. So much for the first testimony. As to the second, our opponent says, "that it is merely declared that the sin of man shall not again be the cause of a deluge for the destruction of the world; but this can have no relation to original sin." But why not? We have seen, that both on account of original and actual sin, God brought the deluge on the world; so now in this parallel passage, he makes known his will, that in time to come, the sin of man both original and actual, should not induce him again to destroy the world by a deluge. As the form of expression is nearly the same as in the former text, the argument will be the same; and as there it was shown that original might fairly be inferred from the universality and constancy of the prevalence of actual sin; so the same conclusion may be deduced from the words now under consideration,

Quest. 4. "BUT WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THAT DECLARATION OF DAVID, (PSALM li. 5.) 'BEHOLD I WAS SHAPEN IN INIQUITY, AND IN SIN DID MY MOTHER CONCEIVE ME.'"? "

Answ. "It should be remembered, that David is not here speaking about every man, but concerning himself alone, and that not simply, but in relation to his fall; and he uses that method of speaking, of which he himself furnishes an example in Psalm

lviii. 4. ‘The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.’ Wherefore, neither can original sin be evinced by this testimony.”

### Refutation.

When David says, “Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me,” from the consideration of the actual sin committed by him, he ascends to the origin of all his sins, and laments the proneness of his nature to sin; and this inherent depravity he represents as coeval with his existence; a corrupt mass in which he was conceived and born, and which he had derived from his parents; all which, taken together, can signify nothing but original sin.

Against this interpretation, Socinians make many objections, as may be seen in the work of Volkelius, *De Vera Religione*; all which, however, have been fully discussed and refuted by our Spanheim, in his “Collection of Theological Disputations.” It is alleged that David is not speaking here concerning the conception of his own nature, but of the conception of sin. But the unreasonableness of this gloss is too manifest to need any refutation. This would be referring what is said about the subject to the act; what is said about the sinner to his sin. Certainly David was not here speaking of the mother of his sin, but of his own mother.

Again it is alleged, “that David is not here speaking of original sin, but of the actual sin of his parents, and especially of his mother.” Now this is frivolous. David was not here confessing the sins of his parents, but his own sins. Moreover, his parents were in all probability, dead long before this time, as David was the youngest of Jesse’s sons, who was an old man when Samuel anointed David to be king; and this Psalm was composed when David was past middle life. And for what purpose should he drag his mother’s sins into public notice, in this manner? Besides, there is not the smallest evidence that David’s mother was remarkable for her transgressions. The sin of which David complains is that from which he prays to be cleansed, and from which he entreats that God would hide his face; but who does not see that these were his own sins, and not those of his parents?

A third interpretation given to this passage is, “That from it, not even actual sin can be proved, much less original sin; for it is possible that one might be conceived in iniquity, and yet not be a sinner, just as one might be conceived and born in blindness, who was not himself blind.” But that a person should be shapen in iniquity, and yet not be a sinner, is a palpable contradiction. If it be meant, that we may derive our being from a sinner without being infected with sin, as the child of a blind man need not

be blind, the error consists in comparing things of an unequal kind. Individual properties are not indeed communicated by ordinary generation; but qualities which affect the whole species are transmitted, of which nature is original sin.

They allege again, "that if it had been the design of David, in this passage, to designate the innate corruption of our nature, he would have ascended from his own sin to that of the first man; but since he does not do this, but stops with the mention of his immediate parents, and especially of his mother, it is a clear indication, that he did not mean here to speak of original sin." To which it may be replied, that there was no need of David's ascending to the sin of Adam, for he was not now speaking of the first origin of sin, but of original sin itself; not of *the originating sin*, as we say in the schools, but of *sin originated*; although indeed the latter supposes the existence of the former. It fully answered the purpose of the penitent psalmist, to describe that inbred corruption, which he was deeply convinced dwelt within him, and also the immediate source from which it was derived to him, which was by natural descent from his parents; and this was substantially the same, as if he had traced this corruption up to his first parent.

But it is still objected, "that, if the words of David are taken literally, they can by no means be referred to any person but himself, for he speaks of no other: if they are to be understood figuratively, then, according to all just rules of interpretation, they cannot be the foundation of an argument." Take them as you will, if they have any meaning at all, they must be considered as evincive of the fact, that David himself was infected with original sin; and if it existed in him, what reason can be assigned why it should not be in others? And as to a figurative interpretation, the words do not appear susceptible of such an explanation without being subjected to great violence: for what can it be supposed that he intended to represent by saying that he was shapen in iniquity and conceived by his mother in sin?

The author of this Catechism, perhaps distrusting such evasions as these, confines himself to two particulars in his attempts to break the force of the argument derived from these words. The first is, that David was here discoursing of himself alone, and that he had special reference to his own disgraceful fall, and did not design to speak of the sin of other men. But this subterfuge takes for granted that David alone was infected with birth-sin, which, for the best reasons, is utterly denied. Moreover, this exposition concedes the main point in controversy; namely, that at least one man has been born in original sin; for it is admitted, that David was shapen in iniquity, and conceived by his mother

in sin. Now this is precisely what we assert; only we argue from the fact, that if this was the origin of David, it must also be of every other man; and the argument cannot be invalidated as long as the fact is admitted; for what imaginable reason can be assigned, why David, above all other men, should be conceived in sin? There is the less reason to think that David would speak thus of his origin, as being in a peculiar manner polluted, when it is considered, that he was born in lawful wedlock, and was descended from pious parents, as appears by the sacred history. But it would be easy to show, if this were the proper place, that what David so emphatically declares respecting his own sinful origin, the Holy Ghost, in other passages, teaches to be the condition of all men. See Psalm, xiv. 4. Job, xiv. 2. Ephes. ii. 3.

The second evasion, to which our Catechist resorts, is, that the words ought to be understood hyperbolically, just as we must understand those words of the same author in Ps. lviii. 4. "The wicked are estranged from the womb, as soon as they are born, they go astray speaking lies." So in this place, David, under the strong feelings of repentance, exaggerates his sin; and, therefore speaks of it as if it was coeval with his existence. These people blow hot and cold with the same breath. What is here said about exaggerating his sin, is in direct opposition to what we read in the Institutes of Ostorodus, who asserts that these words were spoken by David not with a view to exaggerate his criminality, but to extenuate his sin, as proceeding from a constitution born with him. But who that has ever read attentively the whole Psalm, can believe, that the royal penitent had the least thought of extenuating his sin? If then it should be considered a hyperbole, in which David exaggerates his sin, I would retort the argument, and say, if his object was to speak in the strongest terms of the greatness of his actual sin, he was led by the same motive to designate as its source, his original corruption; and how could he have more effectually represented his guilt, than by ascending from his actual transgressions to his original corruption?

The reference to the passage cited from the fifty-eighth Psalm, can be of no service to the cause. The cases are entirely different; the passages are by no means parallel. It is one thing for a pious man, descended from pious parents, to declare 'that he was shapen in iniquity, and conceived by his mother in sin,' and another to say, that the wicked go astray and speak lies from the womb. These last words evidently relate to voluntary, personal acts; but this can by no means be said of the former. I deny, however, that even in these last words, there is any thing hyper-

bolical; for the object was to describe the depravity of the wicked, both in relation to act and habit. But admitting that there is a hyperbole in the words from the 58th Psalm; yet that would not prove that the same must be the fact, in regard to the passage in the 51st Psalm. Therefore, I must, after impartially considering all the evasions to which Socinians have had recourse, consider the doctrine of original sin, as fully established by this single text, if there were no other in the Bible.

“Quest. 5. BUT DOES NOT PAUL SAY, ROM. V. 12. “THAT ALL MEN HAVE SINNED IN ADAM?”

“Answ. It is not declared in the text quoted, that all men sinned in Adam; for the words in Greek  $\epsilon\varphi\ '\omega$ , which are every where rendered in Latin by *in quo*, *in whom*, may with more propriety be rendered *because that*, or *since*, as in the parallel passages Rom. viii. 3.  $\epsilon\nu\ '\omega$  *in that*. Phil. iii. 12.  $\epsilon\varphi\ '\omega$  *that for which*. Heb. ii. 13.  $\epsilon\varphi\ '\omega$  *in that*. 2 Cor. v. 4.  $\epsilon\varphi\ '\omega$  *because that*. It is evident, therefore, that the doctrine of original sin cannot be built on this passage.”

### Refutation.

The passage of Scripture which the Catechism here brings into view is certainly the most decisive for the proof of the doctrine of original sin of any in the Bible. “As by one man sin entered into the world, and so death passed upon all men because that (in whom) all have sinned.” In the Latin vulgate, the latter part of this phrase is rendered *in whom* all have sinned. The apostle in this place institutes a comparison and contrast between Adam and Christ, and shows that the righteousness of Christ avails to the justification of all who are united to him, just as the fall and disobedience of Adam was the cause of the sin and condemnation of all his posterity. He then proceeds to show that death had actually invaded the whole human race in consequence of their connexion with their first father. The fact is undeniable that all die, not even excepting infants; and it is vain to allege that all became voluntarily sinners by the imitation of Adam, for to the majority of men, the first sin was unknown, and as to infants, it is certain they could not become sinners by imitation; nevertheless they are obnoxious to death as much as adults, and in circumstances of as much bodily pain and distress; which can only be accounted for by supposing that they are partakers of the blame and punishment of the first offence. The apostle goes on to declare the reason why all are infected with the pollution of sin and are exposed to its punishment, which is, that in this first man, all have sinned. The phrase  $\epsilon\varphi\ '\omega$  ought in this place to be considered as of the same import with  $\epsilon\nu\ '\omega$  in 1 Cor. xv. 22, where we

have ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ *in Adam* all die, so ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ *in Christ*, shall all be made alive. And in Mark ii. 4. this identical phrase is used in this sense, "They let down the couch ἐφ' ᾧ *on which*, the paralytic lay." But if we take this phrase, as our adversaries wish, to designate, not the *subject*, but *the cause*, it will come to the very same thing. For the reason is here assigned by the apostle why death has passed upon all men, and according to this interpretation, the reason is, "because all have sinned;" but this cannot be understood of actual sin; for in this sense all who die have not sinned, since infants are incapable of sinning actually. The meaning, therefore, must be that all have sinned in their first father and representative. If they had not sinned in him, they would not have been subjected to the punishment of his first transgression. And that condemnation comes on the race on account of this one sin, is so clearly taught in the following verses, that there is no room left for any reasonable doubt, that the apostle meant to teach that this sin was imputed; or that hence condemnation was incurred by all men. It is repeatedly declared that by the *one sin* of the *one man* many *had died—had come into condemnation—had been constituted sinners*, &c.: it seems, therefore, most natural and reasonable, to suppose that the apostle in the 12th verse, where he assigns a reason for the death of our whole race, means the same which he evidently does in the subsequent verses. This interpretation renders the whole context consistent with itself; whereas, if by πάντες ἡμαρτον, we understand the actual sinning of all, not only will infants, who also suffer death, be excluded; but the reason assigned for the death of all will be different from what it is in the following verse: 'Guilt has, by one man, come upon all men to condemnation, not in effect merely, but in righteous judgment.'

In this passage, then, we are clearly taught, first, the universal and total corruption of all men; secondly, that this corruption is derived from the first man, not by imitation of his first sin, concerning which many knew nothing, and of which others were incapable, but by a participation of the crime of the first man. Hence all men are bound to suffer death, although not guilty of actual sin; for according to the nature of the apostle's argument, the participation and propagation of sin and death, must be derived from one man, just as the participation and propagation of righteousness and life are derived from another, even Christ. In a word, the argument may be stated simply thus: 'As by Christ alone, life and righteousness are introduced, so by Adam, sin and death. And as all who are justified and receive the gift of life, are indebted for these benefits to Christ alone; so as many as sin and die, do all sin and die in Adam alone. Therefore, original

sin exists, as is evident from the fact that infants die, who are altogether incapable of actual sin.

The objection which they make, "that it is not asserted, that all men die in Adam is of no force; for the contrast which is here set up between the first and second Adam requires, that the words of the apostle should be understood in this sense. The same thing is necessarily implied in those words, "As in Adam all sin, so in Christ shall all be made alive," for evidently, if all die in Adam, all must have sinned in him. It is repugnant to every idea of divine justice, that any should be subjected to the punishment due to another, without any participation in his sin.

Where the Catechist asserts that εφ' ω should be rendered *because that* or *inasmuch*, in accordance with the use of the same particles in other passages, he gains no help to his cause, for I have shown, that admitting this interpretation, still an unanswerable argument for original sin may be derived from this passage. But I deny that the words ought to be thus translated: and our opponent has adduced no reasons for his interpretation; unless that, elsewhere, these words are thus rendered; which reason makes just as much for us as it does for him. We might, therefore, argue thus, the particles εφ' ω elsewhere signify *in which*, or *in whom*, therefore they ought to be so understood here; but our opponent would not admit this conclusion, because "*a particulari ad particulare non valet consequentia*:" that is, we cannot draw the conclusion from the use of a particle, in one place, that its signification is the very same in another. Well, we can make the very same objection to his argument. It is not, therefore, a satisfactory reason that εφ' ω should signify *inasmuch*, or *because that*, merely because passages may be found where the words are thus used. Besides, the places alleged, are not in point, for in Rom. viii. 3. the phrase is not the same: it is εν' ω. In 2 Cor. v. 4. we do indeed read εφ' ω, yet the particles are here used *subjectively*, that is, in a sense corresponding with our interpretation for τω σκηνηι is evidently the antecedent to which the relative refers. And in Heb. ii. 18. the phrase is εν' ω, and, therefore, although it be taken *casually*, it does not affect the interpretation of the words now under consideration. But while we judge, that the Latin version is correct, in rendering this passage (in quo) *in whom all have sinned*; yet we are not of opinion, that the force of the argument for original sin, is at all invalidated by the other interpretation; for as we have shown above, it comes eventually to the same thing, whether you take these words as expressive of the *subject*, or the *cause*.

As to the exception of Ostorodus, that in this passage the word "sinners" does not denote those who were really such, but per-

sons who are spoken of as if they had been sinners, is too unreasonable to require a moment's consideration; but it is enough forever to silence this objection, that these persons are *really* subject to the penalty of death; if therefore, they are liable to death, which is the wages of sin, they must be sinners; otherwise there would be no correspondence between the crime and punishment. If the crime was merely supposititious, and the punishment real, how could God be a just judge when he treated those as real sinners who were only putatively such?

Quest. 6. "AS YOU HAVE TAUGHT THAT MAN'S FREE-WILL IS NOT VITIATED BY ORIGINAL SIN, EXPLAIN ALSO, HOW FAR THE POWER OF FREE-WILL EXTENDS?"

Answ. "Generally, the strength of human nature in regard to those things which God requires, is very small; yet for those duties which we are bound to perform, the will by which they may be performed exists in all men; so that human ability is not so small, but that if any one sincerely desires to exert his power in obeying the commandments of God, he, by divine assistance, will not make his efforts in vain. This divine aid, God never withholds from any man to whom he has communicated the revelation of his will; otherwise He could never justly chastise or punish the rebellious; but we know he does both."

#### *Refutation.*

Although in man there is remaining some light of reason and conscience, and some liberty of will, in relation to actions of a merely moral, civil, or political nature; yet in regard to things spiritual, and those which concern our salvation, the strength of human nature is not only, as the Catechist acknowledges, "very small," but is absolutely nothing at all; for man in his state of destitution and ruin, is "dead in trespasses and sins." Now, we know that in death there is not merely *little* strength, but not any strength. This is the fact in regard to all those who have fallen under the power of corporeal death, as it relates to natural actions; and the same is true of spiritual death, as it relates to spiritual actions. And as the man who is naturally dead, is altogether impotent to put forth the actions of a living man; so, he who is spiritually dead, is equally unable to put forth those acts which appertain to the spiritual life. For although there remains in man the natural faculty of willing, yet in this faculty there is no ability of willing that which is good, and of refusing that which is evil, of a spiritual kind. But what is this which our opponent teaches? "That human strength is not so very small, but that if a man will exert what he has, by the divine aid which will be granted, he will not fail of obeying the will of God."

This is purely Pelagian. It is as if you should say, "a man who is naturally dead, if he will exert the strength which he has, may by divine aid, put forth the acts of a living creature. But we know that a man naturally dead can do nothing toward his own resuscitation; and the same is equally true respecting spiritual death. No man can produce strength in himself, if the cause and principle of that kind of action be wanting. If he can, it must be either in dependence on God, or independently of him. If the former, it is not man but God who produces the effect; if the latter, the creature is independent of his Maker, for at least one good thing which he possesses. He produces ability in himself by his own effort, and does not receive it from above; but this pretension approaches near to atheism, and is blasphemous. This is for a man to attribute to himself, what the Scriptures expressly ascribe to God, namely, the power "to will and to do;" and the apostle asserts, "That we are not sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God." (2 Cor. iii. 5.) And if the words of Christ himself are true—and we know they are truth itself—"Without me you can do nothing." The assertion of our adversary is altogether false, when he asserts, that a man without the help of God, or previous to that aid, can produce strength in himself to perform the will of God. Indeed, his aid he will deny to none of those to whom he has revealed his will. But this is true only of those who, understanding his will, implore aid from God. Thus in Psalm l. 15. "Call upon me, and I will deliver thee;" and in Luke xi. 9. "Ask and it shall be given you." But the passage which best suits our purpose is that in the 13th verse: "How much more will your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" But even to ask aright, and to implore divine aid sincerely, are not in the power of man until by the operations of grace those groanings which cannot be uttered are excited in him. For until the spirit of prayer is given to a man by God, he cannot truly call Jesus, Lord; nor can he with the spirit of adoption cry Abba, Father. It is true then, that God does not withhold his aid from those to whom he not only externally makes known his will, but whom he internally persuades; for, indeed, that the aids of grace are denied to many who externally have the will of God preached to them, can be doubted by none except such as are ignorant, that "God heareth not sinners," and that their prayers are an abomination unto Him; but he will hear the petitions of the righteous, and his ear is ever open to their cry.

In answer to what this writer says in the last place, "That God cannot justly punish the rebellious unless man is endued with the power of free-will to obey, is of no force, because God most

righteously punishes that impotency, which the first man incurred for his posterity. For the devils themselves are evidently unable to do any thing truly good; and yet who would deny that they are justly punished for their wickedness? They who urge this argument allege, that if you take away free-will, you take away all punishments and all rewards. But this is not true, as we know from the case of the blessed angels, whose will is not in a state of indifference between two opposites, which is the Socinian notion of liberty, but the will of the angels is unchangeably determined to that which is good, and to that alone; so that they cannot will that which is evil; and yet who would deny, that these holy beings are deserving of praise, for the perfection of their obedience? And this inclination of theirs only to that which is good, God is pleased to crown with a gracious reward of everlasting felicity.

Quest. 7. "BUT WHAT IS THAT DIVINE AID OF WHICH YOU HAVE MADE MENTION?"

Ans. "Divine aid is twofold, internal and external."

Quest. 8. "WHAT IS THAT DIVINE AID WHICH IS EXTERNAL?"

Ans. "The principal is the word of God, especially its promises and threatenings; but of these, the promises have much greater force than the threatenings. Here also, it may be remarked, that under the new covenant the promises are far more excellent than under the old. Moreover, it is much easier to do the will of God under the new, than it was under the old covenant."

### *Refutation.*

I observe, in the first place, that our author makes external aid to consist in the promises and threatenings of God's word. Now these may indeed furnish strong motives to induce a man to accept the good proposed, and to reject the evil; but there seems to be no propriety in calling this by the name of "aid," unless we give to the term an acceptation much broader than usual. But that which is most objectionable in this statement is, that divine aid is confined to the external promises and threatenings; whereas God not only promises good and threatens evil in his word, but graciously operates within us, and by divine energy renders these motives effectual; which, without such an internal operation would produce no effect whatever; for the good contained in the promise is neither apprehended nor desired, much less enjoyed, until the mind is illuminated and excited by divine power. And what else is that which we read in so many perspicuous texts of sacred Scripture, where God is said to enlighten those who are spiritually blind, as in Ephes. i. 17, 18—to regenerate

and renew those who are carnal, as in John iii. 5, 6. 1 Cor. iv. 15. Pet. iii. 7. To quicken the dead in sin, as in Ephes. ii. 1. 5. To soften the hard heart, as in Ezek. xi. 19—xxxvi. 16. To convert us to himself, as in Jer. xxxi. 13. 19. To draw us effectually, as in John vi. 44. To create within us a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within us, as in Psal. li. 12. To open our understanding to understand the Scriptures, as in Luke xxiv. 31. 45. To confer upon us saving faith, as in Phil. ii. 9. To excite good thoughts and volitions, as in 2 Cor. iii. 5. Phil. ii. 13. To cause us to walk in his statutes, as in Ezek. xxxvi. 27, and to fear his name, as Jer. xxxii. 39, and to love the Lord, as Deut. xxx. 6. From all these texts, and numerous others which might be added, it is manifest that “divine aid” consists in God’s efficient and gracious operation within us; and not in the bare proposition of promises and threatenings. For without a divine agency to illuminate our minds and cause us to understand the promises, so as spiritually to apprehend the good which they contain, the mere exhibition of them will never produce any saving effect. Unless God incline our will to embrace the good revealed in the word, with all our strength, we shall continue to be unaffected by it. “For the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them; because they are spiritually discerned.” The writer, while he describes both promises and threatenings, under the name of “divine aid,” intimates that the former are much more powerful in their operation on the mind, than the latter; concerning which however, we are constrained to doubt, since there are many more who hate and avoid sin, through fear of punishment, than from the love of virtue. Again, that the promises of the New Testament are much more excellent than those of the Old; and that the duties of the new covenant are much more easily performed than those of the old, is asserted but not proved, by our author. We say, that in substance, the promises of the Old and New Testament are the same, namely, Christ and his benefits, together with eternal life; so that, in substance, there is nothing promised in the new covenant which was not also promised in that of the former dispensation. It is true, however, that the blessings promised are much more clearly exhibited under the Gospel, than they were under the Law. In regard to clearness and sweetness, it may be said, that the promises of the New Testament are more excellent; but not as it relates to the substance of the things promised.

We are aware, however, that Socinians believe that the Old and New Testaments differ, not merely in circumstances, but in essence.

Quest. 9. "WHAT IS THAT 'DIVINE AID' WHICH YOU CALL INTERNAL?"

Ans. "It is this; that God seals on the hearts of those who obey him, whatever he has promised."

*Refutation.*

Wonderful theology! This sealing, which the catechist calls "divine aid" of the internal kind, is produced by a consideration of the divine promises and threatenings; that is to say, the seal of a thing which is sealed, is "aid." But sealing is an act, the object of which is merely to produce a more perfect confirmation. When, therefore, God is said to aid a man by sealing the promises, it is nothing else than for God to certify to a man, running of his own accord in the right way, a prosperous issue to all his efforts. According to this view of the helps of grace, there is not in works of piety any such thing as the preventing, co-operating, or accompanying agency of God; but only a certain sealing of the work consummated by man, to assure him that his labour shall not be in vain. Simply to state the Socinian theology, in relation to this point, is a sufficient refutation. For if there be any truth in the Scripture doctrine of grace, it is God who first excites us to works of piety, then co-operates with us in our spiritual exercises, and enables us to persevere in the performance of the good thus commenced.

Ques. 10. "IF THE WILL OF MAN REMAIN FREE, [AND UNHURT BY THE FALL,] WHY IS IT THAT SO MANY HAVE SET THEMSELVES IN OPPOSITION TO THIS DOCTRINE!"

Ans. "They are induced to do so, from entertaining the opinion that there are certain testimonies of Scripture which they are confident teach that man is no longer possessed of free will."

Quest. 11. "BUT WHAT ARE THOSE SCRIPTURE TESTIMONIES ON WHICH THEY DEPEND?"

Ans. "They are of two kinds. The first are such, as that from them, they suppose this doctrine can be fairly inferred: the others are thought to contain express declarations, that free will does not now exist in man."

*Refutation.*

It is not with the orthodox a mere matter of conjecture or opinion, that the will of man, since the fall, is enslaved to sin; but it is a truth which is capable of being confirmed by the clearest demonstration; and we not only *suppose* that we have texts of Scripture from which it can be deduced that the will of man is entirely indisposed to all spiritual good, but we do actually accomplish what we profess, as will appear, when we come to the

consideration of the particular passages, on which this doctrine rests.

Here we must, for the present, close our extracts from ARNOLD'S REFUTATION of the Racovian Catechism. The writer proceeds in the following questions, in this tenth chapter, *De Libero Arbitrio*, to treat largely of predestination. We should be pleased, if our space would permit us, to follow this learned and solid theologian through the whole discussion; but what we have extracted may serve as a specimen of the manner in which theological discussion was conducted nearly two centuries ago. One thing must have struck the reader as remarkable, namely, that the modern arguments, by which error attempts to defend her cause, are precisely the same as those employed for centuries past. We know, indeed, that those who now adopt and advocate these opinions, greatly dislike this comparison of modern theories with ancient heresies, and denounce it as invidious. But why should it be so considered? Or why should they be unwilling to acknowledge the conformity of their opinions with those of ancient times, when the agreement is so manifest, not only in the doctrines themselves, but in the arguments and interpretations of Scripture, by which they attempt to support them? If the "New Divinity" be correct, then certainly many who were formerly condemned by the majority of Christians, as heretics, ought to be considered the true church, and their doctrines as orthodox; while those who censured and condemned them, ought to be considered as a set of unreasonable bigots, who by their numbers and influence were able to suppress the cause of true Christianity.

Certainly, then, they who are now so confident that they have received new light, ought not to be ashamed of their brethren, who struck out this same light, hundreds of years before they were born, and defended their opinions by arguments as ingenious, and by exegesis as learned, as any of those now living have a right to pretend to. It is, however, a fact, that these theologians who long maintained the character of being orthodox, are very reluctant to be classed with Arminians, Pelagians, and Socinians, even when they are conscious that their opinions coincide with those designated by such denominations. This does not arise from any real abhorrence of the sects so denominated; but they are aware that the Christian public, with which they are connected, entertain strong prejudices against these sects; and it requires no small degree of moral courage to stem the torrent of popular prejudice. There has been, therefore, in our "new light" theologians, an unusual solicitude to persuade the religious community that they were not contemplating innovations

upon the ancient creed of the orthodox, but that they had merely adopted a more rational philosophy, by which they were able to explain the knotty points in Calvinism, so as to render doctrines naturally offensive to human reason, if not entirely palatable, yet in a great degree free from objection. These attempts at reconciling the new opinions with the commonly received doctrines of the church have been pushed so far, that even some who have gone far into the "new divinity," have been ashamed of the want of candour and ingenuousness, which has sometimes been manifested. And now, at length, the character and tendency of these modern theories have created alarm even in the largest body of professed Arminians on earth. I mean the Methodist Episcopal church. The tables are strangely turned upon us. Formerly, we shrunk from contact with this increasing body of zealous Christians, lest we should receive some taint of Arminianism; but now they are lifting up a warning voice to their widely extended disciples, not against our Calvinism—for against this they have uttered their anathemas long enough—but against our Pelagianism; that is, against the Pelagian character of the "New Divinity;" for they are at no loss to identify the system which is now so zealously maintained and propagated with that of John Taylor of Norwich. But while the affinity of the "New Divinity" with Pelagianism has been well understood by considerate men for some time past, it has not been commonly believed that there is also a striking resemblance in the modern theories to the doctrines of the ancient Socinians. This will, however, be remarkably evident by a perusal of the *Racovian Catechism*, which contains the acknowledged standard of Socinian doctrine—and even from the extracts here given, the coincidence between the two systems is exceedingly manifest. This, however, ought to be asserted with some exception; for it is a fact, that in several points, the Socinian creed stops far short of the "New Divinity." This last makes no scruple to assert the complete ability of man, in all respects, to do the will of God, and that by the exercise of his own free agency; but in the *Catechism* which we have had under consideration it is taught that the strength or ability of man is very small; and it is not pretended that he can do any thing without divine aid: and although they fall far short of the truth, yet they admit that there is need, not only of external divine aid, but of that which is internal also.

Whether the "New Divinity" will maintain the consistency of the Socinianism of Poland, remains to be proved: but there is much reason to apprehend, that although the theologians who now advocate it, will not have the courage to carry it out, in its legitimate consequences, yet their successors will be less timid,

and will feel, that in self-defence, it is necessary to go a great deal further in the line of deviation from orthodoxy than has yet been done. Whoever lives to see another generation of men rising to maturity, will see that the "New Divinity" is the stepping-stone to German neology.

---

ART. IV.—*A Treatise on the Millennium; in which the prevailing theories on that subject are carefully examined; and the true Scriptural Doctrine attempted to be elicited and established.* By George Bush, A. M. *Author of 'Questions and Notes upon Genesis and Exodus.'* New York, J. & J. Harper. 1832. Pp. xii. 277. 12mo.

WE have long wished to see the peculiar gifts which Mr. Bush possesses fairly exercised in such a way as to command attention. This end will in some degree, we trust, be answered, by the work before us; for whatever may be thought of its hypotheses and reasonings and interpretations, it has literary merits quite sufficient to preserve it from neglect. Were it only as a writer, Mr. Bush deserves distinction, though we fear that his profession, and the theme which he discusses, will prevent his ever gaining it among mere men of taste. Our literary journals and our current works of fancy might be searched in vain for finer specimens of rich and nervous English than we have met with in this slender duodecimo. Both its merits and its faults are, indeed, of a kind almost unknown to our American reviewers, bards, and novelists. The perfection of fashionable excellence at present seems to consist in a stereotype monotony of thought, and perfect weakness of expression. Now of these faults Mr. Bush is seldom guilty. If his style ever languishes, it is not from debility, but plethora. He often wastes enough on one distended paragraph to furnish, if adroitly spun and woven, the entire material of a tolerable Annual; and we sometimes find more poetry in one of his expressive solecisms, than falls to the lot of many a poet by profession. There are passages in this book which, if found in the pages of a novel or review, would be completely daubed with eulogy; but which, as they stand, are not likely to be even read by many except theologians. This, so far from lowering our own estimation of the treatise, is, in part, our motive for reviewing it at all. We are not disposed to acquiesce in the monopoly of literary honours so ambitiously asserted by the witlings of the world. As the church has in times past sent her giants and her mighty men into the amphitheatre,

so ought she to do now. Christian ministers especially are under obligations to convince the world that the religion which they teach is not an enemy to mental cultivation, and that genius when subdued by grace, is, instead of being quenched, baptized with fire. We are far from apprehending that excess of erudition and refinement which is such a bug-bear in the eyes of some alarmists. Intellectual culture is at least as favourable, both to truth and virtue, as vulgarity and ignorance. The literary fame of Hall and Chalmers never hurt the cause of orthodoxy; which is more than we can say of the unlettered honesty of some among her champions. We have no desire to see the effeminate graces of a false refinement introduced into the church; but a very strong one to see muscular strength and manly elegance assume the place of that which calls itself simplicity, but ought to be called meanness. In accordance with these sentiments, we are disposed to welcome every appearance of an effort to enlist real literary talent in the service of religion. And as we know Mr. Bush to be possessed as well of genius as of learning, we shall not wait to chime in with the tardy praise of others, but embrace this opportunity to testify of his gifts.

The cardinal excellence of Mr. Bush's style is that it has a soul. It is sometimes heavy, but never dull. What he writes is not a lifeless carcase, every now and then convulsed by the galvanic impulse of affected animation. There is a quickening influence pervading all its parts, which makes it always readable and almost always interesting. Indeed we are aware of no contemporary writer more remarkable for uniform and unremitted vigour. This is the more observable, because Mr. Bush is not, in one sense of the phrase, an easy writer. It would often be very hard to read him, were it not for this *vivida vis* which we are speaking of.

But besides this general vivacity and vigour, there are seasons when he rises into eloquence. In proof of this, we may refer to some of the passages in which he applies his exegetical hypotheses to history. In these cases, he is far from being satisfied with a jejune detail of facts; but after a patient and perspicuous statement of the proposed interpretation, he presents the corresponding points of history, with a distinctness, clearness, and impassioned earnestness, which are exceedingly effective. Historians are almost always frigid; and even when, like Gibbon, they are skilful rhetoricians, there is commonly an artificial gloss upon their pictures, which detracts from their effect. But in the few brief specimens of this kind which our author furnishes, he seems to enter into the events as fully as Æneas into those portrayed upon the walls of Dido's palace. Nor could he well have exhibited a

more lively personality of interest, had he been literally able to exclaim,

Quae ipse miserrima vidi,  
Et quorum pars magna fui.

Now the secret of the effect thus produced is nothing more than that the author did not write till he was full to overflowing. Here is the mystery of eloquence, the arcanum of rhetorical effect. The most ordinary intellect might sometimes scintillate, if fairly brought into collision with an animating subject. But while the plan is adhered to, of composing first and feeling afterwards, no electric apparatus can provoke a spark. It is Mr. Bush's heartfelt interest in what he writes about, that vivifies his language. There is of course, therefore, nothing like a set-speech in the volume; no convulsion or grimace such as commonly accompanies mere declamation. We should be sorry indeed to have it thought from our expressions, that the work before us, or its author, is in any degree chargeable with school-boy fustian. With the exception of a somewhat jacobinical invective against crowned heads with which the third chapter closes, the volume is free from even the semblance of mere bombast. The author never rises to the tone of declamation, except when his feelings and his subject raise him to it; and then merely pours out of his fullness, in the first words that present themselves, which, of course, are not invariably the best.

But in characterizing Mr. Bush's style, we may proceed still further. There is more to be said than that he writes in earnest, and at times with fervour. A quality still more distinctive is the graphic richness of his phraseology. His sentences are pictures, and the very sins which he commits against the purity of language often seem to conjure up a train of vivid imagery. This agreeable property of Mr. Bush's diction may no doubt be referred, in some degree, to the original susceptibilities and bias of his mind. Still more may it be ascribed to his familiarity with works of taste and genius, the standards of our own and other languages. We meet, in almost every page, with gratifying proofs of the refining influence exerted by such studies. But the largest part of the effect alluded to we trace to another cause. Although we doubt not that this characteristic quality would have displayed itself in different circumstances, we believe that the remarkable degree in which it now appears, is directly owing to the nature of Mr. Bush's studies for a few years past. He has applied the prophetic taper to the niches and vaults of history, until he feels at home there; and we need not say, that there is majesty enough in the *phantasmata* of prophecy and history

combined to fill the largest fancy. In a particular manner we can see, that the Apocalyptic imagery has at least cast its shadow on our author's pages.

We have often wondered, that when critics undertake, *more rhetorico*, to laud the Bible; they are so apt to forget the splendid panorama at its close. Without any reference to prophecy, theology, or even style, we think the book of Revelation is the grandest specimen of imagery extant. It is distinguished from all others by the independence of its finest beauties on the language which conveys them. It may be translated into any dialect, with scarcely any loss upon the score of grandeur. There are parts of this mysterious scroll in which the concentration of sublimity is awful. A single verse sometimes transcends the entire machinery of many an epic. Some minds owe their first experience of sublime emotion to the symbols of the Apocalypse; and through life retaining the impressions of their childhood, never cease to feel a thrill when it is read, as though they heard the "noise of thunder" or the "sound of many waters." If such be its effect upon the occasional and casual reader, how profound must the impression be which it produces when it is itself the leading object of attention, and when in addition to its mere poetical or pictorial beauties, it is recognised as prophecy, and as such intertwines itself not only with the thread of past events, but with the complicated tissue of the present and the future. Who can wonder that the light which, as it were, steals through the hangings of this mystic temple, should impart a tinge to those who worship on its threshold? Who can wonder that our author, as was once said of another, catches eloquence from his theme, and, like the giant of old, gathers strength from the ground on which he treads?

After this minute account of Mr. Bush's merits as a writer, our impartiality as critics will not suffer us to leave his faults unnoticed. On the score of purity, the best that can be said of Mr. Bush's diction is, *abundat dulcibus vitiis*. He seems quite indifferent to custom or example in his use of words, and even inclined, where other things are equal, to give barbarisms the preference. Some of the words which he has coined and borrowed from writers little known, are mere gratuitous substitutes for those in common use; while others (such as "*septemcephalous*") are such gross violations of analogy and rule, that they are quite unworthy of a scholar's pen. In a few cases he appears to have intended to employ a common form, but to have failed in hitting it, as when he says, "*ecclesiastico-politico*," which may be good Italian, but is certainly not English. It is not, however, to be understood that there is any laborious affectation of outré expressions in the work before us. The fault in

question is the effect of negligence. An absorbing interest in the subject treated, and long familiarity with various forms of speech, very naturally lead to the employment of some phrases, which are only endurable because they are expressive. To the same neglect upon the author's part we may ascribe the want of neatness, due proportion, and compactness, in the structure of his periods. As Mr. Bush's faults are for the most part those of redundancy, not deficiency, the occurrence of pleonasm in his style is not surprising. In the first sentence of his first chapter he speaks of an *import denoting* something; and in another place (p. 90) points out the *design* of a *scope*.\* In a work so full of tropical and figurative language, it would be mere hypercriticism to take notice of mixed metaphors. Indeed, we should not go into details at all, were it not that we consider these offences against taste as the only thing that can deprive our author of an elevated standing among English writers. Were his merits less conspicuous, his faults would not deserve specification. We are not without our fears that his absorption in the subjects which he handles, will forbid the *limæ labor* that is absolutely necessary to remove these blemishes. If not, we know that Mr. Bush has taste enough, and a sufficient knowledge both of principles and models, to exhibit in his style a chaste refinement not a whit inferior to its copiousness and vigour.

We have not included in this list of faults a slight approach to the *pomposo* in our author's general manner. It is so far removed, as we have said before, from vulgar bombast, that we prefer to let it pass for one of those peculiarities which stamp a writer's manner as his own; although we doubt not that to some readers it will prove offensive and perhaps excite the feeling of resistance to what certainly looks something like dictation.

It is time, however, to dismiss the question of mere literary merit, and proceed to view Mr. Bush in a character far more important, that of an interpreter. Some of the needful qualifications for this office, he is well-known by the public to possess in ample measure. Of his acuteness, diligence, and accurate acquaintance with the languages of Scripture, there can be no doubt. In his present situation he has access, we believe, to many valuable sources of information; and his recent works on Genesis and Exodus sufficiently attest his deep devotion to this study. The little that we have to say on this point, has exclusive reference to the specimen of exegesis which the work before us furnishes. Founding our judgment upon that alone, we are prepared to say,

\* The most pleonastic sentence in the book, perhaps, is on the title-page. Short and simple titles are the most agreeable to modern usage, and to good taste likewise.

that Mr. Bush, in our opinion, has a just conception of the principle on which interpretation should proceed, and of the mode in which it ought to be conducted. His object, in the present case, was to determine the true import of certain prophetic symbols. For the attainment of this purpose, he has resorted, very properly, to a thorough investigation of Scriptural usage, and by a minute induction has endeavoured to fix the uniform sense of every phrase and symbol. In so doing he displays at once research and ingenuity, and certainly develops his conclusions to the reader in a manner highly plausible and striking. These are qualifications so seldom found combined, that we are gratified to see one who possesses them engaged in this employment. There is a single point, however, with respect to which we are not wholly satisfied. Skilful as Mr. Bush is in collecting and illustrating the details of evidence, he does not seem so happy in his mode of weighing them, and giving each its just proportion in the mass of proof. He speaks too much as if he did not recognise degrees of clearness and conclusiveness in argument. Not that we charge him with allowing an equality of influence to all, in the original formation of his own decisions. What we mean to say is that his method of exhibiting the items of the evidence, in favour of his doctrines, leads the reader to conclude that he expects an equal stress to be laid upon them all. And this impression is confirmed by the unvaried tone of confidence in which he speaks of almost all his own conclusions as alike in point of certainty and clearness; whereas, even admitting the correctness of them all, some are certainly less obvious and convincing than the rest.

We confine ourselves to these general remarks, because minuter criticism would require citations, which we have not room for, to explain and justify it, as well as an analysis of the treatise, which we do not mean to give. Our reasons for not giving it are two. In the first place it would be impossible to furnish any abstract, within reasonable limits, which would not do great injustice to the author's argument. In the next place, we expect such of our readers as the subject interests, to read the book itself, and do hereby recommend it to their notice, without any fear or scruple, notwithstanding Mr. Bush's premonitions of "imputed heresy."

The phrase just quoted brings to mind a circumstance which struck us very forcibly while reading Mr. Bush's treatise. We mean the tone of mingled apprehension and defiance, in which he forestals reproach and censure. For the author's own sake we regret this very much. It is always ill-judged in a writer to anticipate too large a measure of abuse and opposition. And in the

present case, especially, the mighty preparations to withstand a coming storm, are so entirely disproportionate to any consequences likely to ensue, that they seem to us inexplicable. So far are we from apprehending any great convulsion from the doctrines of this work, that we believe it easy to admit them all without a change of principle. Mr. Bush himself says, that the leading doctrine which he tries to prove, was held at least as early as the seventeenth century. The names of Lightfoot and Usher, Marck and Turretin, would be sufficient of themselves to save our author from the fires of persecution. But even on the supposition that this doctrine were a novel one, it could not be expected to make much disturbance. Mr. Bush appears, in this case, to have been misled by names. Because the word *Millennium*, which is commonly applied to an expected glorious condition of the church, is borrowed from the "thousand years" of the Revelation, he concludes, we think too hastily, that what he calls the "popular Millennium" coincides throughout with the Apocalyptic one. Our own belief is, that the word *Millennium*, in colloquial usage, means no more than what our author calls the *latter day glory*, without any idea of restriction or vicissitude. The expectations of Millennial purity and blessedness, so prevalent throughout the Christian church, are founded, therefore, not as he supposes, on tradition, but on the same explicit prophecies which he considers as prefiguring a halcyon period yet to come. It is true, that the *binding of the dragon* has been commonly reckoned as one of these predictions, and that the name *Millennium* came in this way to be applied. But we think it very clear that this Apocalyptic vision is not the foundation of the popular opinion, and that, therefore, any novel exegesis of the former can affect the latter in a very slight degree. The utmost that we can imagine to be proved by Mr. Bush, is, that one of the passages supposed to be prophetic of a state of things yet future, has received its full accomplishment, and that the name *Millennium*, as commonly applied, is inappropriate and erroneous. Further than this, he leaves the popular belief just where he found it, in entire coincidence, so far as we can compare them, with his own.

Allowing then the utmost that can possibly be asked for Mr. Bush's arguments, the issue, which they lead to, is a very harmless one; so harmless, that to some, we are afraid, his large expressions will appear ridiculous. The solemn tone in which the author sometimes speaks, as though he were indeed lifting up the axe against the carved work of the sanctuary, and revealing secrets which must make the ears of those who hear them tingle—raises expectations which are not fulfilled. The work, upon in-

spection, proves to be a critical commentary with a historical introduction. Had the author left the reader to discover, by perusal, the uncommon merit which it certainly possesses, as a specimen of criticism and composition, all would have been in good taste and agreeable to truth. But when the public are mysteriously forewarned of something terrible, and put upon their guard against some mighty shock to be sustained by ancient doctrines, expectations are created to which nothing in the disclosures of the treatise corresponds. What in itself is interesting, thus becomes jejune, and the bewildered reader tries in vain to understand the martial air with which the author in his closing chapter casts up his intrenchments. All this seems so much out of place in such a work, that it subjects the writer to the imputation of a self-importance which does not belong to him.

Another objection to the same thing is, that it is likely to beget unjust suspicions in the minds of many readers: struck with the incongruity of these protestations and provisos against the charge of heresy, when the doctrines of the book are so innocuous in themselves, they will be apt to imagine that "coming events cast their shadows before," and that these prophylactic measures have a bearing upon some ulterior changes in opinion which have not yet been disclosed, or which as yet have no existence save in the author's second-sight. Under this impression it would not be strange if they should draw the inference, that Mr. Bush is actually preparing to explain away the doctrine of a future judgment and corporeal resurrection, though in fact they are not affected, in the least degree, by this millennial theory. We regret that Mr. Bush should have afforded any colour to these dark surmises, by a gratuitous anticipation of what never will take place, and still more by the expression of so strange a sentiment as that which is propounded in the following paragraph:

"In answer to this, we have only to say, that we cannot see the justice of being held responsible for consequences having relation to other truths, provided our main point, the proof of which is conducted independently of all correlate tenets, is solidly and conclusively made out. It must be obvious to the reader that we have proposed to ourselves a single object of inquiry and proof, viz. that the Millennium of John is past. This position we have treated as capable of being established upon independent grounds, by a train of argument having no respect to any kindred dogmas whatever. If we have succeeded in our attempt, if the demonstration be in itself sound, the conclusion must stand, however it may be impugned on the ground of being at variance with other commonly-received articles of faith. For any such discrepancy the conclusion cannot be deemed responsible, nor does it fairly devolve upon us to show how the result we have reached is to be harmonized with those points of revelation with which it is supposed to be in conflict. Leaving this task, therefore, to those who think it needful to be accomplished, we challenge a rigid scrutiny to our grand position, and to the chain of proofs upon which it rests. Let it stand or fall upon its own merits. And let him who shall take up the gage, be reminded, that if he denies the signification which we have assigned to the prophetic symbols, it devolves upon him to state the reasons of his dissent, and to show *what they do mean.*"

Without taking notice of the curious alternative proposed in the closing words, we must express our wonder, that the mind of Mr. Bush could, for a moment, harbour so grotesque a paradox as that any tenet admits of independent proof without regard to any other, and that consequently no one has a right to make objections to one doctrine, on the ground of its collision with another. This sentiment is flatly contradicted, not by common sense alone, but by the constant practice of the writer who has broached it. To illustrate or establish what is doubtful or disputed, he appeals throughout to what is acknowledged and believed. Ought he then to forbid a similar appeal in opposition? Is analogical reasoning like the pillar of cloud, all darkness one way and all light the other? It is needless to say, that such a canon would unsettle all the laws of argument, and by a sort of logical nullification would establish the sovereign independence of each petty dogma on the ruins of that mighty system which we call *THE TRUTH*.

We make these strictures, it will be observed, not upon any of the specific tenets which this book was meant to advocate, but on a general principle, admitting of extensive application, which is only not dangerous because it is absurd. It might be stricken out without the slightest mutilation of the treatise which contains it, and in our opinion, to its very great improvement. Of the treatise itself we say, as we said before, that though a hasty judgment of its doctrines would deserve no notice, and we therefore do not give one, we believe that those doctrines might be honestly adopted without any deviation from the strictest orthodoxy. What subtle nexus may exist between this theory and others less innocuous, we are not endowed with optics to discern; but so far as any thing is visible at present, so far as this one is alone concerned, we think our author needs no bulwark to repel "the missiles of imputed heresy."

We cannot conclude without an expression of our satisfaction, that on this occasion we have found our learned countryman as much superior to the "prophetic school" of England in sobriety and sense, as in the graces of his style. We take leave of him with unfeigned wishes for his rich success in this delightful occupation, and shall look with some impatience for the maturer fruits of his attempt to rend the veil of the Apocalypse.

ART. V.—*Notice of Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople.\**

CYRILLUS LUCARIS, who was regarded as the most learned Greek of his age, was born in 1572, on the island of Candia, then belonging to the Venetians. After enjoying the instructions of Maximus Margunius, a learned Greek at Venice, and afterwards studying at Padua, he travelled over all Italy, and several other countries of the West, particularly Switzerland, where he resided a considerable time in the city of Geneva. His travels had the effect of increasing his dislike to the Church of Rome, which just about this time was using means to gain the Greek Church over; and in Switzerland he seems to have acquired that strong predilection for the doctrines of the Reformed Church, which he retained till death. He returned to Greece and found a powerful patron in Meletius Pega, patriarch of Alexandria and vice-patriarch at Constantinople, a zealous adversary of Rome. By Meletius he was ordained Priest, and promoted to an Abbacy; but in 1595 we find him acting as rector of the Greek School at Wilna, in Poland. While in this station he was commissioned by Meletius to attend the Synod held at Brezce, the object of which was to unite the Greek Church of Poland and Russia with the Church of Rome. Cyril, of course, was in the opposition, and by that means was involved in no small danger, as Sigismund III., king of Poland, was disposed to carry the measure through by force. In a letter to Sigismund, dated in 1600, Meletius calls Cyril his Exarch, or Vicar, (*i. e.* of the See of Alexandria,) and recommends him to the king as a man of piety and learning; without avail, however, for Cyril was obliged to save himself by flight from the intrigues of his enemies. Not long after this Meletius must have died, for in 1602, we find Cyril Lucaris himself upon the patriarchal throne of Alexandria, which, after a lapse of nineteen years, he exchanged (Nov. 5, 1621,) for that of Constantinople. During his travels in the west he had become personally acquainted with various learned men, and we find that he endeavoured by his correspondence with Protestant countries, not only to preserve the recollection of himself there, but to form new connexions. Before the year 1616, he had opened a correspondence with George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury. In a letter dated March 1, 1616, he introduces to his acquaintance and commits to his care, a young Greek Presbyter, of Berrhoe, in Macedonia, Metrophanes Critopylus. Abbot, in a former letter, had expressed his own wish, and that of king James I., that a young Greek might be sent to England to become acquainted

\* From a Sketch by Dr. Mohnike, of Stralsund.

with the state of learning and religion there. It appears from Abbot's answer to the patriarch, (dated Nov. 17, 1617,) that Metrophanes had been matriculated at Oxford, and he seems to have resided several years in England. In the letters of both prelates there are indications of a mutual disposition to agreement and confidence in matters of religion. Cyril complains of itinerant emissaries from the See of Rome; Abbot talks about his sovereign's meddling with the science of theology.

It was probably during the residence of Metrophanes abroad, that Cyril was promoted to the patriarchal chair of Constantinople; and if we consider his predilection for the Protestant opinions, it is not surprising that he entered into friendly relations with the ambassadors of Protestant courts at Constantinople, especially with Sir Thomas Rowe from England, and Cornelius von dem Haag from Holland, both of whom continued faithful to him in his various persecutions. He also maintained a correspondence with some foreign princes and statesmen, as for instance with Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, and his Chancellor Oxenstiern. Among the western literati with whom he kept up epistolary intercourse we may mention, in addition to archbishop Abbot, the well known Dutch remonstrant John Vytenbogard (or Utenbogardus) and Anthony Leger, afterwards Pastor and Professor at Geneva. The latter is not to be confounded with John Leger the celebrated historian of the Waldenses. To Geneva and its church, Cyril Lucaris appears always to have felt a strong attachment. Thither he sent, in 1629, his Confession of Faith in the Latin language, which his friend Cornelius von dem Haag, the Dutch ambassador at Constantinople, had caused to be printed there, and which made a strong impression on the Greeks and Catholics at Constantinople. An answer appeared from the pen of Matthæus Karyophilus, titular Bishop of Iconium, a Greek who was in communion with the Church of Rome. It appeared both in Greek and Latin, under the title *Censura confessionis fidei seu potius perfidiae Calvinianæ quæ nomine Cyrilli. Patr. Const. circumfertur*. Cyril afterwards delivered to Anthony Leger a Confession of Faith in the Greek language, for the information of the clergy at Geneva, where it was printed in 1633. A still more explicit declaration of his doctrinal agreement with the Reformed, is contained in his Letter to the Pastors and Professors of Geneva, brought by Anthony Leger in 1636, on his return from Constantinople. It was this agreement with the Protestants which deprived him repeatedly of his patriarchal office, and at last cost him his life. In the persecutions which he suffered, a conspicuous part was acted by his popish enemies, and especially the Jesuits.

As early as 1613, when the patriarch of Constantinople was banished to Rhodes, by Sultan Ahmed, Cyril was fixed upon as his successor; but Timotheus a Marmore, bishop of Patras, found means to supplant him. This prelate, eight years afterwards, was poisoned by Josaphat, Archimandrite of the island of Andros, and Cyril, as was mentioned before, succeeded him. In the following year, however, his enemies the Jesuits, to whom the French ambassador attached himself, continued to remove him for a time from court. In 1622, a tumult produced by the murder of Sultan Othman was the occasion of Cyril's being banished to Rhodes, an event so grateful to Pope Urban VIII., that he wrote a letter of thanks on the occasion, to the French ambassador at Constantinople. His joy, however, was not of long continuance; for after a hundred and forty days, Cyril, through the influence of the English ambassador, was reinstated in all his honours, which he retained from 1623 till the 5th of March 1634, in spite of all the intrigues and bribes employed by some of his own clergy and by the See of Rome. But on the day last mentioned he was under the necessity of retiring to Tenedos. During this period, perhaps about the year 1624, he sent Metrophanes Critopylus, now his *Proto Syncellus*, as a regular legate to the west of Europe, for the purpose of forming a more intimate acquaintance with the doctrines and usages of the two Protestant communions, especially the Reformed, and at the same time of forming connexions which might lead to a union of the Protestants and Greeks. On this occasion, Metrophanes visited not only England, the Netherlands and Switzerland, but also the most distinguished Universities of Germany, to wit: Helmstadt, Altdorf, Wittenberg, Tübingen, and Strasburg. At Helmstadt he wrote a statement of the doctrines of the Greek Church which was afterwards translated into Latin. He then returned to Constantinople by the way of Venice. Not long after he became the patriarch of Alexandria, no doubt through the agency of Cyril, but repaid his benefactions with ingratitude, not only by opposing his schemes of reformation, but by his banishment, probably that of 1634. Though this banishment, however, was of brief continuance, the reinstated patriarch did not long enjoy tranquillity, for in 1635 he was banished again, and again to Rhodes. Here his life was in danger, as he complains in letters to his friends, especially to Cornelius von dem Haag. Indeed he would have been seized and put into the power of his bitterest foes at Rome, had not the Turkish Pacha secretly removed him to a place of more security. Nevertheless, on the 25th of July, 1636, he was restored to all his dignities, an event which occasioned general satisfaction. Still his enemies were

not quiet, but secured themselves beneath the patronage of Bairam Pacha, a favourite of the Sultan's. Cyril was accused of treason, in having instigated the Cossacks to sack Azeka (the ancient Tamaris,) and the Sultan ordered the Kaima khan to put him to death. On the twenty-ninth of June, 1638, he was seized in his palace and carried to the fortress of the Bosphorus. The next night he was placed by the janissaries in a boat, for the ostensible purpose of being carried to the port of St. Stephen's, but on the way he was strangled and his body thrown into the sea. Being washed ashore, it was picked up by fishermen and buried by his friends; but his enemies dug it up and threw it again into the sea. Again it was recovered, and secretly interred upon an island in the Gulf of Nicodemia. The second of his successors, (Parthenius II.) caused his bones to be deposited, with suitable honours, in the church. Edward Poccocke was in Constantinople when these events occurred. Leo Ablatius states, as quoted by Heineccius, that after the murder of Cyril, the populace gathered around the house of his successor who had been privy to the deed, crying 'Pilate! give us, the body that we may bury it.' Cyril Lucaris was the twenty-fourth patriarch of Constantinople, reckoning from the overthrow of the Eastern empire by Mahomet II. He deserves a place in the history of the press at Constantinople. With a view to correct the gross ignorance of the clergy, he determined to establish a printing press of his own. For this purpose, he sent Nicodemus Metaxas into England to learn the art of printing, and to purchase what was necessary for a complete printing office. In 1627 it was erected at Constantinople, and Cyril forthwith published several Catechisms in Greek, and, two years afterwards, his own Confession of Faith in Latin. In order to escape the attacks which this bold step provoked, the press was represented as the property of the English ambassador. This, however, gave it no protection. The enemies of Cyril procured a prohibition of the press. Armed jannisaries attacked the office, broke its furniture to pieces, and abused the workmen. Metaxas and Cyril were obliged to take refuge in the palace of the English ambassador. The Sultan was afterwards prevailed upon by the ambassador and the patriarch, to redress the injury as far as was possible, and to punish the authors of the outrage. The only printing press erected at Constantinople before this one, belonged to the Jews.

To Cyril Lucaris we are indebted also for the famous Alexandrian manuscript, containing not only the Old and New Testaments, but the epistles ascribed to Clement of Rome. This manuscript, which is now in the British Museum, was sent as a present to James I. of England, by Cyril when patriarch of Alexandria.

ART. VI.—*Common Schools.*

IN directing the attention of our readers to this topic, we trust we shall not be regarded as travelling out of our proper department, since the moral improvement of men is intimately connected with their advancement in knowledge. That a people without the least intellectual culture should become distinguished for piety, or for soundness of morals, is a thing so contrary to all history and observation, that we naturally associate the ideas of vice and ignorance; though we may not always be able to view as identical those of knowledge and virtue. If these remarks be correct, it ought to be made by Christians a subject of serious inquiry, in what way instruction to a certain extent may be communicated to every individual, and in what way the instruction given can be made to answer its most important design. On the first point we do not now propose to enlarge, as, in our country, the public mind seems to be in a measure awake to the importance of a general dissemination of knowledge among the mass of the community, and in many of the States liberal provision is made for the endowment and support of common schools. The very general establishment too of Sabbath Schools will afford to most children an opportunity of acquiring the rudiments of a common education, and will compensate, in a measure, though not fully, for the deficiency of common schools, in those sections of the country in which adequate provision is not made for their support.

Our remarks, therefore, will not be directed so much to the means of augmenting the number of common schools, as of the best method of conducting them.

To render any plan efficient, it must be adapted to the end had in view; and to make any system of education answer the purpose for which it is designed, such system must be accommodated to the nature of the object at which we aim. What then, let us inquire, is, or should be the great aim in every branch of education? Having answered this inquiry to our satisfaction, we may be prepared to speak clearly and definitely, in regard to the best mode of communicating instruction. And whatever answer a mere worldly minded man may give to this question, a Christian will cheerfully concede, that the great end of education is to fit those who are seeking it, to discharge, to the best of their ability, their duties to their Maker, and to society: and that, for the attainment of these objects, it is necessary that the mind be expanded and the heart improved.

The expansion of the mind, and the improvement of the heart,

are then the great objects after which we should seek in the education of youth: and these two things should never be separated. When united and carried to the greatest possible extent, they present us with the most perfect character, which can be formed among men; when totally separated, they can at best only produce a giant in vice and learning, or a dwarf in knowledge and moral excellence.

The importance of uniting knowledge and piety in the instruction of youth, has long been admitted in theory, yet too little heeded in practice. Ordinarily, an undue share of time and attention is bestowed upon the mere development and strengthening of the intellectual faculties; while apparently but little importance is attached to the nobler work of cultivating the moral and religious feelings. Not that Christian teachers and parents do not say, and say to their pupils and children, that they regard their religious improvement as vastly more important than any advancement they can make in purely intellectual matters; but with this declaration upon their lips, they often pursue a course which seems to contradict their professions. If their children or scholars conduct with sobriety and modesty, if they be respectful in their deportment and attentive to their studies, they seem to have very little anxiety about the state of their feelings in regard to moral and religious matters: and it becomes, if not the exclusive object of their care, their principal concern, to foster in the children a desire to excel in those things which serve mainly to expand the mind. Hence, it ought to be no matter of surprise, that children in most, if not in all of our schools, exhibit a vast disproportion in the amount of their attainments in ordinary and in religious knowledge, and far less anxiety to be good, than to be learned.

If, as Christians believe, great attainments in moral excellence constitute the highest glory of man, and assimilate him most to the character of God, ought it not to be regarded as the chief object with Christians to train up their children in that way, which will most effectually impart to them right apprehensions of their duties, and implant in them strong desires for advancement in piety? The cultivation of their minds, though exceedingly important, as an auxiliary in the moral instruction of youth, should never be regarded as the end, but merely as a part, or rather as a means of education; the completion of which consists in making the pupil both virtuous and intelligent, and in restoring to him, as far as it depends upon human agency, that image of God, in which man was originally created.

If it be inquired, how shall this be effected? What modifications should be made in the present plan of education? we an-

swer, that from the commencement of their pupilage, children should be taught to regard their religious instruction as the most important they can receive. It should be the first given on every day throughout the year, and it should be given in a manner indicative of its value. The absolute necessity of this kind of knowledge should often be insisted upon, and yet not to such an extent as to weary the attention of the child, and thus satiate his mind, if not create a disgust for the subject. The lessons should be frequent but always short, administered with a pleasant and mild expression of voice, and accompanied with a manner indicative of seriousness, and in no respect repulsive. As the children become more advanced, they should be directed to peruse daily a portion of the Scriptures, and other works of an entertaining and religious cast, and be required to commit to memory a part or the whole of some sacred ballad; and they should be strictly catechized as to the meaning of what they read. In this way their minds would be early trained to the proper performance of their office, and instead of becoming the mere storehouses for whatever may be committed to them, they would, by a thorough digestion of this intellectual food, soon attain to the strength and maturity of manhood.

We all know the permanence of early impressions, and the force of early habits; and it must therefore be evident, that it would be very difficult for children, when grown, to efface from their memories lessons given to them from their very infancy, and repeated with untiring assiduity. They would also find it difficult, if they were so inclined, to forsake the practice of reading the Scriptures, and of engaging in prayer and praise to God; and the good acquired by this course of mental discipline they could not possibly lose. It would become so easy, so natural, and we may add, so pleasant for them to analyze, whatever they should read or hear, and to view it in all its bearings, that they could never bring themselves to be the mere collectors and retailers of other men's sentiments. From being accustomed to reflect and judge for themselves, they would become capacitated to discharge with understanding the various duties which would devolve upon them as rational beings, and as members of civil society. On this point of early mental discipline we are the more disposed to insist, as it is a point still much neglected, though not to the degree it was before the general introduction of the Sabbath school system of instruction, which, in our view, has done far more for the cause of elementary education, by employing as far as possible the catechetical method of teaching, than has been effected by all the other systems put together.

Comparatively speaking, of what use would a mere ability to

read be, if the individual be not taught to think? It is true, indeed, that such in our country is the frequent interchange of opinions among men, and such the free and unrestrained discussion of public measures among all classes of society, that most persons do acquire the habit of reflecting upon whatever may meet their eye or ear; yet the facility with which they do so, is nothing in comparison with what it might be under proper training: such, for instance, as the kind we have suggested, and on which we propose to add a few words.

While we insist upon the importance of children being taught to think, we are by no means disposed to join in the outcry which is sometimes heard about the too much attention that is paid to the cultivation of the memory. In our opinion the memory cannot be too much improved, and no man can become a great man, or a learned man, without a good memory. Such a man's memory may not be equally retentive and prompt in regard to all subjects, but it will be more so with respect to those things in which he feels interested, and to which he devotes the principal part of his time and thoughts. That the memory may be too exclusively cultivated, we are fully aware; and that an undue attention is often bestowed upon this single faculty of the mind, we entertain not the least doubt: still we are prepared to maintain our position; and the proper remedy for the evil complained of, is not to cultivate the memory less, but the other powers of the mind more. To improve them all will not require upon the whole more time than the cultivation of a single one, and a child can be taught to think and reason, almost, if not quite, as soon as he can be made to commit his task to memory. Let the memory, then, be constantly exercised, and the child be taught to pass judgment upon all it reads or hears. If it have a mind prone to be inquisitive, either in regard to facts or to the reason of things, let its curiosity be indulged in regard to all proper subjects of inquiry. From an unwillingness to be troubled, parents and teachers often check a laudable curiosity, and thus do the child a serious injury.

In cultivating the memory, we would discard all artificial systems of mnemonics, and would rely solely upon a frequent exercise of this faculty upon matters adapted to the state of the pupil's mind. By pursuing this course, the memory will become as retentive, and even more prompt, than it can be made by any artificial system we ever heard of, and it will possess the additional advantage of being free from thousands of useless and ridiculous associations, and associations too wholly foreign to the subjects of which we are desirous the mind should retain a vivid recollection.

A regular classification of subjects, and a distinct arrangement of the various parts of a discourse, oral or written, with frequent practice, are all that is requisite to make the memory tenacious and ready. No other method can make it more so. In the communication of knowledge, therefore, care should be had to give to the youthful mind a clear and connected view of every subject, since this method is essential to the perfection of the memory, and to the due exercise of the other faculties of the mind. For, until some order and consistency is given to the facts, the mind is not prepared to pass a judgment upon them, and if the business of arranging them be left wholly to the pupil, from inexperience he will be incompetent to the task; his thoughts will be confused, and he will not be able to reason or to judge. To permit a young child therefore to read several pages a day, without any explanation of their meaning, may indeed, if he should read aloud, render him familiar with the sounds, and improve his enunciation, but can be of no other benefit, but rather a disservice to him, as it would accustom him to negligence in perusing books, and leave his mind barren of ideas.

In the earliest stages of instruction, when of necessity it must be chiefly oral, the lessons should be short, often repeated, and level to the capacity of the child. They should soon be made to have some connection with each other, and some general inferences should be made from them. Thus they would become familiar to the pupil, strengthen his memory, and prepare the way for the more full development of all his intellectual faculties.

As the child advanced in age, books conveying some religious, others ordinary, but all of them solid and useful information, and written in a familiar and pleasing style should be placed in his hands. Let the teacher then read and explain a small portion of the work, and require the child to study the same portion until he becomes perfectly familiar with the sentiment, and is able to answer any questions touching the passage which might be proposed to him. After this, he should be required to read his lesson aloud, when every defect in his reading should be noticed and corrected; a comparatively easy task, when the child understands what he reads, but quite the reverse when he pronounces the words in a sentence without regard to their import.

In the latter case, he may indeed learn to articulate the words distinctly, and pronounce them with accuracy, yet of necessity his enunciation must be imperfect. How can it be otherwise? there is nothing to guide him in the matter of emphasis, and he is just as likely to lay the stress of his voice upon a wrong word as upon the right one, and even more so. He may, indeed, by the aid of his teacher, learn to read particular sentences with great pro-

priety, yet it is obvious that his ability to do so will be of very little service to him in the enunciation of those passages, for the correct reading of which he has received no instructions. A boy that does not know the meaning of a single French, German, or Italian word, may be taught, by frequent practice, to utter whole sentences in any one of these languages with perfect accuracy; and yet, in such a case, nothing is more apparent than that his instruction will be entirely useless to him, as it respects the right enunciation of the unknown language: and if the pupil does not comprehend the meaning of the passage he is reading, it matters little whether the passage be one in his own or another tongue.

That the correct reading of one's own language is an accomplishment of prime importance, and the accomplishment which should demand the first attention of every pupil, we deem it unnecessary to argue. There can be no dispute on this point: and yet, if the above remarks be correct, it is obvious, that the task will be exceedingly difficult, if not impracticable, to teach a pupil to read correctly his own or any other language, if he be not at some time taught to make himself master of the sentiment contained in the passages which constitute his exercises in reading. On the other hand, the mere understanding of what one reads, is not the only thing requisite to secure a proper enunciation of sentences; there must also be a facility in the management of the voice, which can be acquired only by constant practice and careful observation of defects. The great inattention to these matters, on the part of both teachers and pupils in most of our schools, is sufficient to account for the paucity of good readers, even among the best informed portions of the community. When a child reads with facility, it will accustom him to weigh well the import of his lessons, if he be required frequently to give the ideas in language different from the authors: and if when he shall have learned to write, he be further required to express in writing the author's sentiments, it will facilitate much his essays in the matter of composition. By a process of this kind, the child will be taught to analyze the thoughts of others, and to arrange and combine with accuracy those of his own. He will also be the better able to appreciate the force of an argument, and to detect the want of connection in a train of thought.

From the foregoing remarks, it will be seen that in our opinion one great object of every teacher should be to secure the thorough mental discipline of his pupils, and that from the commencement of their instruction. A regard should be had to this most important object, in every branch of study. Not that it is to be viewed as the sole object in any one branch of education, but merely as an essential part of all. We should object equally to a system

of instruction, which should have an exclusive regard to mental discipline, and to its opposite, which, overlooking it entirely, would respect only what might be called the practical parts of education. In our opinion they would be equally defective, for while the one neglects that which alone can render mental discipline of any real practical importance, the other, professedly aiming at utility, neglects that which is essential to its perfection. Hence in teaching arithmetic, the teacher's object should be, not merely to make his pupil understand why it is necessary in order to add the fractions  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{2}{3}$ , they must be reduced to a common denominator, and why it is, that the change in the denomination does not alter the value of the fractions, and other principles of the science, both the more simple and the abstruse; but he should also aim to make his pupil familiar with the practical operation of the science: a thing which can be effected by frequent practice and by no other method, and which, to the large majority of pupils, is of vastly greater importance than the mere knowledge of the principles. Let neither be neglected, the learning of the one will not interfere in the least with the acquisition of the other, but will rather aid in it. We have adverted to this particular topic, from an apprehension that the present rage to simplify every thing, and to render it easy, has a tendency to make teachers overlook the benefits of the old mode of accustoming children to long and tedious calculations, while they seek to avoid the defects of those teachers, who, from ignorance or some other cause, were wont to neglect entirely all explanations of the theory of numbers.

Thus also in teaching geography and grammar, the study of the principles and practice should be blended. So that, while the pupil is able to tell that a particular place is in a certain latitude, he should not be ignorant of what is meant by *latitude*, or that a certain *noun* is governed by a certain *verb*, in the same member of the sentence, he may not be at a loss for the reason, why, in the example before him, the verb governs the noun, rather than the noun the verb.

The subjects referred to, comprise the whole of what is usually taught in our common schools; and we have noticed them chiefly for the purpose of showing, that these different branches of study may, besides their ordinary use, be made to bear effectually on the discipline of the youthful mind, and that every teacher should see to it, that in the instruction of his pupils, this object be kept continually in view, not that we reject entirely the old system of instruction as altogether useless: on the contrary, we would retain the whole of it, and supply its deficiencies in the way above

mentioned, since, in our opinion, it is not radically wrong, but greatly defective.

Defective, however, as we believe the old system to be, we are not of those who suppose that the pupil must commit nothing to memory, the import of which he does not fully comprehend; or the reasons for which he is unable to explain. There are many things which it may be of primary importance, that a child should be taught to say, the meaning of which it will be impossible for him to comprehend: *e. g.* he must be taught to pronounce the letters of the alphabet, and then combine them into syllables and words; but can he, prior to this comprehend how these representatives of elementary sounds are made to represent a compound sound, and which he is taught to associate with a particular object? It matters not whether the child be taught to repeat the letters in the order in which they occur in the alphabet, or as they are presented to his mind in a particular combination: the difficulty is the same, for he cannot tell why the letters in the word *horse*, rather than those in the word *mule*, represent the sound which he is wont to associate with the idea of a horse. He associates the letters with the animal, because he is taught to do so, but he knows not whether the connexion between them is a natural or only an arbitrary one. Shall a child therefore not be taught these things, because he cannot fully comprehend the nature and power of letters? For ourselves we doubt much, whether the plan of making children acquainted with letters of the alphabet, by accustoming them at the first to view the letters in combination, has any decided advantage over the old plan, although in our own case, we enjoyed the benefit of the new. The greater progress is, in our apprehension, more apparent than real. But this after all is a point about which we feel but little concern; our principal object in this part of our observations, is to combat what we deem an error of no small magnitude with respect to the religious instruction of children.

There are many discreet and well-informed Christians, who seem to doubt the expediency of requiring children to commit to memory any thing which is not perfectly level to their capacities. Hence they object to the use of all such treatises in the education of children as the catechisms of our church. Ought they not in consistency to object to young children being taught the Lord's prayer, or the answers to such questions as these: Who made you? Who redeemed you? Who sanctifies you? What child in a thousand, when first taught the answers to these questions, understands the import of either the questions or answers? And yet who will venture to say that no child should be made familiar with these expressions until he can

comprehend them? Is not every Christian parent desirous, that, from the very dawn of intelligence, his child's memory should be stored with the fundamental truths of religion? And does not this desire originate from a conviction, that the earlier the impression, the more permanent it will be, and that it is of great moment that the very first exercises of the child's reason should have respect to the relation it sustains to its Creator? Without this previous instruction, how could any such direction be given to the child's mind? If then this amount of instruction to the infant mind be confessedly advantageous, although it be at the first not fully comprehended, it settles the question, that good may result to children from treasuring in their memories, expressions embodying the first elements of Christian knowledge, even prior to the time they become capable of appreciating the precise import of the words employed to convey these elementary truths. For ourselves we see no greater difficulty in the way of a child's reflecting with profit upon any "form of sound words" which may have been impressed upon his memory, than would exist if the same words were presented for his consideration on the pages of a book, at a time when he may be supposed capable of comprehending them: and besides, he would be more likely to make them the subject of serious thought, when that time comes, and to experience more permanent benefit in his meditations upon them, from the very circumstance of their being engraven upon his memory.

We would then have every child in our Church taught, as soon as practicable, the Shorter Catechism, the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles' Creed, and such other pieces as would tend to furnish the mind, as soon as it becomes capable of understanding them, serious and profitable subjects of meditation.

The religious instruction of children cannot be begun too soon, nor pursued with too great earnestness: it should ever be regarded by the parent and teacher as his chief duty with respect to the children under his care. The other matters enumerated are important in reference to their usefulness to men, but this is essential to their own future happiness.

The subjects of study which ordinarily in common schools demand the attention of the pupil, have all been briefly noticed; and the remarks relative to the instruction of an individual child may be transferred to classes of children, and that too with the additional advantages which are always to be derived from several children reciting together. On the proper mode of conducting a school, we shall only farther observe, that the exercises of the school should every day be commenced and concluded with

reading a portion of Scripture and with prayer, and the discipline should be always parental, uniting decision with mildness.

Having now presented our views with respect to the best method of elementary instruction, and the proper method of conducting a single school, we will add a few words on a general system for common schools.

That the best interests of every civil community are intimately involved in the extensive establishment of common schools, and in the general dissemination of knowledge through all classes, is a point universally conceded by intelligent and liberal minded men, and that the best interests of the Church are also closely connected with the instruction of her children, is a fact not to be denied. It becomes, therefore, the duty both of the citizen and Christian to make ample provision for giving to all children within the range of their influence the best possible education; by which phrase, we understand an education that will best fit them to discharge their duties to their God, their country, and themselves. Of necessity, the education of most must be limited to such subjects as are usually taught in our common schools, and this amount of knowledge will be sufficient for the ordinary duties of life, if the acquisitions in these branches of learning be such as, with proper attention on the part of teachers and parents, they may be made. If to an adequate provision for thorough instruction in these subjects, there could be added a well digested and thorough arrangement for imparting, in due proportion, sound moral and religious instruction, there would be but little for us to desire in the matter of common schools.

But of necessity, the State in the adoption of a uniform system for Schools, must dispense with all extended plans for the religious instruction of children; yet this fact does not release the Church from her obligations to have all the children within her pale well instructed in sound religious doctrine, as well as in the ordinary learning of the schools. The plan, therefore, which we would recommend to the attention of all Christian churches is, that they should consider themselves as charged with the duty of superintending the education of all the children within their respective limits, so far, at least, as to furnish them with the means and opportunity to acquire sound, wholesome instruction in morals, religion, and in all the branches of an elementary education; and that suitable persons, selected by each church, for the express purpose, should have the oversight of all the common schools, supported at the expense of the church: that these inspectors should prescribe the course of study, select the teachers, superintend the instruction, provide the means of sup-

porting the schools, and, in short, have the entire management of them. The great advantage of this plan is, that the schools being considered as under the special care of the Church, all concerned will be more likely to bear continually in mind, that the most important of all knowledge, which the child can acquire, is the knowledge of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, whom to know is life eternal. Those studies, which will fit him for usefulness among his fellow-men, will be made the object of his careful attention, without being permitted to employ all his time and absorb all his thoughts. By such a course of training, he will be the more restrained from the indulgence of wicked propensities, and more inclined to the practice of all manly and Christian virtues, and much more likely to walk in the fear of God, when removed from the inspection and control of parents and instructors.

In places where there are persons of various evangelical denominations, yet all agreed as to the importance of a thoroughly religious education for their children, and agreed also as to the fundamental truths of the Gospel, they might unite for the purpose of supporting a Christian school, in which the great principles of revealed religion shall be sedulously inculcated. That there is no insuperable barrier in the way of their doing so, is evinced by the fact, that Christians of different denominations do frequently unite in the support of Sabbath schools, whose ultimate object, in every case, is to impress upon the scholar's mind the nature, value, and necessity of religion. Thus also in common as in Sabbath schools, the Bible ought to be the great text book from which the child should derive his rules of conduct, and the articles of his creed: he should be required to study it carefully, to become familiar with its histories of men and of nations, and of God's providential dealings with both; he should be made fully acquainted with God's promises, his threatenings, and with his kind design in giving the Scriptures; in the hope he may, from his personal experience, be able to testify "that all Scripture is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may become thoroughly perfect."

The plan could be easily enlarged, if thought desirable, so as to unite all the churches, whether of the same or different denominations, in any particular section of our country, in one combined effort to extend this system of Christian education to all within their reach; and thus the more feeble churches might be able, by the assistance of their more wealthy neighbours, to make adequate provision for the instruction of all the children under their care. An association of this kind could be easily

formed, by any number of churches engaging to enter into the scheme, and by each one selecting a given number of persons, who shall act as a Board of Managers to transact the business of the association. Each church should be at liberty to establish as many schools within its own limits, as it might deem necessary for its own wants, and then pay over to the managers of the general association any surplus funds, to be applied at their discretion, for the benefit of the poorer churches and more destitute places.

This enlargement of the plan would of course require great care and attention on the part of those who are entrusted with the management of affairs. Yet we can see no greater difficulty in the way of its execution than has been met and overcome in establishing Sabbath school associations, or in the establishment of societies to supply feeble churches and destitute places with preaching. Let every church consider itself both a school and missionary society, and there will soon be no lack of funds, no want of persons to devote themselves to these works, and no scarcity of well sustained and prosperous schools and missions.

It should be distinctly recollected by the reader, that the enlargement of the plan is not at all necessary to its entire success in those churches, which are wealthy enough to support a sufficient number of good schools for the education of all the children belonging to them.

Some may suppose that the above suggestions are useless, as it respects those States where adequate provision is made for the support of common schools. To this opinion we might assent, if we had regard to nothing else but the intellectual culture of the youthful mind, and the fitting of our youth for the performance of the duties which are hereafter to devolve upon them as citizens. But this, though a most important end in the education of children, is not to be regarded as the chief one. "To glorify God and to enjoy him forever, is the chief end of man," and every system of education, that fails to impress this upon his mind through the whole course of his pupilage, is an extremely defective system.

In one, if not in many of the States, the rule for distributing the public school funds, so far from interfering with the plan here suggested, would aid directly in giving it effect. In New Jersey for example, any number of persons associating themselves and selecting three or more trustees of a school, have the right to draw, from the funds devoted to the support of public schools in each township, a sum proportionate to the number of children in the School. Of course, the trustees of the church schools would be entitled to their share of the public funds, and

might employ it in paying for the tuition of those children, whose parents should be unable to defray the expense of their education. The plan adopted in New Jersey, removes all ground for jealousies among the different religious sects, and it might be easily introduced in those States where a different plan is pursued. But if this could not be done, and if the churches should be deprived of all such aid in the education of her children, we believe she would be amply repaid, for all her additional expense and trouble, in giving to her children the rudiments of a thoroughly religious education.

---

ART. VII.—*Roman Catholicism.*

IT is common for error to assume a specious garb, and thus receive the honour due only to truth. This she finds it not very difficult to do, even when the wise and learned sit in the seat of judgment; and quite easy when the votes of mankind at large are to decide the question.

The most iniquitous system of error is not the most easily detected. Error does not become truth, by merely adopting its garb. The theory which disgusts by its absurdity, or the doctrine which shocks by its profanity, is the least of all to be feared. Indeed, to be worn with effect, the garb of truth must be so adjusted as to hide every deformity. If those who promulgate opinions which destroy the soul, would only give to each of them its true name; if those who are busy behind the scenes, in this fair but fatal arraying of falsehood, would only lift the veil, and exhibit them naked and unadorned, then would they come forth among us comparatively harmless. But this is not the fashion of the sophist. To confound truth with error, that they may both be blended in confusion, is his very object. And as darkness is thus the result which he desires, so, in obscurity and concealment, he chooses to operate from the very beginning. And thus it comes to pass that when most dangerous his system is found most difficult to be exposed.

It is not strange therefore, that the advocates of error (always crafty) should mingle truth with their errors. Connected with a portion of heaven-born truth, a vast amount of error may be palmed upon the world. Men seldom buy pure gold, because, with the multitude, all is gold that glitters. Few men can separate the alloy from the purer parts of the mixture. All they demand is, that their coin should shine, and pass current with their fellows; that their system of opinions should have the ap-

pearance of truth in its favour, together with a favourable reception among those whose office it is to do their thinking for them.

Now whoever looks fairly at *Roman Catholicism* will perceive that one secret of its success is, that it mixes much truth with its errors; and another, that it has enlisted many good and sincerely pious men into the same service which employs so many crafty and designing advocates; these advantages it uses with the greatest skill. Directed by one sovereign head, it scatters these men into all parts of the world, suiting the labourer to his work. If genuine religion has pervaded the community over which it would acquire dominion, the lowly and meek and conscientious and sincere, though only partially enlightened piety of the delegate from Rome is expected to recommend a system, which, ignorantly, he believes to be the truth. Or if that community be found intelligent as well as pious, the Roman Catholic priest will possess the polish and the learning of a scholar, with zeal and self-denial, and perhaps purity of motive worthy of a better cause.

For such a man as this, it is easy and natural to make prominent all that is good in the system, and, (perhaps unconsciously,) to keep back in concealment all that is bad. From his acting thus cautiously, and also exhibiting meekness, and gentleness, and self-denial, and diligence in external observances, and, it may be, still better and surer evidences in favour of his own good character, it easily comes to pass, that men appeal to his character and life as a refutation of ten thousand histories of the crimes of Romish priests, and ten thousand exhibitions of the absurdities of Romish belief. And yet this kind of refutation is entirely vain and insufficient. Because in another community, Romanism (one and infallible) has different but more becoming advocates, and wears a different but more becoming garb. And, further, because in all communities the master spirits, those who govern the whole machine without being seen to do so, are of a dark and designing character.

We premise these things in order to introduce the remark, that it avails but little to the Romish Church to show that their standards and decrees of councils express the great distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel. We grant, that they give to God every natural and moral attribute which Protestants can wish to have attached to his character. We grant, again, that they affirm the supreme divinity of the Saviour; his atonement, justification by faith in him; also his supreme headship over the Church; his intercession for the saints, his guidance and protection of all his followers through life, until they

come to glory. We grant, thirdly, that they declare the Holy Spirit to be the author of regeneration, and insist upon holiness of the heart in order to please God. And yet we believe and we affirm, that Roman Catholic priests obscure each and all these doctrines in their preaching; that in point of fact, (though not in point of wilful design in all cases) the truth which they teach serves only as the means of introducing error among their people, and that if these errors could only be viewed in their naked deformity, the sincerely pious could not remain in her communion. Is the proof demanded? We say then, with regard to the first department of error, that while this Church, in word, allows God to be infinitely holy, she practically denies it by her distinction of mortal and venial sins; as if to an infinitely holy being, any sin could appear of less than infinite importance. That, while she allows that God is infinite in wisdom, she practically charges him with folly, by maintaining that his holy word is calculated to mislead and be injurious, when circulated freely among the ignorant. That, while she declares omnipresence to be a divine attribute, she practically dishonours the only omnipresent being, by teaching that we should pray to angels and to saints, thus making them present on earth as well as in heaven, which is the prerogative only of God.

Again, we reply with regard to the third, that she dishonours the Holy Spirit, considered as the author of regeneration and sanctification, by the dependence, which, in point of fact, her followers are led to place in tortures of the body inflicted by themselves, not only as being means of justification, but as being means of sanctification also. Moreover, she dishonours the author of sanctification no less than she obscures the doctrine of free justification, by her belief in purgatory. If the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin, and, by consequence, frees from all penalty, why should believers have to *suffer* in that place *for their sins*? And so, if the Holy Spirit can and does cleanse the believer's heart, why must he endure any future fires to purge them away?\*

But chiefly with regard to the second branch of the corruptions of Roman Catholic doctrine, we maintain, that this Church dishonours Jesus Christ in all his sacred offices; that she keeps back Christ from the view of her people, in regard to every feature of his character and work which is delightful to a Bible Christian. She teaches in words that Jesus is supremely di-

\* Of Purgatory, Bellarmine, a standard Roman Catholic author says, it is "that place in which, after death, the souls of those persons are *purified*, who were not fully *cleansed* on earth, in order that they may be prepared for heaven, wherein nothing shall enter that defileth."—*Bellarmino de Purgatorio*, lib. i. cap. i.

vine, and yet she has exalted the Virgin Mary almost or quite to an equality with the Son of God. The sinner is directed to her, since, in the blasphemous language of one Roman Catholic writer "she commands her son by the authority of a mother." Thus, in one sense, even theoretically, and in many senses, practically, does she degrade the Saviour, and exalt above him a sinful and dependent mortal.

Again, she maintains in words, that Jesus is our atonement and our Intercessor, and that we are justified by faith in him. And yet she teaches her followers to apply to saints and angels, and to the Virgin Mary especially, to intercede for them with Christ and with God. They are instructed to pray saying, "I desire by thy grace to make satisfaction for my sins, by worthy fruits of penance;" (see Challoner's Garden of the Soul, page 31,) and they are directed to "beg that God would accept of all your pains and uneasiness in unison with the sufferings of your Saviour in deduction of the punishment due to your sins." *Idem*, page 275.

Is it said, we have been quoting the words of private and irresponsible individuals only, and not of the infallible church? We reply, they are what are taught by her priests, and believed by the mass of her people! We are not to be deceived by the cautious silence of her canons and her councils. They are too crafty to express all that they have believed. We will not regard an appeal to her infallible head. What care we for the opinions of the Pope? They are harmless, for the most part, if he does not diffuse them among the people. But we combat, and have a right to combat, and it is our duty to combat, the opinions which are suffered to be afloat among her people, if they be dangerous errors. Nay more, we have a right to demand that the Catholic church itself should publicly disown these opinions, unless she is willing to be responsible for them.

Again, we say, the Roman Catholic church maintains in words that Jesus is head over all things to the church, and is ever present and ever powerful to guide and protect his followers. And yet that she substitutes a *vicar* upon earth for him, which vicar is made so prominent in her system, that his Master in heaven is mostly forgotten. "The church on earth is visible," say they, "and must have a visible head," as if the Pope were visible to the one-ten-thousandth part of his dominions.

Justification by faith is the simple and delightful truth on which the Gospel of Christ is founded. Roman Catholicism has built upon this, "wood, hay, and stubble." One by one, during a long course of years, these have been added to the lawful mate-

rials, until now the advocates of this system of belief are entitled in hardly any degree to be called builders of the true temple.

The connexion subsisting between these unscriptural additions to the Gospel is not more wonderful than it is intimate and complete. Look through the system, and while many of its doctrines seem aimed directly against that glorious article of Bible faith, with the mention of which we entered upon the present topic, not one is sent forth to fight alone. Each is supported by his fellow, and this latter seems as plainly invented by the father of evil for the very purpose of supporting the former, as does the former appear intended by him, to dishonour Christ and obscure justification by faith in his blood. It was well said by Richard Cecil, "Popery is the master-piece of Satan." He "believed him utterly incapable of such another contrivance." "It is a systematic and infallible plan for forming manacles and mufflers for the human mind." "A well laid design, to render Christianity contemptible, by the abuse of its principles and institutions."

We shall adduce one or two instances of this artful and intimate interweaving of errors.

The doctrine that the "good works of the just are truly and properly merits, and as such deserving of eternal life," (see Bellarmine de Justif. lib. v. cap. 1.) and consequently, that we are to "make satisfaction for our sins by worthy fruits of penance," (Challoner's Garden of the Soul, page 31.) does in effect teach men, that Christ's blood cannot cleanse us from all sin. Thus, by the doctrine of *penance*, an appeal is made to the pride and self-righteousness of men, and a blow is aimed at the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

But to support this doctrine of penance, another has been devised, namely, auricular confession to the priest. We say not, that such is the only effect of auricular confession, but that this is one of its tendencies, and perhaps was one reason for its invention. It operates to support *penance*, by giving the power of imposing penance into the hands of a priest, and not leaving the confessed to the liberty of his own will, and to the influence of love for his own ease. Again, it operates thus, by not leaving the confessed to the dictates even of his own conscience. For the sincerely penitent believer, whose way directly to the cross has not been hindered by the priest, and who therefore has applied in faith for pardon directly from God, and has had shed abroad into his soul a sweet sense of sins forgiven; such a believer, if left merely to his own conscience, would never think of adding to the Saviour's merits any penance of his own. He would feel that his sins were entirely blotted out, and their penalty both for time and eternity, completely remitted by the efficacy of the atonement of

Jesus. Therefore, while he would choose to deny himself in order "to keep his body under," he would not dream of a single effort by any thing he could do, to add to the Saviour's satisfaction for his sins. But this would not have suited the purposes of the adversary. So, not only must the path which leads to the cross be obscured, but, after the sinner has even penetrated to that cross and looked and lived, there must be auricular confession to the priest who is to give him absolution, and to prescribe penance. And for what? why, that the temporal punishment due to his sins, and not remitted through the merits of Jesus, may be atoned for by himself. One or two more remarks upon auricular confession, and we shall pass to something else.

It is, after all, the grand engine by which the priesthood rules the people. Every Roman Catholic is required to attend confession at least once a year. It is a powerful engine, because the priest, who has heard your recital of the crimes of your secret retirement; who is acquainted with those things which you have never communicated, and never would communicate, to any other human being, can rule you with a rod of iron. Again, this is a powerful engine, because every doubt about the doctrines of the church, is required by that church to be the subject of confession to the priest. If a Roman Catholic has been thrown into a doubting state of mind by the arguments of some Protestant, auricular confession reveals the fact, and the priest may then either forbid all future intercourse with his antagonist, or may furnish such instruction and such arguments to the individual as his case may require. A further remark is, that auricular confession gives to a priest, who may be so disposed, a very dangerous opportunity of indulging unnoticed in licentious conduct.

But the doctrine of Indulgences also has an intimate connexion with that of penances. The foundation of the latter is laid in the opinion that after the guilt of sin is washed away, and its eternal punishment remitted for the sake of Christ, there still remains some temporal punishment to be endured by the believer, who must make this satisfaction either here or in purgatory. Now, when fasting, and prayers, and alms-giving, and all the varieties of penance have been undergone in this life by the individual, without completing his satisfaction, his friends may purchase masses to be said for the repose of his departed soul, or may buy some portion of that immense store of works of supererogation which the Pope has at his disposal; and these being set down to his credit, (in other words, these being added to what Christ has done, and to what the sinner has also done,) his term of suffering in purgatory can be proportionably shortened. The same result may be obtained by a bequest on the part of the in-

dividual, in aid of the funds of the Church. To erect an hospital, or a place of public worship, or to endow a convent, will purchase an indulgence from the Pope, releasing a soul from many a long year of confinement in purgatory. This doctrine of indulgence, this hopeful sprout growing out of the same root with penances, has yielded to the Church a rich harvest. It has borne golden apples.

Thus much of the connexion between penance and auricular confession, and between penance and indulgences.

Purgatory has been mentioned. Plainly this doctrine is aimed against that of justification by faith. Plainly also it supports the doctrine of penance, and enforces the practice of penance too, by motives of the most stimulating kind. For all those, (it is taught,) who by diligence in penance here succeed in making complete satisfaction for their sins before death, will pass directly into heaven. On the contrary, those who neglect penance here, must go to purgatory hereafter. As plainly this doctrine supports that of indulgences. If there be a purgatory here, as there is penance here, it is natural, on Roman Catholic principles, to suppose that the Pope may, by indulgences, dispense with the one on the same terms as with the other. In accordance with this statement are the words of Leo X. (See *Le Plat*. II. p. 21—25.) “The Roman pontiff may, for reasonable causes, by his apostolic authority, grant indulgences, out of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints to the faithful who are united to Christ by charity, as well for the living as for the dead.” It is true the council deplored the abuses which had been made of indulgences, (as in case of Tetzl,) and determined that “all wicked gains by Indulgences should be abolished.” But then they did not define what gains were “wicked,” (no priest or Pope would be willing to class his gains under this chapter,) and it anathematized those “who assert that indulgences are useless, (when granted in moderation,) or who deny to the Church the power of granting them.” It might here be suggested, that if lawful “in moderation,” they would surely be both expedient and lawful in the very extreme of immoderation. Indeed, there could be no immoderation in the use of that which, if used to the necessary extent, would at once release all the souls that are confined in purgatory.

Closely connected with these is the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass. In this sacrifice, as the people are taught to believe, is repeated over again the “very same sacrifice that was offered by Christ upon the cross.” Various ceremonies are introduced to excite the feelings of the worshippers, and to represent and “commemorate the passion of the Saviour.” Such is the lan-

guage of authorized Catholic books. We cannot help asking how they can commemorate the passion in the Mass, if the Mass be really the passion itself. Still, notwithstanding this contradiction, the Mass is considered the real sacrifice offered eighteen hundred years ago.\* Being such, they suppose it can be effectually celebrated in behalf either of the living or of the dead. And so long as a sincere Roman Catholic believes that the soul of his dear friend in purgatory needs his prayers, so long the sacrifice of the Mass will have its attendants.

It is the record of history, that Philip V. of Spain ordered by will, that an hundred thousand masses should be said for the repose of his soul; and provided that "the surplus, over and above those of them which might be necessary for himself, should be credited and made revertible to poor solitary souls concerning whom no person bestowed a thought." Bourgoing's *Modern Spain*, vol. ii. p. 273. Doblado, in his *Letters from Spain*, states that in that country the custom of begging for souls in purgatory is universal. "A man," says he "bearing a large lantern, with a painted glass representing two naked persons enveloped in flames, entered the court, addressing every one of the company in these words, 'The holy souls! brother, the holy souls! Remember the holy souls!' Few refused the petitioner a copper coin worth about the eighth part of a penny." pp. 169—174.

The author of "*Rome in the nineteenth century*" declares that "you may buy as many masses as will free your souls from purgatory for 29,000 years at the church of St. John's of Lateran on the festival of that saint; at St. Bibiana on All Soul's day, for 7000 years; at a church near the Basilica of St. Paul, and at another on the Quirinal Hill, for 10,000, and for 3000 years;" and all this at a very reasonable rate. Vol. ii. p. 267—270. In the *Laity's Directory for 1830*, pp. 22 and 31, assurance is given to those who contribute to the erection of a Roman Catholic chapel, "that a Mass will be said every year within the octave of All Saints for the repose of their souls after death;" and to the subscribers to the Benevolent Society for the relief of the aged and infirm poor, "that four masses are regularly offered in each month for the benefactors living and dead." We should regret needlessly to injure the feelings of any Roman Catholic in the land. Therefore we admit that these quotations apply only to their religion as it is in Spain, Italy, &c. But let it be remembered that Spain, or at least Italy, is at the very heart of the Pope's

\* Not to suppose so, would be an inconsistency in those who believe in the transubstantiation of the elements into the actual body and blood of the Saviour.

dominions, and yet these things are overlooked and uncensured. Besides the peculiar claim of the Roman Catholic religion is infallibility. Now if it winks at abuses, and virtually authorizes practices in Italy which it condemns in enlightened America, what becomes of either its Unity or its Infallibility? But moreover, we are not ignorant of the fact, (for we have been eye witnesses of its occurrence) that solemn masses are always said, even in this country, on the death of the Pope, and these masses are for the repose of his soul.

We shall close our remarks upon this topic with a few questions. How can Roman Catholics believe that a deceased Pope is benefited by the prayers of his subjects on earth? What is there in purgatory that deprives the Pope of any of his authority, and renders him in any measure dependent on the prayers of those on earth? So long as the Pope remains on earth his blessings and his prayers are desired by all his spiritual children. And if we do not greatly mistake, it would be thought strange for the Pope to request the prayers of his inferiors, even of a cardinal himself. Certain we are that he would not condescend to confess his sins to them. Now, since purgatory is one step nearer heaven than the earth is, why should his entrance into purgatory change so much the character and dignity of a Pope? Surely purgatory is not a more sinful place than earth, because by its very name it is called a place of purification.\* It is true, that to the mind of a Protestant, it looks absurd, that material fires, such as those of purgatory, should operate upon the immaterial mind and the disembodied spirit. But, perhaps it might be said, something else is added to this insufficient and inoperative kind of purification. It might be said, perhaps, that the absence of the body and the things of the world, together with all their varied temptations, and, further, the absence of Satan and his angels, (for it would be the height of inconsistency to suppose that they would be allowed to enter that place of purification,) it might be that the absence of all these would operate favourably on the spirits confined there, when the mere fires of the place could produce no effect.

Therefore, keeping in view this idea, that purgatory is a purifying place, we ask again, why should the Pope need our prayers there, when he never required them on earth?

But further, why so much anxiety to relieve any soul from purgatory, and so little to release one from earth? Purgatory is one step nearer heaven. Purgatory is a place where no new sins are committed, but old ones are continually purged away.

\* See Bellarmine De Purgatorio, lib. i. and cap. i. as quoted before on page 231.

Moreover, the fires of the place cannot harm the immaterial soul, and the body is not there, but in the grave. Now, how is it, that so long as a sinner remains on earth, far away from heaven, there are no regular and earnest prayers to have him removed away, but so soon as he finds his condition bettered, then all is anxiety and distress in his behalf? It is very true, that Protestants know heaven to be a better and purer place than the earth, and that still they love life and seek to prolong their stay here. But the cases are not parallel. These Protestants are under the influence of a physical nature still. It is a part of the constitution of our nature that we should be afraid of death. But in purgatory all these feelings must be unknown, for the body is not there. Besides, no doubt, these Protestants carry their love of life to an extreme, and thus commit sin. - But it is not possible to suppose, that the souls in purgatory are sinning afresh. They have gone there only to endure punishment for the past. But if they are going on still in their sins, when will they ever get out? No! on the principles of Roman Catholics, souls in Purgatory are no longer *sinner*s but (strange incongruity,) only sufferers. While, therefore, the holy and infallible Pope should very earnestly desire to be removed from this sinful world to heaven, he ought also to have some (though not so earnest,) desires to go to purgatory, where he would cease to sin: and being once there, he should patiently wait for the proper time for his removal, and not seek impatiently to hasten its approach.

It is an attribute, peculiar to true religion, that it makes known to sinful man the only acceptable way of worshipping God. Pagan idolatry is offensive in his eyes; the total absence of right views of God from the minds of pagans, also their ignorance of Jesus, and their consequent want of faith in him, are some of its most offensive features. There is only one right way of being saved, that is through Jesus Christ. So too there is only one right way of worshipping God, that is in spirit and in truth, putting our trust in Jesus, the only Mediator. Paganism is the very opposite of this way. And why? Because they do not offer spiritual, but only ceremonial worship, and this not to God but to idols, and because they do not put their whole trust in Jesus Christ. Therefore, just in proportion to the spiritual nature of any mode of worship, and in proportion to the completeness of its recognition of Christ, as the only mediator, is it acceptable in the sight of God. "For there is one God and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5th verse, and "there is none other name (than Jesus)

under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Romans iv. 12.

Every reader of the New Testament, has noticed that this name is there written almost on every page. The inspired writers would have shrunk back in horror from the thought of making any created name equally prominent with his. It seems to be the very spirit of the Bible, to hold up Jêsus to the sinner's view. And so far from implying, that we need any other intercession than his, or any other justification than that which is by faith in his blood, they continually instruct us to put our whole trust in him, and in him alone. He is "the way and the truth and the life, and no man cometh to the Father but by him," and "whosoever comes to him (directly to him) he will in no wise cast out." "We have an advocate (not many advocates), with the Father, even Jesus Christ the righteous. 1 John ii. chap.

With these things in view, let us look at the worship of the Roman Catholic church. We shall glance at their invocation of the Saints, and at their use of Images, and pictures, &c.)

Let us admit now, in candour, that when the aid and intercession of saints and angels is invoked it usually is that they may intercede for us with Christ and not with God. Also that Christ is considered by this church the chief, though not the sole intercessor. But this is not always the case. Prayers are sometimes offered to the saints, especially to the Virgin, that she would intercede with God himself for the sinner, and thus obtain the gift and the descent of the Holy Spirit. Indeed it is quite consistent, on Roman Catholic principles, to suppose that she can prevail directly with God, since they style her "Most pure," "Undeiled," "Powerful," "Holy mother of God," "Refuge of sinners." All these epithets seem to imply her possession of merits of her own, and her independent power to intercede with God in our behalf.

We cannot help making some quotations here, to show the character of the worship paid to the Virgin. They are taken from "The Roman Catholic Prayer Book, or Devout Christian's Vade Mecum," which may be had at the Roman Catholic Bookstore, No. 130 South Sixth street, Philadelphia.

This little volume is intended for the daily use of the devout Catholic. It contains, among other parts of worship, "the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin."

The following is one of the prayers of this Rosary:

"Hail, holy queen, mother of merey, our life our sweetness, and our hope; to thee do we cry, poor banished sons of Eve; to thee do we send up our sighs, mournings, and weepings, in this valley of tears. Turn, then, most gracious advoeate, the eye of merey toward us, and after this our exile ended, show unto us the most blessed fruit of thy womb Jesus, O most clement, most pious, and most sweet Virgin Mary."

In the same Rosary of the Blessed Virgin, after one of the many forms of meditation there given, the worshipper receives this direction. "Then say, 'Our Father,' *once*; 'Hail Mary,' *ten times*." The reader may be curious to know what is the "*Hail Mary*." We give it, therefore, verbatim:

"Hail Mary, full of grace; our Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women; and blessed is the fruit of thy womb Jesus. Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners now, and in the hour of our death. Amen."

This is the prayer which is to be repeated *ten times*, "Our Father who art in heaven," but once!

Another prayer from the same Rosary is this:

"Oh Holy Mary, mother of God, as the body of thy beloved Son was for us extended on the cross, so may our desires be daily stretched out more and more in his service, and our hearts wounded with compassion of his most bitter passion. And then, O most-Blessed Virgin, *vouchsafe to negotiate for and with us, the work of our salvation, by thy powerful intercession*. Amen."

Another is the following:

"O glorious queen of all the heavenly citizens, we beseech thee accept this Rosary, which, as a crown of roses, we offer at thy feet; and *grant*, most gracious Lady, *that by thy intercession* our souls may be enflamed with so ardent a desire of seeing thee *so gloriously crowned*, that it may never die in us until it shall be changed into the *happy fruition of thy blessed sight*. Amen."

We give in the next place "the prayer of St. Bernard to the Blessed Virgin Mary:"

"Remember, O most pious Virgin Mary, that it is unheard of in the world that any one ever had recourse to thy protection, implored thy help, or sought thy meditation, without obtaining relief. Confiding, therefore, in thy goodness and mercy, I cast myself at thy sacred feet, and do most humbly supplicate thee, O mother of the eternal Word, to adopt me as thy child, *and take upon thee the care of my salvation*. O let it not be said, my dearest mother, that I have perished where no one ever found but grace and salvation. Amen."

The compilers of the volume add to the above prayer this remark: "This little prayer has been found of infinite benefit to thousands. It is highly recommended that *young persons* and others would learn it by heart, and with sincerity often repeat it."

In another part of this book we find this prayer:

"O God, who, by the resurrection of thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, hast been pleased to fill the world with joy; grant, we beseech thee, *by the Virgin Mary*, his mother, *we may receive the joys of eternal life*, through the same Christ our Lord."

The following is "the Litany of our Lady of Loretto." It will be remembered that "Litany" signifies a form of supplicatory prayer:

“ Lord have mercy upon us.  
 Christ have mercy upon us.  
 Lord have mercy upon us.  
 Christ hear us.  
 Christ graciously hear us.  
 God the Father of heaven, have mercy on us.  
 God the Son, redeemer of the world, have mercy on us.  
 God, the Holy Ghost, have mercy on us.  
 Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us.

Holy Mary, Holy Mother of God, Holy Virgin of Virgins, Mother of Christ, Mother of divine grace, Most pure Mother, Most chaste Mother, Undeified Mother, Untouched Mother, Amiable Mother, Admirable Mother, Mother of our Creator, Mother of our Redeemer, Most prudent Virgin, Venerable Virgin, Renowned Virgin, Powerful Virgin, Merciful Virgin, Faithful Virgin, Mirror of Justice, Seat of Wisdom, Cause of our Joy,	} Pray for us!	Spiritual Vessel, Vessel of Honour, 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, Comforter 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!
--	-------------------------	---	-------------------------

To these supplications are added (*only*) eight others addressed to God and to Christ; after which follows the Lord’s prayer, and then come these words:

“ We fly to thy patronage, O holy mother of God; despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin.”

The whole concludes with a short prayer to God.

“ The Litanies of the Saints” contains petitions for the intercession of the Virgin, together with St. Gabriel, St. Michael, and St. Raphael, St. John Baptist, St. Joseph, (the reputed father of Christ) and all the Apostles, also St. Stephen, St. Laurence, St. Fabian, and St. Sebastian, St. Anthony, St. Dominick, St. Francis, St. Mary Magdalen, St. Agatha, St. Lucy, St. Agnes, St. Catherine, &c. &c. &c.

These quotations will confirm the remark already made, that the Roman Catholic system combines its errors with truth, and in this way procures for them access to the mind. It is observable that in most of the prayers to the Virgin, &c. allusion is made to our Lord’s intercession. If this were left out, the error would be too glaring; therefore all that the system ventures is,

to obscure his intercessory character by introducing created beings to share it with him.

We are well aware that the little volume before us is not publicly authorized by the Church of Rome. But we have nothing to do at present with her authorized doctrine or practice. Such being the style in which Roman Catholics conduct their worship, can we admit that they offer the same worship which the New Testament inculcates, and which was witnessed in Apostolic times? Is Christ in his glorious mediatory character, as distinctly held forth to the view of their worshippers as he should be? We think a candid perusal of any one single epistle of the New Testament renders such a question almost ridiculous.

Now if the invocation of Saints obscures the intercession of Jesus Christ, this single fact condemns the practice. The respective merits of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism may be determined by this single question—"Which of them most honours Jesus Christ?" Protestants are willing to submit to this test. And it is a proper test. Because it would be strange indeed, that Christian worship, originating as it did with men who attributed supreme divinity to Jesus Christ, should have been intended to be conducted in any other way than the one most honourable to Christ.

Now, therefore, apply this test, and say which is the Gospel system, that which presents Jesus as the *one* and *only* "Mediator between God and man," (see 1 Tim. ii. 5,) or that which instructs us to pray to saints and angels for their intercession to be added to that of our Lord?

Moreover, the practice of invoking the saints is unreasonable as well as unscriptural. Either the Virgin Mary does or does not hear her numerous worshippers who invoke her name daily. If she does hear them, she must be present in more places than one at the same time—and therefore is no longer a human being, but possessed of an attribute of Deity. This attribute is *omnipresence*—and it is attributed to the Virgin, if she is said to be in two, *even in two* places at the same time. Because, if she may be in two places at a distance from each other, she may be in ten thousand, (indeed she must be in ten thousand to hear all her worshippers;) and if in ten thousand, she may be *every where present*.

But if she does not hear her worshippers, of what advantage are their prayers? They spend their breath, to say the least, in vain.

But if she did indeed hear every prayer of every worshipper, another question arises: Could she answer them? If she could

answer them, if she could "take upon her the care of the salvation" of so many souls, would she not be equal with God? If she could not, why pray to her?

And truly, whether she can or cannot answer prayer, why pray to her at all? Is not Jesus Christ head over all things to Roman Catholics as well as to Protestants? Is he not able and willing to hear their prayers, as well as ours? Why are they so anxious to obtain the aid of the Virgin and the saints? Jesus is ready to intercede for them himself, if they will apply to him. And his intercession cannot fail. He is every where present, for he is one with the Father. He hears every cry of distress in every part of the universe, without the possibility of failure. Herein he differs from the saints and from the virgin. Who would value the intercession of a mere minion at any court, while he had that of the king's only and well beloved son? What is the Virgin Mary, even in her glorified state, but a created, and consequently dependent being? Who dares venture deliberately to compare her or her intercession with the Eternal Son of God?

It is useless to pretend that prayers to the Virgin are only made with the view of obtaining her intercession for us with Christ, so that he may be willing to intercede for us. We deny that such is the fact. The large majority of Roman Catholics know nothing about this indirect intercession of the Virgin. She is constantly held up as their guide and protectress, and to her they repair as to a Saviour, and expect to find power in her to prevail directly for them with God. And further, we need no previous intercession of the Virgin to render Jesus favourable to the returning sinner. He loves us more and better than she does or can do.

It is useless, also, to pretend that prayers for the intercession of the saints in heaven, are just the same with requests for the prayers of our pious friends here on earth. Because we never use such language of adoring worship to the latter, as Roman Catholics do to the former.\* Again, if we did, our words could be heard by our friends, because they are not yet removed from us, as are the saints, by death. These pious friends are still in the world of prayer; but the saints on high, are in the world of praise.

We proceed now to the use of images and pictures in the Roman Catholic worship. It is urged in their favour, that they serve to excite devotional feelings. This we readily grant. A splendid painting of Jesus on the cross could hardly fail of affect-

\* See prayer of St. Benedict to blessed Virgin Mary, p. 240.

ing every pious spectator. But herein is the danger of using them. The more splendid and affecting, the more dangerous they become. Common people easily learn to forget the pictured, in looking at the picture. And all people are more or less prone to idolatry. The history of the human race sufficiently establishes this fact. We are aware of the distinction so often made between worshipping the reality in the representation, and worshipping the representation instead of the reality. But it is too nice for common use. God has said, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven or in earth, &c. &c. thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them."

Now even if (which we by no means admit,) the words "bow down" have reference to real worship, and to that only, yet why make such nice distinctions? For to say the least, the Protestant translation of the words *may be* correct, and the Roman Catholic *may be* doing wrong even to use images as helps to his worship. Why, therefore, will they hazard even the possibility of this? There is no need of pictures or of images in worshipping God in spirit and in truth. Nay rather there is no propriety.

Do Roman Catholics bear in mind, that many Pagans in Hindostan make the very same distinction, to which they themselves must have recourse? The most ignorant Brahmin will tell you, that he does not worship the image for itself, but merely in honour of the God whom it represents.

We have not been able to find any authorized expression of Roman Catholic doctrine in regard to the supremacy of the Pope. A cautious silence has been observed; but a very unjustifiable silence, when we consider the great differences of opinion on this subject which have prevailed among Roman Catholic writers. Some of them have made the most extravagant claims for the Pope, which others have vigorously resisted. Now why so great silence on the part of those infallibles whose mere dictum might settle this important point for ever?

Even the famous Council of Trent, assembled in the sixteenth century, for the very purpose of restoring "the Lutherans to sound doctrine, and suppressing heresy in general," did not declare itself on this point. Not even in that canon which relates to "the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and the Sacrament of Orders;" not even in that canon which determines the powers of "Bishops and Presbyters and Ministers;" did they say one word about the powers or claims authorized or unauthorized, legal or usurped, of him whom Roman Catholics venerate as pastor of the Church universal, including bishops and presbyters and ministers, together with their people, as vicar of Christ, and as vice-

gerent of God. But it was truly a master stroke of policy to be silent here, for, in the language of Mr. Cramp, a recent and excellent writer on the subject, "it has left open the door for any interpretation of the powers of the Pope, which the times will bear." The council of Florence also, held in 1439, though not so entirely silent as the one at Trent, used very vague and general language. But surely, when contending with so subtle an opponent, no man need wait for an open and candid exposure of faith from herself. It is enough that we have the language of facts and of history. To borrow again the language of Mr. Cramp, "The Pope has always assumed as much power as he could safely exercise." The student of history is referred to the conduct of Pope Innocent III. and of Gregory VII. the audacious Hildebrand, to whose acts of outrageous and impudent violence the patrimony of St. Peter was indebted for a very rapid and enriching extension. Besides, we have the language and sentiments of standard Roman Catholic writers, and to them we may appeal. Bellarmine, who, by the appointment of Pope Gregory XIII. delivered lectures in the college of Rome, fourteen years after the council of Trent, says, "the Pope is supreme judge in matters of faith and manners," that "when the Pope instructs the whole Church in matters of faith, he cannot possibly err," that "it may be piously believed, that even as a private individual, he cannot be a heretic," that "though the ordination of bishops, generally considered, is of divine right as of God's appointment, yet that bishops canonically elected, receive their actual jurisdiction and authority, not from Christ, but from the Pope;" that, "as prince of the whole Church, he may, by his own authority, enact laws binding on the conscience;" that "the Pope is above councils, and acknowledges no authority whatever above himself;" that "the Pope may change kingdoms, and take away from one, and bestow on another, as supreme spiritual prince, if the same should be necessary to the salvation of souls;" and, finally, that the "Pope may and ought to enjoin kings, to defend the Church, and punish heretics and schismatics, and if they neglect it, to compel them by excommunication, and other similar measures." In accordance with all this, the Popes, again and again, have deprived princes of their thrones, and sundered the bonds of their people's allegiance. The sentiments of Bellarmine, as above expressed, must have been those of the court of Rome in his day, as is plain from the fact we have already stated, of his being appointed public lecturer by Pope Gregory. If Gregory XIII. did not approve, then ought he not, and would he not have felt bound to condemn them publicly? And if he did approve them, and if he was infallible, would it not be in-

consistent for any modern Roman Catholic to reject similar opinions? That the "infallible" Gregory did approve them is not left doubtful, because, for the expression of these sentiments, Bellarmine was rewarded with the cardinal's hat, and (after his death) came within a few votes of being canonized as a saint. See Du Pin, cent. xvii. b. v.

But the Pope is a professed disciple of the meek and lowly Jesus! There are also, besides the Pope, a multitude who profess the same thing. But this man claims to be above all the rest. How comes this to pass? Is it merely such superiority as the under-shepherd has over the sheep of his master? Does such delegated temporary authority as this content him? Or is he satisfied with the authority of an apostle even? By no means. True, he exhibits not "the signs of an apostle!" He performs no public and credible miracles, to substantiate his claims! But what he lacks in the quality he makes up in the quantity or extent of them! He is not merely a successor of one apostle; he is not merely one of twelve co-equal descendants from the twelve of Galilee, but he is successor of them all! And in order to give foundation to these claims, a difference in favour of Peter must be diligently sought to be discovered among the twelve equal and unpretending apostles. And, moreover, it must be carefully kept out of view, that the first pretended successor to the pretended supremacy of Peter was not his (really and truly equal) fellow-apostle John, who was still living at the death of Peter, but some other person hitherto uninspired and inferior!!

Before proceeding to answer the question we have asked above, we must remark that the claim of infallibility in matters of faith, which is made for the Pope, is utterly inconsistent with itself, unless infallibility in personal conduct and feelings, that is, complete holiness of heart and life, is also added to his qualities. For what security can we have that any man will make a conscientious use of his infallibility in matters of faith, unless he be a holy man? Suppose him to be a wicked man, he may choose to give a wrong decision, even when the mind of the Spirit is plainly revealed to him. Now in the case of the twelve apostles we have abundant security. God's grace was sufficient for them. Their lives testified to the honesty of their hearts. But has it been thus with the Popes? Let history give the answer.

The question now is, how came it to pass that among brethren one should assume to lord it over the rest? Roman Catholics will say, Christ gave this authority to the Popes. Truth and facts reply, they assumed it to themselves. The record of history is briefly this. Ambition and lust of power appeared

among the clergy very soon after the death of the apostles. The more influential assumed authority over their less gifted brethren, and these soon learned to pay a willing obedience to the occupants of the more important stations in the Church. Very early arose the distinction between presbyters and bishops; and also the distinction between metropolitans and other bishops. These metropolitans were afterwards in the eighth century called archbishops. But as early as the fourth century, five of these were distinguished above the rest, namely, the bishops of Rome, of Constantinople, of Antioch, of Alexandria, and of Jerusalem. At this time Christianity was the religion of the Roman empire, and Rome its metropolis. It is not strange, therefore, that the bishop of Rome should gradually have acquired the superiority over the remaining four. Neither is it strange that he should have found the bishop of Constantinople a more powerful rival than before, so soon as the imperial residence was transferred from Rome to Byzantium. For a long time, and bitterly, did these two bishops, thus equally matched, contend for the superiority. Nor did the contention cease, even when the emperor Phocas, incensed with the bishop of Constantinople for refusing to approve the slaughter of Mauritius, declared Boniface III., then bishop of Rome, to be the Oecumenical Bishop and Head of all the churches. This happened in the seventh century, and the separation of the Greek from the Latin Church, which followed the mutual excommunication of the two bishops, has continued until this day.

Upon these facts no comment is necessary. We shall be contented if their light is only permitted to fall with unbroken, unrefracted rays, upon the claims of the Pope.

But we must be allowed to make one or two objections to these claims.

First. The doctrine of Papal supremacy hides Jesus Christ from the sinner's view. It is the spirit of the Gospel to exalt Christ, therefore we call it Christianity. But it is the spirit of this "other" Gospel to exalt the Pope, therefore we call it Popery. Who, and what in the sight of God is the Pope? Nothing but a polluted creature like all other men! Nothing but a worm of the very dust! What should he be in his own sight? What Paul was in his; "less than the least of all saints who was not meet to be called an apostle." Yet, what are his views of himself? Let his magnificent but impious titles give the answer. He who should be crying out with Paul, "Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" suffers himself to be styled "sacred and holy!" He who should acknowledge himself as weak and ignorant as a wayward child,

claims to be the vice-gerent of God on earth! The Bible holds up constantly the glory and power of Christ. Popery does the same for antichrist.\* Every epithet of honour, every ascription of praise, is in the former heaped upon Jesus. Every possible mode is there used of making him prominent. Just so in this other Gospel of the Pope. Is Christ our prophet and our priest and our king in the Bible representation? This "other" system makes the Pope our prophet, for he decides infallibly in matters of faith; our priest, for he absolves us from sin by dispensing to us the merits of Christ; our king, for he rules supremely over the whole Church. Now, to establish his claims, Roman Catholics should bring forward the very strongest proofs from Scripture. But this they cannot do.

Our second objection therefore, is, that the supremacy of the Pope is not supported by Scripture. Speaking of the body of Christ, which is the Church, the apostle says, "and God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps," &c. but not one word about a Pope!

The language of our Saviour to Peter, when he called him a rock, and said he would build his Church upon it, does seem at the first to favour Peter's supremacy over his brethren. But then, if it were granted that Peter was greater than the rest, is it right to say that he was the vicar of Christ, and the vice-gerent of God? And even if he ought to be called so, can it be proved that this privilege has descended to his pretended successor? Christ said upon *this rock* he would build, not upon a long line of others succeeding him. Here is a great chasm to be passed over. Besides, did not our Saviour apply to the other disciples, as well as Peter, in the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew, almost the very language which he had here used to Peter alone? It seems to us, that this verse, wrested from its true meaning so eagerly by the advocates of papal supremacy, (drowning men will catch at straws,) applies to Peter what was equally true of them all.

If our Saviour had, indeed, elevated Peter to the papal see, and conferred infallibility upon him by this saying, would he ever have had occasion afterwards to say to him, "Get thee behind me, *Satan!*" or ever have denied his Master?

If a Roman Catholic Bishop should now write a book and publish it in the very city of Rome, declaring, that for a certain decision of the Pope's in some ecclesiastical affair, the Pope was to be *blamed*, his holiness would feel himself much aggrieved. And

\* See note on opposite page.

if this had been done to Pope Gregory VII., it would have cost the offender his life. And yet Paul, who thought he was not meet to be called an Apostle, once withstood a certain Pope *to his very face*, and dared to say, and did safely say to him, that he was to be blamed! This was no other than Pope Peter the First.

We have this fact recorded by Paul himself, in his Epistle to the Galatians, which epistle evinces that even in that day had commenced the disposition to put Paul below Peter.

Is it not probable that the Jews would have cordially received Jesus as their Messiah, if he had only come with the splendour of a Roman Pontiff? Yes; if such distinctions as this, and others depending upon this, had been promised by him to his followers, never would the fickle multitude have cried out "Crucify him!" Is there not a striking similarity in splendour and greatness between the Pope and the expected Messiah of the Jews? Is there not an entire dissimilarity between the pompous pontiff and the simple lowly Saviour?

There is, and so surely as there is, so surely the Pope of Rome is Anti-Christ.\*

---

ART. VIII.—*Memoir of Julius Charles Rieu, from the French of Frederic Monod, jun. one of the Pastors of the Reformed French Church of Paris. With Introductory Remarks, by the Rev. A. Alexander, D.D. Philadelphia. French & Perkins. 1833. pp. 65. 18mo.*

WE look to France with tender recollections of the past, and trembling hope for the future. The past which we regard is not the chivalrous age of bearded knights, amorous troubadours, and strong-handed feuds; nor yet that grotesque period of powder, ceremony and brocade, in which the Louises shone predominant over a dissipated and warlike court; but the bright intervening season in which Presbyterianism swayed its mild influence over a simple, pious and happy people. Time was, when Frenchmen

\* We deem it proper to say that we do not use this word *in the usual sense*. We believe it an entire mistake to apply to the Pope the passages in the epistles of John, which contain this term. And it occurs no where else in the Scriptures. The Apostle there speaks, in our humble opinion, of the Corinthians and Nicolaitans, &c. who our denied our Saviour's divinity. Still as there were, and are many anti-christs in the world, we may apply the term *in a general way*, wherever we think it proper.

These remarks we would *not* apply, however, to what St. Paul says of the *man of sin*.

went up to their annual Synods, under the leading of teachers who held the truth as we now hold it. The mace of authority, and the pike and musket of a ferocious faction, broke the charm of that halcyon day. The murder of thousands, and the expatriation of thousands more; the unresisted prevalence of Popish license and superstition; the mingled fanaticism and sensuality of the dominant party; and the judicial blindness and infatuation which ensued—left beautiful France a defenceless field, over which the hideous monster Infidelity might expatiate and raven after his prey. Yet we are unwilling to believe that the foot of atheistical pride has trodden down every remnant of the ancient seed; and from time to time we are made glad by tokens of the same faith which dwelt in Farel, Beza and Claude.

The political changes which have resulted from the last revolution, have been as the lifting up of a mighty pressure from a spring which had been well nigh deadened. What there was of Protestantism had been developed without reference to the social principle. It no more resembled the ancient glory of the French Church, than the sickly ears in the corner of a field resemble the yellow harvest of the preceding year. Like severed coals, the pious who remained lost their glow, and some waxed cold. A pulseless Socinianism occupied the place of the Gospel, or unblushing infidelity poisoned the rising race. Yet there was a remnant according to the election of grace, and there has been all along a vigorous, and, of late, an increasing struggle after pristine faith and discipline. Among those who have borne shame and opposition for the Saviour's sake, and who have held up the standard of the Reformation, when to do so was to sacrifice almost every thing of worldly honour, the Monods have been nobly eminent. The *Archives du Christianisme* has been like the sound of a trumpet to slumbering believers. The influence of these men, and such as these, has awakened, rallied, nerved and united a band of evangelical Christians; and we hope and pray for the time when the blessed Gospel shall resound in a thousand churches of France.

There is a peculiar and distinctive aspect of piety pertaining to every age and clime. It is the same family, but the features vary; a treasure modified in its manifestations by the mould of the earthen vessel. Grace seems scarcely the same thing in an Augustin and a Knox. The religion of a German and an American believer differ in a striking manner. And there is something in the simple, fervid, child-like, affectionate, confiding, joyful piety of evangelical France, which has, in our view, a peculiar charm.

The reader of the volume which we are reviewing, will enjoy

the exhibition of a lovely portrait. Here is no long succession of striking events, no strong points of worldly greatness, no ambitious elevation, no eccentricity; but unadorned, natural, graceful piety. The translator is a young Clergyman of the Presbyterian Church, who has been happily instrumental, since his return from France, in awakening some interest in behalf of Christians in that country, and whose attention was no doubt fixed upon this little work by his sympathy with European Calvinists. Let us hear his own words:

"In the autumn of the year 1831, the translator of this little work was riding in company with a distinguished pastor of Geneva, in the environs of that delightful city; we were speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; of the long and profound slumbers of the church of Geneva; of the recent revival, whose silent, but irrepressible power had broken up the icy bondage of established error; of the attendant persecutions and sufferings of the ministers of Christ, and of the new reformation which the providence and Spirit of God are now rocking in the cradle of the old. Having spoken of the labours of Neff, Duvier, Wilks, Haldane, and many others, "whose record is on high," he turned to me, with his peculiar earnestness of manner, and inquired, "Have you read the Memoir of Charles Rieu?" On my answering in the negative, he added, "Do not sleep till you have read it." Immediately on my return to the city, I procured and read it, with emotions kindred to those which are awakened by the memoirs of Brainerd, Martyn, Neff, and Oberlin. It is now given to American Christians in an English translation; with the fervent hope and prayer, that it may prove to their hearts, as it did to my own, *a coal from the altar*. What might not the American church do for her own extension and the conversion of the world, if all her sons were animated by the spirit of this holy and admirable young man—a spirit which breathed glory to God in the highest—love to all who bore the image of Christ—peace and good will to the whole world. Such was the spirit of Rieu. God grant that we may all be baptized with it, and that, under its influence, we may "count not our own lives dear to ourselves, that we may finish our course with joy, and the ministry which we have received of the Lord!"

"The author of this little Memoir is well known, not only in Europe, but in our own country, as the editor of the *Archives du Christianisme*. Within the last year, he has been chosen one of the pastors of the Reformed church of Paris, in succession to the late Mr. Marron. He was a personal and intimate friend of Rieu; and his memoir appears to have been a simple, unlaboured, and unpretending memorial of Christian affection. The translation claims no other praise than that of fidelity.

JULIUS CHARLES RIEU was born in Geneva, in August, 1792, of a distinguished family. Of his childhood and youth little is recorded by M. Monod. We learn, however, that he early dedicated himself to God, and yielded his powers to the public service of Christ. In 1817, he left his native country for Denmark, and became the pastor of a church among certain French refugees, colonized at Fredericia, in Denmark. In so doing, he made great sacrifices, with the true spirit of a minister or a missionary. He tore himself from a beloved circle of friends, many of whom resisted his determination; and from his country, which was just then beginning to enjoy the promise of freedom. Yet he preferred Denmark to Geneva, and at the age of twenty-five years,

repaired with a heart burning with zeal to his new destination. Some idea of his temper and life, may be derived from the following extracts:

"Having learned that many of the parishoners had forgotten the French language, he stopped at Göttingen on his journey to the colony, devoted three months of unremitted study to the acquisition of German, and arrived at Fredericia prepared to preach the word of God in that language. His ministry on earth was not destined to continue for a longer period than that of his Master. But what has he not accomplished during the three years and a half of its duration!

"By the sweet influence of his instructions and example; and by the assistance of God, which he never ceased to implore, the moral and religious character of the colony underwent in a very short time a visible alteration. Drunkenness had there been a vice of peculiar frequency. But after a short time, Rieu persuaded the heads of families to subscribe a regulation which authorized the consistory, under the direction of the pastor, to deprive the drunkard, who persevered in his vice after three or four successive admonitions, of his colonial rights during a certain period: that is, that his portion of the lands, gratuitously bestowed by the Danish government on the colony at its first establishment in Jutland, should be administered, during that period for the benefit of the community. This rule was put in force against one of the colonists in 1821; he was, if I mistake not, deprived of the revenue of his colonial lands for three years.

"Though reminded that a preacher ought not to neglect the talents with which he had been endowed for exhibiting the truth with power, Rieu was still more deeply persuaded that the great excellence of a sermon did not consist in its being formed of sonorous and well cadenced periods, or written in a style of scrupulous accuracy, or constructed with art on a method laboriously conceived, and skilfully adjusted. He was convinced that the too great importance often attached to these things was what the apostle denominates *preaching ourselves*. It was his resolution to *preach Christ Jesus the Lord*, according to the commandment which he had received; and it was therefore his principal care to set before his flock, the great truths of the gospel, and the great moral lessons which flow from them, with all possible force and simplicity; and he was always eloquent, but with a Christian eloquence very different from that of the world. 'My oratorical art,' said he, 'is prayer;' remarkable words, which ought to be graven on the heart of every preacher of the gospel. Never did he separate morality from doctrine, or doctrine from morality; these two things were connected, and, as it were, commingled in his heart and in his discourses, like the sun and the light, and with that inseparable union in which they are presented in the gospel. The fall and spiritual misery of man, the necessity of a Saviour, redemption accomplished by the expiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ, justification by faith in Christ, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, a final judgment, an eternity either of happiness or misery; and as consequences, repentance, sanctification, the observance of all Christian duties; these were the subjects of his discourses."

"The point of view in which his subject was to be exhibited being once determined, he kneeled before the Lord, implored the assistance of his Spirit, and besought Him to prepare himself that spiritual nourishment which He knew to be best suited to the souls for which it was designed. He then took his pen in hand, and wrote with freedom and rapidity a sermon which was always useful, because it was full of the spirit and the word of Christ; of that word which never returns void to him from whom it emanates. And this man, who, but a year before occupied months in the laborious composition of a single sermon, now prepared two during each week; for he preached on the Sabbath morning in French, and in the afternoon in German. The first of these sermons he committed to memory; the second he read, not being yet sufficiently familiar with the German to trust his memory with the repetition of a discourse in that language; During nearly four years, he constantly composed two sermons in each week; for it rarely, if ever, happened, that he repeated an old discourse. He thought that this practice gave to the ministry too much the char-

acter of a trade; that it was important to give to public discourses, as far as possible the appearance of *improvisation*, and that the tone, the tendency, and the details of a sermon ought to vary according to circumstances, which are never entirely the same at different periods. He adopted the habit recommended by Reinhard, of being always in advance by one week in his preparation. Seldom did he preach a sermon either in French or German, unless that which was to succeed it was ready in his desk, and thus he was never left to be embarrassed by those accidents which might occur during the week, to interrupt the labours of preparation. It is true that he rose at four o'clock in the morning; that he occupied, as a faithful steward, every quarter of an hour which his Master allowed him; and only took that repose which was absolutely necessary to the preservation of his health, a strict attention to which he considered his duty, both as a pastor and a son. The Sabbath was to him the happiest day of the week. Far from sharing in that species of anguish with which many pastors regard so rapid a succession of the Sabbaths of the Lord, he beheld their approach with joy, the source of which was to be found in the manner in which he employed them. At nine o'clock he ascended the pulpit and preached in French. He then visited, in succession, three or four infirm persons of his flock who had been confined for years to their own houses, and performed with each of them a private service. At two o'clock he commenced his service in German, at the close of which he held in his own house a large Sunday-school. And finally, at six o'clock, the young apostle opened the doors of his house, and the faithful resorted thither with eagerness, to be again edified by the reading of the holy word, and by the tidings of the progress of Christianity on the earth. The day of the Lord being thus occupied to the end, the faithful pastor closed it in supplications for his flock, and found in that own heart a sweet and effectual recompense for his labours, a true foretaste of that eternal recompense which awaited him, and which he was so soon to receive."—Pp. 16—25.

In the winter, Rieu held two catechetical exercises every week, and also two social meetings. He read the Bible with inquirers; gave lessons in various useful branches; established Bible Societies; and devoted himself to scriptural study. He diffused the savour of his piety far and wide, by means of his personal intercourse and his correspondence, and lived with a constant reference to the shortness of life, and the imminence of judgment. At great expense of labour and time, he established a school, and erected an edifice for the accommodation of two hundred pupils. But we must refer to the memoir itself for more copious details. In the midst of these labours, in the year 1821, a disease appeared in Fredericia, which, for some unknown cause, made its principal ravages among the French colonists, so that their Lutheran neighbours called it "the malady of the Reformed." Rieu was unwearied in his attendance upon the sick and dying, exhorting them to flee from the wrath to come, and to lay hold on eternal life. On the 21st of June, he was himself attacked with slight premonitory symptoms. No sooner was this the case, than he wrote the following letter, which was, as is justly remarked by Dr. Alexander, "a sermon not only from the very heart of an affectionate pastor, but from the mouth of the sepulchre." We cannot deny our readers the perusal of this pastoral epistle entire:

“ Fredericia, June 21, 1821.

“Gentlemen, and well beloved Elders and Brethren of the French Reformed Church at Fredericia.

“ Being this day attacked by the symptoms of a disease which has already brought many of our brethren to the grave, I feel it proper to leave you a few instructions, which will be found of importance in the event that it should please God to remove me to himself.

“ All my papers of every description will be forwarded without delay to my family. May the Lord accompany them with his blessing!

“ And now, my beloved parishioners, I have but one word to say to you. It is but a repetition of that which you already know, and which will occupy my thoughts even to the end. It is that I have loved you, and at this hour love you with my whole heart. My prayers have ascended and will ascend in your behalf to the last breath of my life. I believe that I have shown my love towards you, by declaring to you the truth of God as I have believed it in my conscience and before God. Before I have prepared for you the food which it was my duty to dispense, I have invariably cast myself at the foot of the throne of grace, and besought the great Shepherd of souls himself to speak to you by my mouth, and not to suffer me to intrude a single thought of myself. Alas! I know that but for my unbelief, the Lord would have much more eminently accomplished his strength in my infirmity, and would more exclusively have exhorted you himself. Nevertheless, I have this firm and perfect confidence, that He who has chosen me; (me, an unworthy creature, more than a thousand times dead and condemned by my defects and transgressions,) has verily enabled me to build on *the only true foundation, Christ crucified*; and that, without regard to the great imperfections and blemishes which every where cleave to my ministry, He will *keep that which I have committed to Him unto that day, and will save me unto His heavenly kingdom*; and this assurance is the more unwavering, because at this hour I lay myself at the foot of His cross and make a full and entire renunciation of my own merits, which are all, from first to last, but *filthy rags*; and solemnly declare before God that I receive Jesus Christ, *God blessed forever*, for my only Saviour, who by the blood which he shed on the cross, has washed me from all iniquity and purified me by his Spirit; so that I can stand before his face in righteousness. I smite my breast like the publican, with a deep consciousness of my guilt; and I cry with the crucified and converted thief, ‘Lord! remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.’

“ Thus death becomes to me the happiest moment of my life; though I feel myself in *a strait betwixt two*, willing still to labour for the souls entrusted to me; yet ardently desirous to *depart and be with Christ, which is far better*. Assuredly, should He remove me so early, it would be a favour for which I cannot sufficiently humble myself before Him and sing anthems of praise. What was I, O my God! that the combat should be so soon terminated before I have ‘resisted unto blood, striving against sin?’

“ Dear parishioners, consider well your responsibilities. I have declared to you the counsel of God; it is true, (and I make the confession with grief and humiliation before the cross,) with too much weakness and fear of man; above all, my conscience reproaches me for not having sufficiently imitated the example of the apostle, by exhorting each of you in private from house to house; nevertheless you can hear me testimony that I have never been ashamed of Christ crucified, while proclaiming his word to you in the pulpit. *His kingdom then is come nigh unto you*; the walls of your temple attest it. Oh! that you had all listened to that word of life which alone can save your souls! What would have been my joy to see multitudes of you converted to Christ! Hearken, hearken to his voice *while it is yet to-day*; I call to you from my sepulchre. If you hear not this voice, you would not be persuaded *though one rose from the dead*. Heaven and earth will pass away, but this word will not pass away. O Christ save them and pray for them, as thou has condescended to pray for me!

“ Adieu then, dear parishioners, I commend you to God and to the word of His

grace; watch and pray, *for yet a little while, and he that shall come will come.* We shall soon stand face to face before the tribunal of Christ.

“If time permit, I will also write to my beloved relatives and friends in Christ. If not, they will know that I had an ardent desire to do so; you will communicate to them these lines. Oh! that grace and peace may rest upon them! may they all consider that they are soon to *pass from this world to the Father*; may they hasten to follow that Saviour who is the light of the world, the resurrection, the way, the truth, and the life. Adieu, also, to my well-beloved sister H—; if she survive me, and escape the dangerous malady which now threatens her life. I commend her also to the grace of the Lord, in whom she has trusted, and who has redeemed her. I commend her in this world to my dear parishioners, and to my beloved family, desiring them to render her existence as comfortable as possible. I say to her, adieu, we are not separated. I entreat my relatives to make every possible exertion to send a pastor to supply my place in this church. To my last breath I will pray to God for you all, whom I love with the tenderest affection. May grace and peace be and abide with you from this time forth and for evermore! I remain deeply affected with all the proofs of attachment which you have given me,

“Your devoted pastor,

“CHARLES RIEU.”

When he found his symptoms becoming more aggravated, he commenced a journal addressed to his near relatives. In this he speaks with calmness of his approaching dissolution; but he does far more. After detailing all the stages of his malady, he declares: “My soul is filled with unutterable peace and joy. If any thing causes me, after all, to expect my recovery, it is that so early a recall, almost before I have entered into the conflict, would be a favour infinitely beyond my merits or my hopes. What am I, the most worthless and polluted of creatures; what am I, that such *manner of love should be bestowed upon me!* Doubtless, I ought to receive it with more fervent gratitude than any other blessing; I have done absolutely nothing to deserve it; but what do I say! rather is not all, all, all, absolutely gratuitous? It would be delightful for me to speak to you from time to time in short and hasty sentences,—this brings me near to you,—and to speak to you of God; for he alone should be viewed,—and his voice should be heard and obeyed in this matter.”

His only prayer seemed to be, *Thy will be done!* When more alarming symptoms occurred, there was the same calm in his soul. The last words of his journal are these:

“I go forward with joy indescribable through the dark valley; for I go to Jesus, my God; to Christ, who has conquered for us. All his promises converge to a point and fill my own soul with a gladness which I have never known before.

“No, he has not deceived us!

“Happy are they who have not seen, and yet have believed! I go to see him as he is. Already I see him. I feel his hand supporting my soul; while this clay is crumbling down, the inward man is renewed. I shall be changed into his image. I shall be like him! where no sorrow—

“Oh! that I could impart this joy to your souls! But there you also may find it. I am not separated from you; in the moment that I close my eyes here, I seem to stand with you, and behold Christ coming in the clouds.

"Oh! that you may all sleep in Jesus! Farewell beloved friends! A little hope— This happy moment then approaches for which I have so ardently longed, and in the thought of which I have habitually found my sweetest satisfaction. Oh! how good art thou, my Saviour! Thy face fills me with joy. Resurrection and life! Eternity, eternity with Jesus! So much beloved, though unseen; what will it be; my spirit fails; O blood! O cross!

"What peace in that last word to the thief: To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise. Joy, endless joy! fulness of pleasures! for ever with him whom our souls love; we shall raise the song of the Lamb, with the ten thousand times ten thousand who know it, who have learned the new song. To him who hath saved us. Before his throne—I burn!

"When will this wall of flesh be broken down? Yet a little while—Oh! how great is his goodness! Weep not, my friends.

"The last thing which could even in a slight degree oppress my conscience, is the recollection of a warning which I wished to give to certain offenders, which I have been compelled to neglect by a succession of recent circumstances. I have just sent this admonition by my elders, so that I feel assured their blood will not be required at my hands.

"My peace is still pure, and perfect, and unmingled; my joy passes all understanding. I only describe it that you may yourselves breathe after it. Surely, it is not found in the busy circles of the world, and the path thereof is not traced by the philosophers of the world. No, no, Thou alone bestowest it, O God, God the Saviour, God the Comforter!

"Blessed, blessed, blessed for ever be thy glorious name!

"Dear mother, uncle, aunt, brothers and sisters, nephews and nieces, friends in Christ, we are not separated. We shall soon meet.

"Still Sabbath morning—I will write no more until to-morrow." (Here the Journal terminates.)

In a literary point of view, there is nothing in this work to be remarked. It is an obituary, rather than a biography. In some respects, it may be considered as an humble biography; in others it is one of the noblest we have seen. For if there is any thing inspiring in the struggle of untried youth with a crushing disorder, a struggle of faith and hope against the sweeping away of all earthly expectations; if there is any thing sublime and inspiring in the aspect of true religion triumphing over death, and taking joyful wing for an unknown world; then is this death-bed worthy of our highest regard.

We have only to regret that the sketch here presented to the public is not more extensive. Such a subject evidently demanded a fuller exhibition. The translator has done his part faithfully and with success, as we have satisfied ourselves by a careful comparison with the original. In conclusion, we heartily recommend the book to all who love the beauty of unfeigned religion.

ART. IX.—*The Sixteenth Annual Report of the American Society for Colonizing the free people of colour of the United States.* 1833.

THE revolution of another year has furnished us with the sixteenth annual report of this Society. It is, as usual, a very interesting document exhibiting a still progressive course. In its own language, “while opposition has been embodied, and hurled against it reproach and defiance, its multiplied friends have stood forth calmly and triumphantly for its vindication, and borne its cause onward with resistless power.”

There are no statements which we read with more interest, than those connected with this Society. True, there is one object which rises above all others in magnitude and grandeur. We refer to the stupendous purpose of bringing the whole world under the renovating influence of Christian truth. As an object of benevolence, it comprehends all others, and views them only as departments of its own great plan. But aside from this, we look to no benevolent operation in the world with so much interest as to the one embraced by the American Colonization Society. Perhaps this is but the expression of an individual feeling; but when we consider the magnitude of the evils in our own country which the Society tends to alleviate, and the wide field which lies open to philanthropic exertions on the other side of the waters, we cannot but regard it as essentially justified.

Would that we could collect into one view all those things which enhance the greatness of this enterprise; the degradation of Africa and its strong claims upon *American* philanthropy; the *manifest* evils of the system of slavery in our own country, together with those ten thousand as yet *undiscovered* ones which have insinuated themselves throughout all the ramifications of society. But these are subjects which we confess ourselves unable to delineate; they require the hand of a master. Were they but boldly drawn out, we doubt not that the sentiment we have expressed would receive the cordial approbation of every beholder; that the universal feeling would be that no scheme of benevolence, save one which embraces the world, can be more comprehensive than that which aims at the alleviation of these moral, physical, and political evils.

It is with that deep interest which such sentiments inspire, that we have always been accustomed to regard the Colonization Society. It presents the only scheme, with reference to this subject, which has ever been devised, or surely the only one which has the least appearance of *feasibility*. That it *has* this appearance,

not only in a small, but in an ample degree, and that, as a scheme, it is worthy of liberal and Christian America; a scheme, in its general character, *fully commensurate* with the vast and magnificent objects contemplated, we fully and gladly believe.

It is not compatible with our present design to enter into a minute examination of the article which we have announced at the commencement of this article, or to remark at length upon the many interesting facts it contains. In our notices of them we must, therefore, be brief.

We have already alluded, in general terms, to the success of the Society during the past year. It has transported 790 emigrants, 247 of which were manumitted slaves. Preparations are making for receiving still larger numbers than have yet been sent.

“The managers are convinced that Liberia is now prepared to receive a much larger number of emigrants annually, than the means of the Society have heretofore enabled it to colonize. They believe there is no reason to apprehend that the resources of the Society will even exceed the demand for aid from those anxious to emigrate, or the capabilities of the colony to afford accommodation and subsistence to those who may choose it as their residence. . . . Thousands might be safely introduced in a single year, provided temporary buildings should be constructed, and some provision made for their accommodation and support during a few months after their arrival; and to this object an allowance of fifteen or twenty dollars to each emigrant would probably be sufficient. Were one, or even two hundred thousand dollars entrusted to the Society, it might be well expended before the close of the year in removing emigrants, and in preparing for larger numbers to succeed them.”

For the accommodation of these new emigrants, and as preparatives for still more enlarged operations, the managers have additional tracts of territory, and avow it as their purpose, “with the least possible delay, to found and multiply settlements on the high lands of the interior.” And they express the hope that “the early removal of emigrants to stations at some distance from the coast will still further reduce the danger resulting from the influence of the climate.”

It is exceedingly interesting to notice the disposition of the natives, as exhibited by the conditions of one of these late territorial grants.

“The chiefs of the country . . . have granted an unquestionable title to this land, on the sole condition that settlers shall be placed upon it, and that schools shall be established for the benefit of native children. Some of these chiefs having obtained the rudiments of an English education in Liberia, expressed earnest desires that the benefits of instruction should be afforded to their countrymen, and the young men declared their purpose of submitting to the laws of the colony, and their willingness to make further grants of land to any extent desired, whenever the terms of the present negotiation shall have been fulfilled.” p. 3.

How different these from the wild, intractable men whom the New England and Virginia colonists encountered!

It is evident that for the sure and permanent success of the colony, it is desirable, if not indispensable, that its policy should be to a great extent agricultural. The advantages which its situation affords for a prosperous commerce, and the new avenues which are constantly opening to support it, have afforded ground for fear, lest the attention of the colonists should be directed too exclusively to this object. Agriculture can afford the only sure means of subsistence. These, it is apparent, are what are most needed in a new and growing country, constantly exposed to an inundation of emigrants. We are pleased, therefore, that the Report informs us that the colonists have "become generally and deeply sensible of the primary importance of agriculture, and have engaged in it with a degree of resolution and energy which must insure success." The managers have determined to encourage this spirit of agricultural enterprise, and have fixed upon various means to effect it, which will be carried into immediate operation.

There are now six day-schools for children, and one evening school for adults in the colony, embracing in all 226 pupils. The people are represented as "importunate" for instruction, and the Board are hoping soon to be able to support a general system of common school education. In connexion with this subject, we would call attention to one event which is mentioned in the following paragraph:

"A high school or seminary, which should prepare youth not only to become able teachers of the most useful branches of knowledge, but to fulfil successfully their duties as public officers or ministers of religion, would prove of vast benefit; and the managers feel encouraged, by a munificent donation of \$2000 from Henry Sheldon, Esq. of New York, and of \$400 from another distinguished friend of the Society, (Hon. C. F. Mercer,) to be invested as a permanent fund for the support of such an Institution, to hope that one may soon be established on a broad and lasting foundation. To this object, the managers cannot hesitate to invite contributions, and to express their anxious desire that the fund set apart for it may be sufficiently increased, not only to found the seminary, but to secure its permanent prosperity. They would remind the wealthy and liberal, that charity for such an object, may rear for them the noblest, because the most useful and durable of monuments, and that by endowing an institution of learning, such as Liberia now needs, they will not only prolong their life in the memories and affections of men, but form the manners, enlighten the understandings, and exalt the characters of future generations." p. 7.

That such an institution should be endowed we doubt not, and we are equally confident that the liberality of an enlightened community will not let it long remain a desideratum. What a spectacle would it be! A flourishing seminary on the shores of

that benighted continent, reared in the midst of its darkness as a proud monument of American philanthropy!

Three churches have been erected during the year, and there appears to be a special desire for religious knowledge. The managers say that, though "they can report no great advancement in the moral and religious interests of the colony, they have reason to believe them justly appreciated by the settlers generally, and regarded by many with devout care. Open immoralities are rare. The Sabbath is strictly observed, and public worship is attended by nearly the whole community, with regularity and decorum."

These few facts we have culled from the Report, as those of more special interest. They are such as must be cheering to all the friends of the enterprise, and calculated to support and augment their expectations. In view of such gratifying success and such pleasing prospects, we should suppose all opposition would fall, and all hearts unite in this cause of humanity. And when we turn to our own country, we are not wholly disappointed. In some measure proportionate to the success of the Society, seems to be the spirit of discontent with slavery. That there is a spirit abroad in the land, on this subject, is fully witnessed by the movements of Virginia, and the late ample appropriations of Maryland. We believe these instances exhibit but a small portion of that influence which the Society is destined to exert. But still, strange as it may seem, there is opposition. Of this, the report speaks in the following manner:

"The managers have already alluded to the opposition which has been made to the Society, and would now add, that it has been denounced in terms of unmitigated severity and reproach.

"It has been represented as hostile to the free people of colour, as designed to add to the rigour and perpetuate the existence of slavery; as injurious to our own country and to Africa; and, in fine, as proposing a plan, the best feature of which is its impracticableness on any large scale.

"The managers will offer in vindication of the Society, on this occasion, only the following facts."—pp. 23, 24.

For these facts, and the subjoined remarks, we must refer our readers to the Report itself, which can be obtained by any individual, on application to the Secretary, at Washington. We shall conclude our extracts from it at present, by adding the following remarks from the speech of the Rev. Mr. Hammet, which are truly worthy of notice, and which will introduce the topic to which we design to confine our remaining observations:

"There is, however, Mr. President, in the report one particular which my sense of duty will not permit me to pass over in silence. It is there stated, Sir, and I confess that I heard it with mingled feelings of surprise and regret, that this So-

ciety still has to contend with a persevering and untiring opposition from some quarters. Opposition still to such a cause as this! Sir, I had hoped that that day had well nigh passed by, and that the success which has already crowned the efforts of this Society, had left no longer doubtful the benevolence of the scheme, or the practicability of carrying it into full effect. Let this Society fall, Sir; take from us the hope of relief which it holds out, and like the miserable patient who hears from his physician that his last expedient has failed, you leave us nothing to reflect upon but the sullen gloom of despair. The evil which this Society proposes to remedy, has already spread to a fearful extent, and is becoming more and more alarming every day. That class of the community to whom it affords succour, though nominally free, can, in fact, never be so in this country. A gloom hangs over them, through which they can never hope to penetrate, and they groan under a weight of prejudice from which they can never expect to rise. \* \* \* \* \*

No individual effort, *no system of legislation*, can in this country redeem them from this condition, nor raise them to the level of the white man, nor secure to them the privileges of freemen. It is utterly vain to expect it. And, Sir, to procure for them what they cannot have here, and what the history of this enterprise has proved can be secured to them elsewhere, is the object contemplated by this association; remembering always, that in proportion as we benefit them, we benefit ourselves. Now, Sir, I ask you, is it not amazing that such an enterprise should meet with opposition from any lover of his country—from any lover of freedom?"

All great enterprises meet with opposition. It is to be expected; and, therefore, not at first a just matter of surprise. That Columbus should have met with so many rebuffs is by no means marvellous; but, if after having accomplished his voyage and demonstrated his theory, he had still been ridiculed and despised as the merest visionary, it would have been astonishing indeed.

We confess we are filled with a similar surprise when we contemplate the opposition which, at present, is arrayed against the Colonization Society, now that the practicability of its scheme is so far demonstrated. We need no longer prophesy with regard to its results. It has excited an interest. It is now spreading, by its moral influence, the spirit of emancipation. These things are no longer problems—they are facts. Its beneficial influence in this country cannot be doubted, with any more reason than the most notorious occurrences of the day. And as to its transatlantic operations, the success of the Society has been astonishing, exceeding even the most sanguine expectations. Whatever else the Society may accomplish, it surely has been a sufficient reward for all its labour and toil. But, in the face of all these things, it would seem as if opposition was increasing as much in virulence as in unreasonableness.

We propose to notice some of the objections to the Society; and in so doing, we shall select those which are mainly urged by its opposers. We do not undertake this, however, from the least fear of a serious check being put upon the progress of the Society, or from an imaginal necessity of rallying to its support; but because it is a topic naturally coming under review, and pro-

perly demanding notice. Nay, so far from apprehending any evil results, we have rather regarded these efforts as of beneficial influence. They will stimulate the hitherto slothful advocates of the cause; they will excite a spirit of diligent inquiry, and though they may, to some extent, unsettle the foundations of former confidence, it will eventually be but to re-establish it upon a firmer basis. Yes, we have been visionary enough, if thus, reader, you please to term it, to imagine all the mighty engines of destruction which are now planted against the Society, as betokening days of greater and more glorious prosperity, than its most sanguine friends are at present expecting.

The Society, from the first moment of its organization, has been the object of hostilities, arising from various quarters, and prompted by various motives. But in the language of its managers,\* its enemies are now "reduced to two classes; those who would abolish slavery instantaneously, and those who desire it may never be abolished." Thus it is beset with prejudice and deadness of moral feeling on one side, and with intemperate zeal on the other. Which, in a moral point of view, to deprecate the most earnestly, it is difficult to determine; but which is the most pregnant with immediate and dreadful ruin, there can remain no doubt. On the one hand is the silence of wilful obstinacy; on the other, the loud clamours of raving fanaticism. Thus these extremes, though as divellant as possible, unite and make common cause against those who adhere to the wise and well tried maxim "*medio tutissimus ibis.*" The nature of the case, however, involving the claims of justice and the manifest interests of our country, affords the surest guarantees that those views and feelings which would now rivet the chains of the slave still faster, and perpetuate the curse upon our country, will give way to the wide extending and powerful influence of Christian patriotism and benevolence. They are thus constantly yielding as steadily and inevitably as the wandering icebergs waste away under the fervid influences of the sun. But to restrain the foolish indiscretion and maddened zeal on the other hand, there is no hope, till, like the raging wild fire, it has utterly consumed the means of its own subsistence.

It is the opposition then, of this nature, which now possesses and will probably retain the most prominence, until all extremes shall be forsaken and the whole community unite in that course which a truly wise and humane policy will universally dictate.

This opposition has lately embodied itself under the name of

\* Address of the Managers to the people of the United States, June 19th, 1832, page 4.

the New England Anti-Slavery Society, and is now operating through the press by means of a monthly periodical, entitled "The Abolitionist." "The Liberator," however, though conducted on individual responsibility, is identified with, and indeed regarded as the parent of this opposition. From these organs, then, the feelings and principles of the party may be fairly ascertained, and it is to them that we appeal as vouchers for our representations of the objections urged against the Colonization Society.

These objections may be chiefly classed under three distinct heads. The *first* relate to the principles of the Society; the *second* to its operation on the coloured people; the *third* to its promise of benefit to Africa.

THEY OBJECT TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIETY, alleging that it is of sinister design. If we appeal to the well known virtue and integrity of a large portion of its members, we are told, forsooth, that they are the dupes of slaveholders! that they are deceived! and really lending their aid to prop up the tottering system of slavery; that the society was founded by slaveholders and patronised by them, with (which is regarded as a *sequitur*) the express design of perpetuating the system!

They still further appeal to the tame and wicked course of which they accuse the Society, because it does not expose all the injustice and oppression, both moral and physical, with which the system may be fraught; because it does not draw out its horrid pictures in bold and living lines, and meet each and every one with an uncompromising severity; because its spirit is not one of loud and fearless denunciation, of open and deadly hostility, not only to every principle of the system, and every one in whatsoever manner or degree involved in a connexion with it, but to all who would look upon it with the least spirit of compromise, or refuse to unite in the same vehement and exterminating warfare. If you would temper their zeal, by speaking of caution or policy, they will point to the chains of the slave, to the eternal principles of right and humanity, and throw back your suggestions as taunting by-words. What! caution or policy in such a cause as this! when humanity is outraged, and the groans of tortured millions are deafening our ears! Thus, at the very outset, disregarding all considerations of wisdom or experience, they throw aside the helm of human affairs. Scylla and Charybdis are on either side.

Such are the grounds of their charges against the principles of the Society. If it is thought we have mingled more feeling with our delineation, than is consistent with a cool and proper statement of arguments, it is because of our desire to present at the same time the state of mind from which they originated. If we

have been overheated, it is because these principles are of hot-bed growth.

But, to avoid all censure, we will, again, simply state the method by which their charge of unsound principles is supported. The first reason assigned is, that it was founded by slaveholders, and now embraces a large number of them among its most active members. The second reason is, the temporizing course which it is alleged the Society actually pursues. Their answer to the fact that it embraces a large number of honest, and wise, and virtuous supporters is (as we have stated) that they are deceived!

This, we believe, any member of the party will recognise as a cool, dispassionate, fair statement of the case. We are ready to meet it dispassionately: or with no more of that warmth, than is always necessary to impart life and pertinence to an argument.

The first argument, when presented in its nakedness, seems to be simply this. The Society was founded by slaveholders, is patronised by them; therefore, its design is to perpetuate slavery. Whether this inference is regarded as actual demonstration, or merely a strong presumption, is not material. We do not flatter ourselves that this exposition will be really opposed by those who use the argument, for it carries on the face of it its own rebuke. It is too bold a leap for those unskilled in logic. We are therefore; persuaded that there must be some bridge (perhaps some *pons asinorum*) by which people are delicately led over from the premises to the conclusion. But, hitherto, it has eluded our most diligent search.

But, soberly, we are at an utter loss how to treat this argument, whether to leave it to the condemnation which its own effrontery will insure it, or to meet it with that stern reproof which it so richly merits. Treat it soberly, we cannot. What! has it come to this? Are we to regard it as a circumstance, not only suspicious, but as sealing a condemnation from which there is no appeal, that many slaveholders patronise the Society, and that it is attracting the general and favourable attention of the South? Is every white man south of the Potomac unworthy of confidence, and incapable of benevolent feelings, or of a good action? What! are we to be so distrustful of our southern brethren? Can they not feel as well as ourselves, the claims of justice and of Christian benevolence? Can they not feel the grinding and oppressive influence of the system upon themselves, and witness the degradation in which it involves the slave? When did warm-hearted charity take its flight from the genial climate of the south to dwell only amid the chilling winds of the north? When has it happened that the cries of moral, and civil, and

physical distress have received the pities only of the Icelander? When did our brethren sink so deep in infamy that their breath became contamination, and their fellowship a crime? Oh, we blush for our country; we blush for our own native New England, that such sentiments should be implied, even if it were by the very off-scouring of the population. We know her liberality of sentiment; yea, we know well the rebuke which such insinuations must inevitably receive at the tribunal of her People!\*

But we would by no means, be understood to allow the fact of so exclusive an instrumentality of slaveholders in the founding and progress of the Society. Much might be said to qualify the assertion. But as it is unimportant, and no imputation, if true to the utmost extent asserted, we shall pass it entirely.

We shall close this point by the following extracts. They may tend to assure certain persons that there is some reason and humanity still to be found at the south. We are sorry that we have room but for a short extract from the speech of R. J. Finley, Esq. The whole of it should be read in connexion with the subject. He says:

“I know that an opinion prevails very extensively at the north, that the southern people are attached to slavery in principle; that they would not get rid of it, if they could, nay, that there is such a morbid sensibility on the subject, that they will not suffer even the calm discussion of any remedy, however feasible and peaceful. In order to remove this apprehension, I have merely to say, that I have publicly discussed this subject every where in the southern States, from the eastern shore of Maryland, to the Gulf of Mexico, in the presence of hundreds of slaves at a time, and with the general approbation of the audience to which my addresses were delivered, and have uniformly represented it as affording the best and only safe means of gradually and entirely abolishing slavery. Indeed, so well is the moral influence of the operations of this society understood at the extreme south, that all the advocates of perpetual slavery are bitterly opposed to it; and none in that region are its advocates, but the friends of gradual, peaceful, ultimate, and entire emancipation. In fine, this Society is drawing the line in a direct manner, between these two classes of people at the south.”—p. 16.

And now what will be said to confront these facts? Does it still follow of course, that slaveholders wish to perpetuate the system? Here we are explicitly told by one who has travelled extensively, and laboured in this cause, that “none in that region

\* Since writing the above we have met with a paragraph in the “*Liberator*” of April 13th which we will extract. Nothing could more fully corroborate our statement of their argument. It is from an editorial article.

“There is a fact which has an important bearing upon this point, and which the advocates of the Colonization Society at the north generally keep out of sight. It is this:—a great majority of the members of the Society are slaveholders. The same is true of its Board of Managers. This throws the balance of power into the hands of those who are every day stealing the liberty of human beings! When speaking of the Society, therefore, it is proper to represent it as partaking of the character stamped upon it by a majority of its patrons.”

(the south) are its (the Society's) advocates but the friends of gradual, peaceful, ultimate, and entire emancipation." It can be met in no way but by a stern denial.

We hope the author will recollect this paragraph when he compiles a second edition of his "Thoughts on Colonization," and honour it with an insertion under its proper head.

We give one more extract; it is from the speech of G. W. P. Custis, Esq.

"Some alarmists tell us the slave population is to be freed. And, Sir, does any one regret that the hope is held out, that, with our own consent, we shall one day see an end of Slavery? Should this Society be, as I doubt, not it will, the happy means of producing this result, it will be renowned as having done one of the greatest and best deeds that have blest the world." p. xvii.

And now we ask again, what will be said about the desire of the "majority" of the Society, i. e. all the "slaveholders," to perpetuate slavery? But, let us allow, for a moment, the narrow insinuations against our southern brethren, and grant that it is really criminal to be allied with them in this philanthropic exertion. We would then ask the two following questions, for we are admirers of parity of reasoning. 1st. Can the New England Anti-Slavery Society succeed in abolishing slavery without the consent of the south? 2d. If southern men should become patrons of the Society, will not all good and virtuous men be bound at once to leave it, and wash their hands of its iniquitous fellowship?

But if the character of those who are connected with the Society, and are among its firm supporters, is to have any weight, there is one fact which cannot be disposed of so summarily as our opponents seem to imagine. We refer to the undoubted integrity and wisdom of a great number of its members and zealous advocates. The only method adopted to dispose of this fact is very courteously to allege their utter deception. This, indeed, is very strange. Who are these persons who are thus deceived? Why, the Society has received the approbation and support of almost or quite all the ecclesiastical bodies in our land. It has been commended to the notice of Congress by the legislatures of a large number of the free States, and, as yet, it retains their patronage and support. Now is it enough to say that these men are duped? Can they not see? Can they not understand? Have they not the same judgment and wisdom whereby to scan the designs of this Society, that they possess on all other subjects? O no, for they are duped; and duped by whom? By a few slaveholders! Indeed! why, we thought the reputation for artifice and cunning was on the other side.

But no, the wise, and the great, and the upright at the north, are duped by a few who are represented as unprincipled southrons. *Sic tempora mutantur*. How absurd! How preposterous! Still this is the way in which they would fain evade the fact. But if they see fit to appeal to the character of the supporters of the Society in order to show its pernicious tendency, they must seek some other than this paltry method of giving satisfaction.

We come now to the second reason offered in support of the charge of sinister design. It is, as we have stated, the alleged temporising course of the Society, in that it acknowledges no direct interference with the system of slavery, or, in the language of our opponents, "is not hostile to slavery," if by that is meant it does not declare open war with it.

Here, if we mistake not, is the diverging point of the two parties. Here is where one pauses to meditate upon expediency and policy, while the other ridicules the monitions of either. Here is where one with ease selects the point and method of attack, while the other rushes heedlessly on to an overwhelming destruction.

The course which the Society pursues is not indicative of false principles. On the contrary we affirm, and pledge ourselves to maintain that it is the only wise, prudent, and effective course which can be adopted, and that is indicative of the soundest discretion. Should we speak at length, in defence of the position which the Society holds, and the principles by which it is governed, we should exceed the limits to which prudence confines us. Therefore we remark, briefly,

(1.) The first principle which the Society assumes, upon a survey of the field before it, is, that the great evil of slavery cannot be eradicated without the united consent and energies of the whole American people.

This is evident. The evil is wide spread. It is interwoven with the texture of society. Moreover, it is placed by our civil Constitution out of the reach of national interference, even if it were desirable to adopt that method of attack. But this provision of our Constitution is denounced as unjust, and its alteration demanded. But it is one of those subjects which, by compromise when that Constitution was formed, was placed without the pale of jurisdiction. It was a delicate point, where concession was made, and whatever may now be the strictly legal right to repeal those concessions, it would be a manifest outrage equity and good faith. But, whether right or wrong, it cannot be. It would cause secession at once; it would destroy the Constitution, and resolve the nation into its original elements.

(2.) The Society finds, then, a necessity of taking some stand,

if possible, and engaging in some enterprise for the good of our country, and the welfare of the blacks, which will be free from popular objection; which shall be catholic in its character, and enlist the favour and co-operation of the greatest possible number.

Such the Society deem the plan which they have adopted, of "colonizing (with their consent) the free people of colour residing in our country, in Africa." To unite in this is something. It is one point gained. It is an entering wedge. It is however denied in the outset, we are aware, that the prosecution of this object is a benefit to the blacks. On the other hand, it is alleged to be highly oppressive. We shall not stop now to controvert this point. It will be noticed hereafter. We have now to do, not with the actual operation of the principles of the Society, or the question whether they are equitable and beneficial, but with the principles themselves, the motives; are they sound and unimpeachable?

In answer to this we say, that the intentions of the Society are pure, as is witnessed by its efforts, under these circumstances, to direct public attention to some plan in which all parties can unite. It occupies high ground, elevated above the arena of angry conflict; ground on which those of different views and motives can meet and harmoniously co-operate. And is it not something that there has, at last, one inch of ground been discovered and occupied, when, but a few years since, the subject could not be approached at any point, without the warmest feelings and most jarring conflicts? Is it nothing that people are so far likely to be brought together? And is not this conciliatory disposition an earnest of still greater harmony; of that unity of public sentiment and action which is necessary in order to make the least advance in alleviating the evil? For, we must remember nothing can be done without the united energies of the whole American people.

Is not this, then, a sufficient answer to those who stigmatize the Society because it does not expose and denounce all the horrors of slavery; because it does not meet them all "with uncompromising severity;" because it does not descend into the arena of angry conflict with every slaveholder in our land, meeting him with the harsh epithets of kidnapper and fiend? To do this would be, in reality, to "uncap the volcano," and spread its burning and destructive streams through every portion of our land. Union of sentiment and effort is what is wanted; is what is absolutely necessary. Success in the cause of emancipation is as much dependent upon union and harmony of public sentiment, as the prosperity of our nation upon the union of the States.

To pursue, then, any other course than one which is convincing and conciliatory, is to defeat the very end in view; is to array in opposition an invincible host; the height of madness!

But, it is said, the Society embraces those, and allows and encourages their co-operation, who care not for the blacks; who are selfish, and who, if they wish their removal, are prompted rather by ill motives of self-interest, than feelings of benevolence. And there comes up, too, the old allegation that it embraces many who desire and are seeking the perpetuity of slavery.\* What if it does? Is it any objection that the aid of these is secured in a good work? Does it follow that the scheme is really calculated to perpetuate slavery, because a few evil minded persons have thus imagined it? Does not the Bible tell us of the wise being caught in their own craftiness? Such espousers of this Society will surely be taken in their own nets, for if there ever was a delusion, it is the idle fancy that the Colonization Society will perpetuate slavery. What matters it if they do come and give the Society their patronage with these vain expectations? Their hopes are none the less vain for this. We can tolerate and rejoice in their labour, while we remain entirely irresponsible for their sentiments.

No; these catholic principles of the Society, instead of being objectionable, constitute in the present state of things its very excellence. Holding the position which it does, it seems to us to be strikingly analogous to that most exalted of all our institutions of benevolence, the American Bible Society. Like that it retires from the theatre of party warfare, and takes a position at once elevated and grand, calling for the laying aside of all party prejudices, and for a noble union in a great and sublime object which is deemed equally the interest of all. And who would think of impugning that Society because it did not manifest hostility to Socinianism, or Universalism, or Campbellism, or Presbyterianism? Is not its silence on these points its very excellence? And while other associations may be organized for the furtherance of party views, should it not still maintain the same calm, dignified, elevated stand; a prince among them all?

Still further—what should we think if we heard a Unitarian, or a Presbyterian, or a Methodist, impugning that Society because it invited and admitted the co-operation of those whom they individually regard as heretics? Is not this the *excellence* of the Society, that it occupies ground common to all? We go further yet—what if Christians of all sects should unite in a cla-

\* See the extract made from Mr. Finley's speech, and the accompanying remarks.

mour against the Society, because it received the contributions of a band of infidels who presumptuously deemed the Bible so replete with absurdities, that its circulation would prove its sure defeat? Would that be any just ground for preferring the charge of infidelity against the Society? Might they not receive their contributions with uprightness, remembering that the Lord has promised to bring their counsels to nought, and take them in the nets which their own hands have spread?

Similar do we consider the Colonization Society. It looks abroad and sees the various moral, political, and physical evils of slavery, and hears them crying for relief. But on this very subject it also finds the nation rent asunder by sectional jealousies and deadly enmities. And now, being conscious that good can be done only as these jealousies and enmities are healed, what does it do? Does it add fuel to the flames which are already raging, by entering into the arena of strife? No. It takes a vantage-point above it, one which may, in a great measure, unite the efforts of all. In the language of Mr. Hammet's speech, "In this, we all agree. The peculiarities of creed, of sect, and of party, are here forgotten, or lost in the glories of one common philanthropy." And because there may flow into it here, those who are actuated by different motives—slaveholders and non-slaveholders, and all the variety of *gradual* or *immediate* abolitionists, or even those who madly seek the perpetuity of the system—is this any objection to it, if so be their efforts are united in a *good cause*, and for the promotion of a desirable object? That the object is a good one, will be the subject of remark hereafter. We are now ascertaining the principles and motives of the Society, and, as the result of our remarks, we state them to be as follows:

I. It desires the united good of ourselves and the coloured people.

II. It believes the union of public sentiment, and the *reconciliation of sectional feeling*, to be essential to the promotion of this object. *Therefore*, it avoids violent opposition and denunciation; and

III. It pursues that course which seems to be calculated to effect the object, by securing the co-operation of all parties.

Let it no longer be said, then, that the Society "originated in the desire to eternize Slavery," (Liberator of Feb. 2.) that it is a cunning invention of kidnappers and "*slave drivers*," who have deluded, most completely deluded, the *poor, innocent, simple-hearted, unsuspecting Yankees!!* We claim for it other motives, and shall continue to claim them till it can be proved by

some better logic, that they did not, and could not enter the minds of its founders, or present a better.

And now we ask, if the Society holds this high ground, and if it is just ground, why those who choose to organize themselves into parties to descend to the more contested portions of the field should oppose it, because it does not come down from its high station and side with them in their acrimonious warfare? Why is it not as just that the Bible Society should be condemned on one side, because it is not Presbyterian; on another, because it is not Socinian; and still on another, because it is not Arminian? We see no reason why the New England Anti-Slavery Society, if it chooses to be *sectarian* in its character, need interfere with *this* Society, or look to it otherwise than as occupying ground which is common to all sects, where parties can unite.

We have thus exhibited and defended what we know to be essentially the views of the Colonization Society. Let us now turn and examine the principles of those who oppose it. We gather them from their conduct and their publications, and we find them precisely the reverse of those we have been contemplating. Which are the most consonant with sound discretion, we leave to the estimation of the public.

Instead of deeming it necessary to conciliate the south, and produce union of sentiment and effort—they raise the cry of exterminating warfare. The slaveholder is not courted or won, but is kicked and vilified. An attempt is made to exasperate public sentiment against him, and then deliver him over to its unmitigated vengeance.\*

But what can be done towards alleviating the evils of slavery in Georgia, for instance, provided every other State were free, and all were loud and unanimous in their demands for its abolition? Why, nothing at all, unless Georgia joined the same voice; for that was the express compact on which she entered into the union, that no one should interfere with her regulations of slavery. If we violate this compact, *justice is outraged, and the nation is ruined.*

\* It may be alleged that we use harsh language in our description of their disposition. Harsh language! We envy not the man his feelings, who can read the following extract without overflowing indignation:

“It is a fact, that scarcely a preacher of any name, or a professor of any one of the more numerous sects (of Christianity) can be found, who is not a slave driver and human flesh merchant, south of the Potomac. Remember the Richmond preaching kidnapper!”

This is from an article in the *Liberator* of April 20th. The article is appropriately headed “The Firebrand, No. I. by an incendiary fanatic.”

The following proposition is frequently seen in this paper, in staring capitals, “EVERY LIVING AMERICAN SLAVEHOLDER IS A KIDNAPPER.”

*Nothing can be done without the consent and co-operation of the slaveholding States.* But what is the method to be taken in order to secure this? Shall we adopt the spirit of conciliation which we have ascribed to the Colonization Society, or shall we, with the rankest indiscretion, cry out "*No compromise with slavery*"—no quarter to the slaveholder—the kidnapper—the fiend? Let reason answer.

Nothing can be done without the will of the south. How then shall its prejudices be met and subdued? by denunciation, or by compromise and kindness? Let us remember the fable of the Wind and the Sun, when they attempted to deprive the traveller of his cloak. Yea, let us remember the words of the wise man, "A soft answer turneth away wrath."

These being the principles on which the New England Society proceeds, we do believe, however honest its intentions, that it only tends to add iron to the bondage of the slave, by strengthening rather than dissolving those prejudices which must be removed ere the least light can break in upon their forlorn condition. If all the people north of the Potomac should grow zealous on this subject; if they should rage, and foam with fury, what would be accomplished? Why, nothing but national anarchy and destruction. And this Society may proceed on its present principles; it may spread, and embody all the intellectual and physical resources of the north, and it can do nothing. A poor encouragement: but the truth, forlorn as it may be. It can do nothing. It has done nothing. Where is the impression it has made upon the system of slavery? Where is the southern prejudice it has removed? Where is the solitary slave it has liberated, or a single fragment of the fetters it has broken? On the other hand, the Colonization Society has already given liberty to hundreds and hundreds of slaves, it has made an impression which is felt throughout the south, dissipating prejudice, opening the door, and inviting emancipation.

After all its idle declamation, the New England Society is the most gradual in its operation, though so "immediate" in its principles. They can effect nothing, they cannot bid one captive go free until public opinion is revolutionized. Ask these abettors of immediate emancipation what they are doing, what they have now done for the objects of their pity, and they can tell you only of what they are going to do—they point to the future—to the future! The Colonization Society moves in advance of public opinion. It waits not for it, but, by its moral power, bears it along with it. It rears a proud monument of its philanthropy on another continent; it demonstrates its benevolence and efficiency, and thus forces the unwilling tribute of public approba-

tion. Which is the more powerful: The one which waits to be borne along by public opinion, or that which, Hercules-like, rises up and bears the nation with it? Which is the more gradual: the one that points only to the future for its benefit, or the one which can appeal with pride to the past, and with glory to the present?

We have vindicated the principles of the Society; and now we challenge the world to show an institution, contemplating such complicated difficulties, or exhibiting a nobler monument of human wisdom and design.

We pass now to the second general class of objections.

They are THOSE WHICH RELATE TO THE OPERATION OF THE SOCIETY UPON THE COLOURED PEOPLE.

It is first alleged that the course of the Society, not only negatively, but positively, favours and fosters the prejudices which exist against the coloured people, and which at present are so insuperable a barrier to their elevation in this country. The Society, they say, exhibits a spirit of compromise with these wicked feelings, and thus acts an inhuman and unchristian part.

It is assumed in this objection, that prejudice is the only thing operating to prevent the elevation of the coloured man in this country. This is not so. There are natural causes which no one can remove, such as superior knowledge, wealth, respectability, &c. which are in themselves a power, and a power which must inevitably operate against him.

Prejudice, too, may not be so utterly unreasonable as is frequently and commonly represented. It lies not solely against his skin, but his character. The class are so universally degraded, that their character has become identified with their skin; and here is the real ground of prejudice against those individuals among them who may sustain fair characters.

But we cannot now stop to speak of these causes. It matters not, for our purpose, whether the prejudice is right or wrong; we deny that the Colonization Society does any thing to foster it. It designs not at all to interfere with it directly in either way. It does not, however, militate with any attempts on the part of others to remove it, nor are such attempts at all inconsistent with the character of an advocate of the Society. The Society, as such, maintaining its catholic position, refuses to be identified with any effort, save simply to colonize, &c. But it recognises the existence of this prejudice among the various evils incident to the situation of the slave. But for what? To oppose it? No. To promulgate it? No. It assumes it as a fact which does exist, and will exist, if not forever, still for ages and ages to come.

From this and other facts which are unfavourable to them in this country, it draws this principle, which is fundamental in the scheme of its operations, viz: that the blacks will have vastly greater facilities for improvement, and happiness, and liberty, in a community separated from the whites, than they can be expected to enjoy otherwise.

The Society does not meddle with the question, whether this ought to be; neither does it attempt to defend it. It leaves its own members and others, to think and act upon this matter, in their individual capacity, as they please. This prejudice, it assumes as a fact which will exist, and be of immense power. Though some impression might be made upon it, still they deem the certainty of its existence past all doubt. They thus see the hopelessness of gaining relief by combating the prejudice, and therefore it is, that the Society seeks a separate abode for the coloured man, that he may rise up where every thing conspires to stimulate him, and not spend his life in vain endeavours to attain here an elevation which his very circumstances render impossible.

But, it is said, this prejudice is wrong—it is unjust—it must not be. But still it is, and it will be. Telling people that they are wrong will never make them right. This prejudice will never be done away, be it right or wrong. No, the coloured man has been a slave here, he has been ignorant and degraded, and the history of his degradation will be handed down from generation to generation, long after every shackle shall be thrown off, and it will fix itself as a stigma upon him, and depress his spirits as long as human nature remains depraved, and prejudice finds any abode in the heart of man. To think it will be otherwise, and to promulgate any scheme which is built upon such a presumption, is Utopian in the extreme. Why then cover up this fact, or why contend with it, and fight, like Don Quixote, with a windmill? Why hold out hopes to the coloured man, which he can never realize, or, if ever, only when the ashes of the present, and of the third and fourth generation to come, shall have mingled in the grave.

We believe this prejudice to be incurable. And in believing this, we are not slandering our countrymen any more than almost every religious creed slanders them. We believe in the depravity of human nature—a depravity which religion itself does not exterminate here; and we hold this prejudice to be consistent with that depravity. People may cry for shame! for shame! They may call it, in the height of national pride, a foul calumny. Still it is, and it will be. It requires no prophet's eye to discern

this. We need but look in the mirror of the past. The whole history of human nature is our witness.

But as to the course of the Society, we affirm, that though it does not aim at it, still it exerts the most beneficial influence possible upon this prejudice. Yes, we believe it; though it may meet with the disdain of those who disagree with us. It takes the wisest way to soften it, that could be adopted even were this its express purpose. What is in a great part the occasion of this prejudice? As we have said, it is his degraded character and condition. It is far from being solely his colour. It is colour, chiefly as this degradation has become identified with it. What then can be more successful in undermining this prejudice than to show them enlightened, intelligent and virtuous? What can do more for the Africans here, than an active, wealthy, powerful, dignified nation of their own colour springing up on the coasts of Africa? It would lead to associations, in our minds, of a different kind. It would do more, by removing the cause, to affect the prejudice, than all efforts to oppose it face to face. When we meet with prejudice, we must, in some measure, compromise with it—we must undermine it, if we would conquer it—we cannot storm it.

But it will be recollected what we have already mentioned, that there are many things aside from this prejudice, which tend to depress them here; things which cannot be regarded as blame-worthy, all of which tend to justify the plan of the Society. We cannot enter upon them here. We therefore pass to another point.

It is said the Society oppresses the coloured people by perpetuating slavery.

We have partially remarked upon this subject heretofore. It needs, however, a separate notice here. We have defended the Society only from the *design* of perpetuating slavery. But though it is acquitted on the score of design, the charge may be brought against its tendency. As we are now speaking of the actual operation of the Society, the question occurs in answer to this objection, does it tend indirectly to perpetuate slavery? We answer, No. We shall not proceed to show that its natural operation is, and must be, directly the reverse. We shall simply appeal to a few facts. The first is this:

All those individuals who desire the perpetuity of the system regard the Society as destructive to it. This surely is opposed to the opinion expressed by the northern abolitionist. Now who, we ask, is it probable, knows most of the actual or legitimate influence of Society, those who live North or South of the

Potomac? We appeal to common sense to interpret this fact and throw its mighty testimony into the scale where it belongs.

Again, it is the testimony of all slaveholders who desire the abolition of slavery, that the colonization scheme is an indispensable auxiliary. Else, why did Virginia, in her late anxiety to abolish slavery, look to this method as its only relief? Why has it been before discussed by her wise men and legislators as the only plan? Why is it always agitated in connexion with abolition, not only in Virginia and Maryland, but wherever, in more private circles, it may be discussed? If, then, the opinions of the South, of those who may be supposed to be best acquainted with the tendency of the Society, is thus decidedly expressed, what can more completely refute this objection? No. The Society, so far from perpetuating slavery, is the only medium through which there is the least light thrown in upon the dark aspect of the system. And it is encouraged by this light that discussion has been invited, and that the subject has been agitated. Otherwise, it would have remained forever a forbidden theme.

The Society does not and cannot operate to perpetuate slavery; for the southern people are far from being attached in principle to the system. Far otherwise—it is complained of as an evil, and as facilities for emancipation are afforded, they are improved and will be improved; and as they are improved, increased prosperity will lead on to other and still other emancipations. The attachment to the system is an attachment rather of necessity than choice. Remove that necessity, open the door for the easy ingress of a new state of things, and the people of the South will be far from advocating the perpetuity of the system. Does any one doubt this? He cannot then be awake to the signs of the times. A mere escape from the dangers of the system, by a removal of the surplus population is not, as is confidently declared, what will satisfy the people. No. Nothing short of that prosperity and vigour which they behold in the other States.

But still the abolitionists of the North persevere in attributing all these movings at the South not to discontent with the system, but to a slavish fear of its consequences. Thus, if slaveholders begin to move and inquire what can be done; if they form societies to curtail the evils or lighten the burdens of the system, the cry at once is, they are only combining to perpetuate slavery. Do whole States move in the matter of abolition and colonization? O, it is not from principle, it is not from benevolence; it is only from fear, a slavish fear. So determined are they that no good shall come out of Nazareth. Why a slaveholder is a villain; he is incapable of a worthy motive or a noble

action, and all earnestness of reform are mere hypocritical illusions!

We come now to the third class of objections, WHICH RELATE TO THE PROMISE OF BENEFIT TO AFRICA. The Society pretends that the establishment of a colony on the coast of Africa, such as is now there, will, as it increases from year to year, be the most effectual means of carrying the light of Christianity and civilization to that vast continent. But even this good is denied. That colony, which has flourished beyond all others of which history gives us knowledge, is held up as an object of scorn; yea, more, as a place of oppression and exile!! The idea of its conveying any blessing to Africa, is ridiculed without measure. But what! will not a population of 2500 or 3000 people, with six schools and two or three churches, with its courts of justice and civil officers, enjoying all the advantages of a Christian and civil community, will not such a colony, we ask, thrown upon the shores of a benighted continent, spread light and blessings around it? If this is denied, what can be asserted? If, as a nation in embryo, it is not an earnest of future good inconceivable, we are at a loss to know on what to calculate.

This colony is vilified, grossly vilified, by the advocates of "immediate abolition;" calumniating statements of its situation are from time to time promulgated, without any responsibility, which are at direct variance with the testimony of all who have visited it, and which the "Liberia Herald," and respectable inhabitants of the colony repel with indignation.

There are still other charges brought against the Society which we are unable now to notice. We have presented the main ones, and, we trust, have shown them to be futile. We have defended its great positions, shown it to be of honest and upright intention, and pursuing wise and judicious plans. If it should fall and the plan be abandoned, the colony will forever stand a living and ever increasing monument of its benevolence; but it will be a dark day for the oppressed and the enslaved in America. Their sun will have set, and the darkness of an Egyptian bondage will rest upon them. But no. It will rise, and like Sampson, burst asunder the cords and withes with which the Philistines would have bound him. It will open the door of release, and bid the captive go free—it will pour its blessings across the wide ocean, and thousands, yea, millions yet unborn will rise up and call it blessed.

And now, we ask again, why need those who are immediate abolitionists, interfere with the Colonization Society? Really we see no reason why an abolitionist of the most intemperate sort should rail against the Society, unless it is to rail against it

because it does not come down and fight under the banner of a party, and change entirely its scope and design. Its object is purposely specific, not general. Why then sound the tocsin of alarm and accuse it of horrid enormities, because it does not declare war with slavery? That subject, by its constitution and in its wisdom, is out of its sphere. It does not say it should not be touched. It refuses to approach it itself, but where is the barrier it throws in the way of any other man's discussing the principles of the system, and revealing its moral, political, and physical evils, and using any temperate and rational means for their relief? We affirm there is none. We affirm that we ourselves, being advocates of the Colonization Society, can oppose in sentiment, and by a rational influence, the system of slavery, without acting in opposition to, or in accordance with, but with independence of the Colonization Society. That Society purposely and wisely avoids being identified with any efforts immediately affecting the system of slavery, and thus its highest wisdom is imputed as its greatest crime.

Yes, the Society occupies high ground; and it is truly interesting to see by what a simple, dignified course it is calculated to bring every blessing in its train. Its sole and simple object is to colonize the free people of colour with their own consent. All unite in this. As they proceed, and the colony grows, and the subject assumes importance, a door seems to be opened; thoughts of emancipating slaves occur; they increase; the object extends. Thus the Society indirectly, but most powerfully affects slavery. And while keeping quietly and silently at its one simple object, it finds discussions of abolition arising up, and the spirit of emancipation extending, where, but a little while before, it was treason to lisp it.

But as thoughts of abolition and colonization are entertained, we are met with the difficulty interposed by the ignorance and wretched state of the blacks. This, then, demands remedy, and enlists public attention, which is thus imperceptibly led on, step by step, in this great cause of philanthropy. Here we find one cause, and a great cause, why the religious instruction and general education of the coloured people is enlisting the attention of the community; and it will enlist it more and more, while the one simple object of the Colonization Society is prosperously pursued. Where, we would ask, is the objection that the Society "prevents the instruction of the blacks?" It aids it, in this indirect, but most effectual way; by this way, in which it secures all the benefits which the most devoted friend of the blacks can desire.

But there are those who are unwilling to wait this natural

process of things; who raise a vehement clamour because every thing is not done at once; because the slave is not raised as by the touch of a magic wand, from his state of servitude to the enjoyment of the most beatific freedom. They forget it must be the work of time—that it must be gradual. Gradual, we say; yes, it must be gradual, though there is not a word in the whole English vocabulary, which a northern abolitionist so heartily abhors. “Immediate,” “immediate,” is their motto.

Let us bring this principle to the test. The Russians are the slaves of their emperor. Slaves we say, for he is an autocrat—he is of despotic authority. Now this ought not to be. They ought to be free. When? Why, a wise man answers, that such is the state of things, such is the ignorance of the people and their inability to govern themselves, that they should be made free little by little: i. e. gradually. Gradually! gradually! iterates another—what oppression, what injustice, what a compromise with tyranny! No. Immediately, immediately! And so to-day, those who are the ignorant subjects of a despot, are to-morrow to be transformed into the enlightened members of a blissful Republic! What absurdities!

Still this is substantially the doctrine advanced with relation to the slaves. Yet every great change must be gradual, (however hateful the word,) the whole course of nature is gradual; the growth from boyhood to manhood is gradual; the decline from manhood to old age is gradual; the transition from night to day is gradual, and this hateful word gradual is inscribed upon every thing under the sun, yea, even upon the sun itself, as it gradually passes from the east to the west!

But now suppose the administration to be transferred to other hands. “Immediate,” “immediate!” is the motto; and, like the boy who wished to be a giant, you see every child on a sudden notice outstripping his garments, as he rises to the stature of a man; and every man when arrived at a certain point as suddenly sinking to decrepitude and death; despots dethroned to day, and democracies ruling to-morrow; and the sun itself, like a meteor, darting across the heavens to leave us in a deeper and thicker darkness!

Oh! when will such absurdities cease? When will men learn to be content with the tardy but ordained course of nature? It is because they are thus unwilling to wait for the slow and natural but sure operation of moral causes, that they oppose the Colonization Society. But it affords the only relief; the sure relief; the relief which by its very hateful, gradual process is analogous to the whole course of nature.

We hail it, then. We bid it go on; go on in its simple spe-

cific course and commit the result to Him who ruleth all things. Other means will be opened as they are needed. Let it go on, and dispense its rich blessings to the two millions of our enslaved countrymen; let it go on till it removes from our nation the only incubus on its prosperity, and the most fruitful cause of its discords and strifes. Let it go till it causes the hundred millions of a benighted continent to rejoice in the blessings of civilization and religion; till that scripture is verified, which appears committed to our favoured hands to fulfil, when Ethiopia shall stretch forth her hands, and the desert blossom as a rose!



