

Events in Feejee:

Narrated in Recent Letters

From Several Wesleyan Missionaries.

London: Sold by John Mason, 66, Paternoster-Row; And at the Wesleyan Mission-House, Bishopsgate. 1855.

Price Three Pence.

Contents.

London: Printed by James Nichols, Hoxton-Square.

Events in Feejee, &c.

THE Feejee Islanders have distinguished themselves by a bad preeminence over all other Heathen people, in their reckless disregard of human life, and their ferocious delight in bloodshed. The strangers cast upon their shores, whether shipwrecked mariners from Europe or America, or Feejee natives from neighbouring islands, were considered a lawful prize, sent to them by their gods to be killed, and cooked, and eaten. Enemies slain in battle were devoured with savage relish; prisoners of war had portions of their own bodies severed from them, and eaten before their eyes, while they lingered in pain till their conquerors desired to close the feast by devouring the miserable victims. Widows of Chiefs were slain to accompany their deceased husbands to the other world. Every form of murder, under every pretext, appears to have been considered lawful, and to have been cultivated as an art, and continually practiced. These inhuman habits have been combated by the Missionaries from the time of their first arrival in Feejee. What sufferings have been endured by those brave and devoted men, and by their equally devoted wives, in their endeavours to instruct and reclaim these monsters in human shape! What perils have awaited them, what insults have they had to bear! How agonizing have been their feelings when they have witnessed murders they could not prevent; how intense their disgust and sorrow when human flesh has been thrown into their habitations, or placed at their doors, by way of insult! How often have they and their heroic wives exposed themselves to violence and death, that they might deliver those who were appointed to die! And how signal have been the interpositions of Divine Providence for their protection and deliverance! They have had the sympathy of the friends of humanity, and the prayers of the devout, in their arduous undertaking. It has been no small assistance which they have received from vessels touching at their Stations, and especially from the Commanders of Her Majesty's vessels in those seas.

Grateful reference is made in the following communications to Captain Dunham, of H.M.S. "Herald," and to Captain Dunn, of the "Dragon."

Throughout their labours and sufferings they have had evidence that it was not in vain they had devoted themselves to the task of converting the Feejeeans to the faith of Christ. One and another, from time to time, embraced the Gospel; men such as Elijah Varani, who had been among the foremost to shed the blood of others, became strong in the Lord, and were ready to lay down their lives for the truth: the noble army of martyrs has received an increase to its number from the converts of the Missions in Feejee.

Intelligence has now been received which leads us to hope that even of Feejee it may be said, "Violence shall no more be heard in her land, wasting nor destruction within her borders." King George of Tonga, on the occasion of a visit to Feejee in the present year, appears to have been a main instrument in bringing about this desirable result. The narrative given by Mr. Calvert possesses a thrilling interest: the end was not attained without a severe struggle, after war had been forced upon George and his attendants by the revolted Feejeean Chiefs. We shall not anticipate the narrative by detailing the particulars, but merely call attention to the remarkable fact that Ovalau, which was the first to make an attack on the attendants of the King of Tonga, and which afforded shelter to the Chiefs who fled from his victorious army, has now, according to the last advice in Mr. Calvert's communication, consented to settle its differences with Bau.

The letters from Mr. Moore and Messrs. Joseph and Samuel Water-house, Mr. Polglase, and Mrs. Wilson, all sustain or illustrate the more detailed and connected narrative of Mr. Calvert. We commend them all to the attentive perusal of our friends.

For the previous history of the Feejee Mission, reference is made to the Journals of the Rev. Walter Lawry, in two volumes, and to "The Southern World," by the Rev. Robert Young, and to the annual Reports and other publications of the Wesleyan Missionary Society.

Events in Feejee During the First Six Months of the Year 1855.

By the Rev. James Calvert.

Extract of a Letter from the Rev. James Calvert, dated Vewa, Feejee, June 3d, 1855.

Re-Occupation of Rewa as a Mission-Station.

THIS has been a remarkable year in Feejee; in which we have had unusual excitement by frequent and extraordinary occurrences. At our last District-Meeting Mr. Moore was appointed to resume the occupation of Rewa as a Mission-Station, it having gained strength and many other advantages in the war with Bau, so as to offer safety to us; and was indeed in such a settled and prosperous state as to demand our return, in order that we might have free access to many other parts of Feejee.

Violent Intentions of Rewa Towards Bau.

In October, 1854, many Bau towns revolted, and joined Rewa. The King of Rewa triumphed; and was flushed with the prospect of speedily gaining his heart's desires,—of destroying Bau, and of killing and eating the Vunivalu (Tui Viti, better known as Thakombau).

For a most interesting account of this great Chief or King of Feejee, and of his profession of Christianity on the 30th of April, 1854, see the Weale an Missionary Report for 1855.

He was afraid that he could not restrain his immense army, when he should come to Bau, from doing injury to the Mission-premises there, and therefore sent, desiring Mr. Waterhouse to remove; which request was, of course, disregarded.

Danger of Civil Commotion in Bau.

The Vunivalu was not only hard pushed by ammunition being short,—places revolting, and rumours of an op-position-party being in Bau,—but he was dispirited and severely afflicted; brought on, in a great measure, by the things which had befallen him. I felt much for him. I feared that danger was at hand; mainly, I thought, through Koli i Visa Wangga, head Chief of the Bau fishermen, who was holding intercourse with Mara, the rebel Bau Chief who had joined the King of Rewa. As Koli had made me acquainted with the fair side of his movements, I clung to him, hoping to exert some influence if he really designed evil. We were often together, as Mr. Watsford and I were wont to be, with Thakombau, when we interceded for the lives of the women, whom he strangled in spite of all our entreaties. But the King was now greatly altered; had seen and felt his obstinacy and wickedness; and hoped that the Lord, in whom he trusted, might regard him in his low estate, undertake for, and rescue, him. We prayed to God continually for his safety. It was indeed a most critical time. I thought his safety might be in flight, and advised him to run away for a season; but he refused, saying, "I cannot do that. If evil comes, I must die. But I think the Lord will deliver me. I am *lotu*. If I do anything, (to my enemies, to conciliate them,) it will be disregarded. There is one thing that may be useful, which I desire: Do you keep close intercourse with Koli." This I particularly attended to; while Mr. Waterhouse was mindful to make special and unceasing efforts with another dangerous party in Bau, over whom he had gained the necessary influence. Yet it became probable that Bau would be divided: the fishermen (Lasakauans) were about to put up a fence for civil war. Previous to which, Koli came over to Vewa on the 23d of October. I had been to see Mr. Waterhouse at Bau, who felt the dangerous position of the Vunivalu, which would undoubtedly also endanger the Mission-premises, and perhaps the lives of our friends. Mara had given property to Koli, and promises. The King of Rewa had promised him one hundred canoes, many of which were building. *Weighty* reasons were promptly needed to keep him from taking the bait. After showing him the gross sin, in this enlightened age, of taking life, which could not be stayed, if once commenced, until many had been killed; and the danger to himself, as it would end by the club being brought on his own head; I gave him twelve dozen hatchets and ten wedge axes, earnestly intreating him to resist every inward and outward temptation to shed blood. This was a bird in the hand—a *heavy* one; whereas many of the canoes promised were yet living in the forest, and his personal danger was a consideration. The desires and plans of the enemy were for the present frustrated, by being postponed.

Kind Interposition of Captain Dunn, of the "Dragon."

On the 1st of November, 1854, through the judicious and kind exertions of Captain Dunn, who has been very desirous to prevent evil and promote good in Feejee, we got Mara on board the "Dragon," where he and the Vunivalu had a long and interesting interview. Mara's opposition was softened, His own party was cramped for the time.

Revolt of Towns to the Westward.

But there arose a fresh, powerful, and extensive movement against Bau to the westward. Naloto, Verata, Naivuru-vuru, Kumi, Nalatha, Nasong-go, Na-vesikalen, Nukuona, Rasea, Nandaro, Natomboning-gio, Nanamu, and other towns, joined Rewa. The two Dravuni towns alone were left, at the point opposite the west end of Vewa. Then was manifest the end of Divine Providence in the ferocious attack made on me at Motureke; for Dravuni was at that time more against Vewa and Bau than many of the places that now revolted. But, after the people from Dravuni had rescued me at Motureke, knowing the critical state of those places, I collected a considerable quantity of Feejeean property, and took the people of Vewa with me to present it to the Dravuni people, as an expression of obligation and gratitude to them for their kindness to me. This placed us on terms of friendship and intercourse with Dravuni; so that the party which now revolted was surprised to find that Dravuni was faithful to Bau and Vewa, and disposed to take a firm stand against the aggressors who had progressed with amazing rapidity, burning five or six towns, and killing fifty or sixty persons, (whose bodies were not allowed burial,) in a few days. At Dravuni, therefore, a good fence was got up, and embankments made; and there, at a tolerable distance from us, all the armies of the aliens were defied. They were kept at bay, and much annoyed with this unexpected impediment. This place has been nobly defended by the Vewa people, at the request of the Vunivalu, without the loss of one of our number. An old established Christian and Local Preacher of Mr. Hunt's time, a Chief of the place, Micah Roli, has acted a most decided and consistent part in the whole affair.

Christian Conduct of Tui Viti, and Death of the King of Rewa.

The Vunivalu went on well in his *lotu*. The bodies of enemies who were killed and brought to him, he returned to their friends for burial; and spared the lives of some who were taken alive, and returned them in safety to their own towns. He refrained from aggression, and desired and sought peace. He twice sent messages to the King of Rewa, telling him that Heathenism depopulated places, and destroyed Chiefs; as a proof of which many Rewans were missing, and he was the only Chief of rank remaining in Rewa. He said he had become Christian, lamented his past bad conduct, and no longer desired to act as he had done hitherto; that religion was true and useful; and he begged that the King of Rewa would become Christian, and consent to the establishment of peace. This advice and request the Rewa Chief indignantly rejected, as he did also the exhortations of his Missionary, saying he would burn Bau in a very short time, and kill and eat the Chief; that it was a very favourable opportunity for ending the ten years' fight with high honour to himself; that he was confident of being able to avenge himself, and therefore firmly and contemptuously refused all offers for peace. More than this: he defied the Lord Jehovah's power to screen the doomed one from the clubs and stomachs of his warriors. However much he had suffered from man, he was evidently now on a dangerous course. He built two new temples, presented offerings to his gods, and ordered the *lotu*-drum not to be beaten, or Divine service celebrated at the usual place, lest his gods should be offended. Though kind, to Mr. Moore in many things, he would not yield to instruction and advice; but was determined to go on with the war, make special efforts to gain additional help from his gods in which he trusted, and rely upon the numbers who had become his adherents. Neglecting the constant exhortations of his indefatigable Missionary, and the kind and earnest entreaties of his humbled rival, he was now put into the school of affliction; but he continued to harden his heart, and he was cut off by dysentery on the 26th of January.

Premature Rejoicings.

Some Rewa towns at once wished to turn to Bau; but the Vunivalu objected, as he would not, by a partial arrangement, be the cause of continued warfare. He felt that he had done wrong in the long and destructive war with Rewa; and he resolved to use every means to bring about peace. He sent a message to that effect, and the Rewa Chiefs consented. Things were going on well generally; yet many disliked peace, and were against the Missionaries who actively promoted it. Moreover, so dark and evil were the minds of the people, that many believed that Mr. Moore had given medicine which caused the death of the Chief. It was greatly feared that the

Mission-premises would be burnt, and perhaps some of the Mission family killed, as had been threatened. However, danger and opposition appeared to subside; and it was hoped that peace would, in spite of opposing influences, be established, and that the Mission-premises, Missionary, and his family, would be safe. On the 7th of February, I returned from Rewa. On the following day the offering for peace from Rewa arrived at Bau, and the drums beat merrily next day. We hoisted our flags at Bau and Vewa. It was a day of exultation! At our family-worship we heartily praised the Lord for this lessening of Feejee's evils. But, alas! shortly after our praises had been offered, while our hearts were yet warm, a messenger from Bau arrived with painful intelligence, which he abruptly delivered: "Mr. Moore is at Bau. Mrs. Moore without a bonnet or shoes. The children in their night-clothes. The Mission-house and every thing is burnt at Rewa." What a proof that determined enemies to the peace and Christianity were active and daring! and how necessary our most strenuous exertions! How thankful were we that no life was lost!

Destruction of the Mission-House at Rewa by Fire.

At midnight (on the 9th of February) Mr. Moore was awakened by the crackling of bamboos in the adjoining house, which had been set on fire. He got Mrs. Moore and the two children out in their night-clothes, and urged them on with rapidity to a small house outside; though Mrs. Moore was anxious to remain on the spot to try to save something. Consternation and fear prevailed. The source of the evil deed was not known, and people stood aloof. As soon as the people mustered, and when there was no small stir, Mr. Moore urged them to take what things they could get, and carry them home. This was as effective as Mr. Leigh's fish-books; it occupied their attention and efforts; and was, I believe, instrumentally, the salvation of Mr. and Mrs. Moore: for it is now reported that those who fired the premises have ever since wondered how their design of murdering all on the premises was frustrated. A club was up to kill Mrs. Moore, but a Rewa man prevented. I now see how providential was my hurried and unexpected return the day before; for had I been there, and made any attempt to save the property, I doubt not but we should all have perished. The fire consumed most of the goods, whether belonging to the family or to the Mission. Much of what the natives took, they have as yet taken care of, or otherwise disposed of. Some empty boxes which could not be concealed, and other articles, have been returned, through the exertions of the Rewa Chiefs.

The Missionary Returns to Rewa.

Mrs. Moore and the children remained at Bau ten weeks. Mr. Moore returned at once to Rewa, and prosecuted his labours. His presence there was absolutely needed. He has borne his loss remarkably well, and has persevered with astonishing zeal, in the midst of difficulties. His spirit, sacrifice, and labours, excite our warmest admiration, and have been crowned with distinguished success. When he had got a small hut built, Mrs. Moore and the children accompanied him to the scene of their sufferings and losses, and to the field of their toil. He has now got up a good-sized native house. We have supplied, from the various Stations, a few necessary articles of barter, and some household utensils; for each has been willing to contribute something in books and clothing; but their personal loss is very heavy. I trust that the friends of Missions and Mission, aries in the colonies, and in England too, will be ready to show their sympathy in some tangible form. Mr. and Mrs. Moore have had much to endure in body and mind, by night and day, without having also to suffer the loss of almost every thing; this ought not to be allowed. A Missionary and his wife in Feejee, and especially in such a place as Rewa, by far the most difficult Station in Feejee, ought not to be permitted to bear this burden; and I am persuaded the case will be fully met by our friends with a re-supply. They have two children, for whose support and education they have to provide. That is an additional reason why their loss should be made good.

Hopes and Fears.

It was well that, during the last hours of the Rewa Chief, he was not able to speak; so that he could not give the usual dying advice for revenge, which is considered so binding. This preventive to peace, therefore, was out of the way.

However, shortly after his death, Mara, who had been absent, returned. He was mortified at not having been waited for and consulted about peace; and, during his absence, he had formed an intimacy with the daughter of the late King of Bau, his reputed sister, whom he knew he could not marry if he made peace with Bau. All his desires and professions for peace were now laid aside, and he went about in every direction to stir up the remains of evil, to prevent peace between Rewa and Bau if possible, and to be himself the head of more active warfare with Bau than that which the late King of Rewa had carried on. He said they would now fight in earnest.

The burning of the Mission-premises, and the return of Mr. Moore to Rewa, however, led many to desire

peace and *lotu*, as they believed that they must lose their Missionary if Rewa again engaged in war. This proved a great stimulus to those who were peaceably disposed; and, indeed, in a great measure confirmed the steps that had already been taken. But yet Mara had many adherents in the dominions of Rewa;

It is a remarkable fact, that the presence of the Romish Priests in Rewa, of whom the once-famous Father Mathew, of Ireland, is one, appears to have had no influence on either the Heathen or Christian party. he retained all the Bau towns that had revolted; and he, being closely united with all Ovalau and the Whites there, was a formidable opponent. Besides this, he made further attempts to get the Bau fishermen to join him.

Arrival of King George from Tonga.

While things were in this state, King George, of the Friendly Islands, arrived at Bau, on the 24th of March, with thirty-nine canoes, to pay a friendly visit to the Vunivalu, and to take away the large canoe, "The Ra Marama," which was given to him when he passed through Feejee with Mr. Young. Rumours had been spread at Ovalau that King George intended to attack Ovalau, because of its revolt from Bau, and to avenge the murder of Elijah. It appeared that Mara had ordered the people on Ovalau, in the event of the Tongans going to that island, to attack them before they disembarked; as, if they once effected a landing, it would be a lost case. Previous to King George's arrival at Bau, a messenger met him from Bau, requesting him to remain over the Sabbath at Motureke, in order that full preparations might be made at Bau for a stately reception.

Murderous Attack on a Tonga Canoe at Ovalau.

Having been requested by the French Governor of Tahiti to pay kind attentions to the French Priests on the occasion of his visit to Feejee, and being intrusted with letters from the Priests in the Friendly Islands to those in Feejee, King George availed himself of the opportunity afforded by his stay at Motureke, to comply with the request of the Governor of Tahiti, and to effect an early delivery of the letters, by sending the smallest of his canoes, with twenty persons on board, to the French Priests at Ovalau. At the same time he sent a bundle of Tonga kava and a whale's tooth to the King of Levuka, as a token of his friendly feeling, expressing his pleasure in hearing that the King of Levuka had become Christian. It appears that Tui Levuka, Mr. Binner, and the white colonists, having heard of the arrival in Feejee of the Tongans, had held a consultation with reference to the rumours of hostility which were prevalent; and the King of Levuka had, with the full approval of the white colonists, resolved that, should King George send one or two of his canoes to Ovalau, it was manifest that nothing hostile could be intended; and, in that case, they should land and be received with every respect, and be entertained in the best possible manner. When the canoe neared the town of Totongo, where the Priests reside, they took in sail, sculled towards the shore, and were about to anchor. A great number of natives had collected on the beach, with some Whites and half-castes. By the orders of the head Chief of the Mountaineers, a Levuka man fired on the Tongans, none of whom had landed. Two half-castes and a man from Ngau, who is living with Tui Levuka, also fired. At this instant Tui Levuka arrived on the spot, having ran with great haste, after calling upon Mr. Binner, to request him and our Tongan Teacher to pull off to the canoe to prevent its nearing the shore at Totongo. He rushed into the water, and drove the natives away; otherwise, it is probable that there would have been much more firing. The owner of the canoe, Tawaki, was mortally wounded. He was a Chief of rank, brother to Benjamin Latusele, Native Assistant Missionary. He was also owner of a large canoe in the Tongan fleet. Another man was also slightly wounded in his hand. The Tongans sculled from the shore, when Mr. Binner and Paula reached them. They took Paula on board the canoe, and required him to go with them. They gave the letters for the Priests to Mr. Binner, made sail, stood out to sea in order to avoid Mara's canoe, which was near an entrance on the reef, and then stood in to their own party at Motureke. Poor Tawaki died of the wounds he received. This unexpected calamity hastened the departure of King George's fleet for Bau on the following morning, that there they might bury their dead.

Kambah, the Head Quarters of the Rebels, and the Chief Mara.

It appeared, from King George's sending a most peaceful and friendly message to an island opposed to Bau, that he did not intend to intermeddle in the wars of Feejee, but to do what he could, as mediator, to induce the contending parties to end their destructive contentions. But this attack, occasioned by his being on a visit to Bau, would evidently involve the Tongans in the war. Three towns, within three to five miles of Bau, to which they were subject, had been annoying the Chief of Bau for some months by making attacks on his towns, and coming out within gunshot in menacing attitudes on several occasions. Kambah also occupied a prominent position about six miles distant. This town had been in entire dependence on Bau. Yet there the Bauans who had rebelled assembled, with Mara at their head. He was considered the real cause of the firing on the Tonga canoe at Ovalau: he was also known to have presented whales' teeth at the windward islands to induce them to

join him against the Tongans resident in Feejee.

Mara Refuses Offers of Peace.

Seeing that the only probability of averting the calamity of the Tongans coming into the conflict was to get Mara to sue for peace, I desired King George to send a messenger to him, which he was ready to do. Mara made some remarks about the death of the Chief, expressed himself ashamed to see King George, refused to come to him to settle his differences with Bau, which George had desired, undertaking to become mediator, and desired George not to meddle with Feejeean strife. It appeared to me not unlikely that a thousand lives would be sacrificed before the end of the conflict, should the Tongans once become fairly involved. I therefore desired George to try again, by sending a Tonga messenger to Mara. This he objected to, saying that when he sent a small canoe on a most peaceful errand, the purpose of which could not be mistaken, one of their number, a Chief, had been shot; and that, he had reason to believe, mainly through Mara, who was the main spring of the evil still raging in Feejee. It was evident that war would soon commence, unless Mara would submit; and knowing, as I did, the custom of the Tongans to fight for the parties they were visiting, when war was waging, even though no high Chief was at the head of the visiting party, I went to the Chief of the Bau fishermen, and desired him to try to persuade Mara to come to terms of peace, by representing that he would otherwise involve the Tongans, himself and others, indeed the principal parts of Feejee, in a most fearful and destructive war: that, if the Tongans once attacked Kambah, they would unquestionably take it, even at the sacrifice of a thousand persons, and by years of siege, if necessary; and that he knew King George to be a man of resolute purpose, who would carry through what he commenced, if his life was spared. This message and request was intrusted to a principal man among the fishermen. Mara absolutely refused to yield; and boasted strongly of the utter impossibility of Kambah being taken by Tongans. He asked if they were stones. He pointed at a Chief from each of two populous and renowned-for-fighting districts,—Buretu and Nakelo,—as the representatives of a great number of the best Feejeean fighting men which he had in the town. He said he also had twenty from each of several towns; that they had laid in great store of provisions; and he avowed that no Tongan should be able to stand on any ground about Kambah. "If," said he, "they build a fence on the adjoining island, there they will be able to remain; but to come to Kambah will be certain death." It became clear that the collision could not be prevented.

Prayer and Preparation for War.

I proposed to King George that a meeting should be held for prayer, previous to going to war. At six in the morning on the 2d of April, an immense number attended. The large strangers' house was full, and many were outside. I desired the King to conduct the meeting. About sixteen persons engaged in prayer. It was a time long to be remembered. They earnestly and powerfully interceded with the Lord to guide them aright, to prevent them from doing evil, to aid them in that which would be for his glory and the benefit of Feejee; they pleaded for forgiveness of past offences, and for blessings and salvation on Tonga and Feejee. I afterwards waited on the King, and requested that he would prevent the destruction of life as far as possible. That, he said, he intended to do. He regretted the necessity for war, but considered it to be a duty to resent the conduct of the Feejeeans, and especially of Mara; and he believed that, were the case passed over, Tongans of small number would not hereafter be safe in Feejee. Previous to determining on war, he had ordered the Chiefs of the three groups of the Friendly Islands to assemble separately, and consider the case. They were all of one mind on the subject. He said that he intended to fence Kambah in, and, having subdued them by starvation, would, without killing any, bring them to the Vunivalu, who might act as he deemed right towards his own rebellious subjects. He considered that his arrival at this time was opportune, and that the Lord might use him to deliver the oppressed; and he hoped that the distractions of Feejee might speedily subside, and a better state of affairs be permanently established. Before I left him I spoke with the Queen, and found that she was preparing to accompany her husband. I begged she would remain behind, with women, children, and the aged, in which the King joined me; but all was of no avail. After begging that he would not expose his person in the forefront of the battle, I left Bau for Rewa.

Descent upon Kambah.

On the 3d of April the whole fleet passed Kambah, on their way to Kiuva where the Vunivalu had ordered his Feejeean army to join them. There they remained till the 7th, when the united forces proceeded to Kambah. It is probable that there were upwards of a thousand Feejeeans, and about two thousand Tongans. The Feejeeans went inland to attack a long fence which was made across a neck of land at some distance from the town. King George and his party, with the Vunivalu, went with their canoes to effect a landing to the north of

Kambah within the long fence, opposite to the small town of Koroi Thumu. Their landing was announced to us by a terrible volley of musketry, which we heard at Vewa, a distance of about ten miles. Knowing the King's purpose to invest the town, and the strength of the well-provisioned party in the town, we expected a long siege. In a short time, however, we were aroused by shouts stating that the smaller town was in flames. We passed over the island to see, and found that Kambah also was burning.

Destruction of Kambah.

In landing, the Tongans had met with strong opposition; one of their number was shot before they reached the beach, and fell into the sea. A landing having been effected, King George and others went to cut down trees for their fences. While he was thus employed, some Tongans were shot and clubbed, and their bodies were dragged into the town to be cooked and eaten. Without waiting for orders from the King, the Tongans at once stormed the town, taking and burning it. The Kambans and their friends, who were protecting the long fence against the inland Feejeean army, seeing that their small town was taken, ran to Kambah. The united forces now proceeded towards the town of Kambah: already the bodies of six Tongans (one a Chief) had been laid before the Heathen temples of the town, as offerings to their gods, and the Priests of all had promised that the Tongans should be destroyed, so that there should not be any left to take their canoes back to Tonga. The death-drum beat loud inside the town, the Kambans rejoicing over the bodies of the Tongans, and keeping up a brisk fire on the approaching army. The Tongans rushed on, passing by their killed and wounded, and speedily made a breach in the fence, and forced their way inside the town. Mara, and upwards of a hundred of his valiant men, of whom he had boasted so much, had made their escape: they ran over the sharp shells on the reef, and swam across to the three towns which adhered to them. When Mara saw our Teacher there, he said, "Ay, Aquila, your spirit is still in you, because you have not seen them. The man is a fool who fights with Tongans. I fired on them twenty or thirty times; but all we could do was of no avail. They rushed on impetuously. They are gods, and not men."

But little resistance was offered after the town was entered. Many were captured,—by the Vavauans especially, and some by those from Tonga and Haabai,—but their lives were spared. The Feejeean army killed a great number of women and children, as well as men; and would have done greater evil, had not one of their number been killed in mistake by a Tongan; after which they were shy, and retired. The *lotu* people in the town were assembled together, with their Teacher and a rebel Chief of Bau, and were spared. It was feared that one *lotu* man and his wife were killed: they had been concealed among reeds: but when the burning approached them, they thought they should be discovered, and perish, and knelt down together for prayer. The fire stopped, and they were not seen. There they remained till night, when they escaped to a town up the river. About one hundred and eighty of the enemy were killed by the Tongans and Feejeeans. Fourteen Tongans were killed, and about the same number wounded. Two hundred prisoners were taken, and were delivered up to the Vunivalu. All of them were spared; though some, when tried on the following Monday, were proved to have acted in a way that rendered them worthy of death; especially Keroi Ravulo, a rebel Chief of Bau. Many desired his death; but the Vunivalu decided that even his life should be spared. The others were returned alive to the towns to which they belonged. The Kambans are to remain in Bau till taken to their own town, which is to be rebuilt soon.

Flight of the Rebel Chief Mara.

At Thautata, the nearest town of the enemy, the rebels had nightly been calling out, while the Tongans were at Bau, expressing their impatience for the attack on Kambah, saying that the fire-wood which they had chopped for cooking the Tongans was decayed. When Kambah was attacked, the Thautata flag was up; but when the smoke ascended, it was lowered, and the people became anxious for their own safety. The two men principally concerned in the revolt of Thautata and its two smaller towns were killed at Kambah; while others made their escape with Mara. At night the whole of the inhabitants of Thautata, (except one, who was found and killed, and whose body Mr. Waterhouse got from some natives that were dragging it away to eat,) Vatoa, and Waithoka left their towns, and escaped up the river to Buretu.

Mara delayed not at Vatoa, but went to Buretu and Nakelo, and begged their continued adherence to him, which they promised. Mara was anxious to get to his friends and adherents, the Whites in Ovalau; and not being very easy at Buretu or Nakelo, when he could not get a conveyance to Ovalau, he passed on inland, through towns of his party, till he reached the coast to the west of Vewa. At Kumi he begged a canoe, promising to return on the following day, and got clear to Ovalau with a few of his followers.

Submission of the King of Nakelo.

Messengers were sent from Bau to inform the King of Nakelo that his son, who had been captured, and ten others from Nakelo, were alive, and that they should all be set at liberty. The Buretu and Nakelo districts were advised and encouraged to submit. They were glad promptly to avail themselves of the opportunity. The King of Nakelo, together with a Bau ambassador from Buretu, came to Bau, begging for peace. He rejoiced much to find his son and people spared, and given up to him. He and they *lotued* while at Bau. The Kambah tragedy subdued the rebellious at Rewa, and decided the wavering; and all in those parts were desirous of being reconciled to Bau. Offerings for peace were brought to Bau from several towns and districts to the southward. Ail were accepted, and the drums beat merrily at Bau, sounding most melodiously to us who had been so long accustomed to hear frequently the drums of death and revolt from those quarters that had now submitted.

Kumi Taken and Destroyed.

Kumi had taken an active part in opposition to Bau, and had furnished Mara with the means of escape, which was an additional offence. Proposals for peace were rejected, and submission to Bau was refused. It was a mean but populous town, with which many other towns were joined in rebellion. Mara's boasting and promises in those parts, when on his way to Ovalau, had been listened to, and his request for their adherence to him in continued warfare complied with. They commenced putting up extra fences, and making further embankments. Two towns in the neighbourhood, where we had a few *lotu* people, settled their differences with Bau through Vewa, and returned to their allegiance; but Kumi, though entreated to do so, obstinately refused.

The Vunivalu requested King George to subdue this place also, so that all the towns to the westward might be disposed to peace. Fearing that there might be a further destruction of human life, I went to Bau on the evening of the 12th. I stated to King George that the loss of life was great at Kambah; and that, though Kumi was most rebellious and impudent, I hoped he would not allow a slaughter similar to that at Kambah, which I thought he might obviate, and yet accomplish every desirable object. He regretted the loss of so many lives at Kambah, which he had tried to avoid; and said he would take care to prevent such an event at Kumi. I also begged that he would not allow the burning of the two towns in its vicinity, Naivuruvuru and Verata, which had submitted, though reluctantly. He said they should not be molested.

On the 13th of April, one hundred and forty-three canoes passed Vewa for Kumi. They anchored at some distance from the town. The Vunivalu sent a messenger, requiring them to submit, to vacate their town speedily, and allow it to be burnt; promising that their lives should be spared. They accordingly fled to a town inland, and the Tongans entered Kumi and burnt it. On the following day the fleet returned to Bau; and offerings of peace and forgiveness were speedily received from the districts of Vungalei and Nathovu, from the towns of Nanamu, Nalathi, Kumi, and many other towns in various directions.

Peace Established.

The Vunivalu and Bauans were now delivered from the serious difficulty of providing food for the daily consumption of their visitors. All resources were now open: cooked and raw food was now supplied in abundance. The turbulence of past months and years subsided. What a mighty change! The people are now *lotuing* by thousands, that which has hindered being removed. The Vunivalu bears his newly-acquired position and relief in a most becoming and Christian way, and continues with unabated zeal to urge all to become Christians, so that the peace may be permanent, being established on the best and surest foundation, and that Feejee may be saved from its abominations and degradation, and raised, by the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, which is now likely to have free course and be glorified.

As an expression of gratitude to King George, for the timely and abundant help rendered in the distracted state of his dominions, the Vunivalu gave him his schooner of eighty-six tons, the "Thakombau." Every possible attention is paid to King George and his suite. Masts and yards for all his canoes were ordered through Rewa from all the forests of those parts; and sail-mats in great abundance are ready at the large island of Kandavu.

King George Visits Rewa and Kandavu.

On the 11th of May King George and all his party, accompanied by the Vunivalu in his own canoe, left Bau for Rewa and Kandavu. At Mr. Moore's request, I went to Rewa with them. I went on George's new large canoe, perhaps the largest in the world, which had been presented to him by the Vunivalu. There were about one hundred and forty persons on board. We went up the river. King George superintended all the movements, and worked himself at every thing, keeping all actively in motion. He is certainly an extraordinary man. At Buretu we stayed a short time for food, which waited our arrival. The Vunivalu went on shore to the Chief's house. The Chiefs again presented whales' teeth, begging that past offences might be forgiven; and were well

received. The Vunivalu had for years been much aggrieved for having been shot at when on a peaceable visit to this place. I had the satisfaction to see him shake hands with the two principal men. He desired them all to become Christians, and asked me to address them. We returned on board, and proceeded up the river until we came opposite Nakelo, where we anchored for the night. The King himself provided me a comfortable place for the night on the canoe; and he gave out a verse and prayed. Early the following morning I visited the town of Nakelo. Some food was brought to the canoes, and an immense heap, which had been piled ready for us at a distance from the river up which we passed, was fetched by parties from each canoe. The canal through which we passed, cut by a former King of Rewa, was shallow; but at high water, the tide making the whole length of the river, it was sufficiently deep for the largest canoes. In times of war this canal is closed by a fence made of large trees. The King of Nakelo came on board the Vunivalu's canoe, and went with us to Rewa. On our way they took on board the various canoes a pile of many thousands of stalks of sugarcane, which had been brought by the people of Tokatoka to the river side; also several cooked pigs, and other food. Forty large canoes, with long streamers from the mast-head, being propelled up the river, was a rare sight. This river, with its various branches, will answer well, when this extensive and fertile district shall be properly cultivated, for the conveyance of produce to vessels from the colonies. War being ended, and Christianity established, I doubt not but the industry of these natives will be encouraged to supply pigs, yams, timber, tobacco, coffee, cotton, cocoa-nut oil, and other articles, for the colonial markets. Hitherto there have been but short seasons of peace between Nakelo and Tokatoka. We had Chiefs from both districts on board the Vunivalu's canoe, they being again on friendly terms, and very comfortable together.

We spent the Sabbath at Rewa. The Tongans held their services in the two large houses which they occupied; and we assembled in the open air with the Vunivalu and the Rewa people, on a spot sacred in the past days of Heathenism. The sight was most gratifying,—the change is immensely great. We were in the vicinity of the oven used for cooking the Bauans. Instead of hating, fighting, and devouring each other, as they have been for the last ten years, they are now worshipping the true and living and life-giving God together. This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes. I and Mr. Moore called at the large house occupied by King George, to see the Queen, but could not see either of them. Class-meetings were being held in various parts of the house; and one company I observed outside, assembled on a small hill for the same purpose.

On the Monday very large quantities of cooked food were brought from the towns subject to Rewa. From one district the row of cooked taro was thirty-three yards long, and two feet square. It was held in by a lining of sail-mats, which were supported by posts, entirely covered with small sinnet. King George gave to Mr. Moore and me, as our portion, a live turtle, the best cooked pig, a large basket of taro, and one of yams. At King George's request, Chiefs who had been connected with the war now ended, were assembled from every part; both those who had joined with Rewa, and those who had supported Bau; to whom the decree of peace was delivered for them sacredly to keep. The punishment for any transgression was thus announced: Any town offending by taking any steps towards war will be considered the enemy of all, and will be liable to chastisement by the combined powers of Bau and Rewa.

King George had stated to me at Bau his intention of making inquiry about the destruction of the Mission-premises at Rewa. I approved of his doing so, but desired him to wait awhile. I now waited on him, early one morning, and gave him particulars about the fire and retention of property. I told him that we were thankful for his volunteering to see into the affair, as his influence would be far greater than that of any ship of war. In the evening he met the Rewa Chiefs on the subject. They wished to ward off inquiry, but promised to collect what they could of property which had been taken away on the night of the fire, and retained. The case is to be inquired into on the return of the fleet from Kandavu, when it is also arranged that persons from all the towns round about are to assemble on the Sabbath, and some from each place are publicly to renounce Heathenism. But it appears the people are not disposed to wait; for two hundred and fifty have already followed their Chiefs and become Christian in the Nakelo district, and Chiefs of other towns have already begun to worship God. The fact is, the people generally are tired of war, and of presenting offerings to that which has obviously been of no manner of use, but a burden and cause of evil to them; and they are desirous of adopting the religion of which they have long heard, talked, and thought, and which they believe to be true and useful.

On the 15th the fleet sailed early for Kandavu, and I returned home, regretting that I could not accompany them without neglecting the printing, and risking being absent on the arrival of the "Wesley." In my way, I called again at Buretu, and there saw the most splendid temple that I have met with. It was finished three days before Kambah was taken. The gods of Buretu are much trusted in; credence is generally given to the oracle there. They are reputed as having always screened Buretu from every attack. A Chief of the place said to me, "The *lotu* is true; or Kambah would not have been taken." At Nakelo, also, I found a new temple. There, too, I met with a Chief from another town, who said that all their gods and Priests were liars, for they had all promised that Kambah should be secure, and the Tongans killed. The people say, "We thought and felt that Kambah would be destroyed, and that we should be killed; but the gods and Priests pledged our safety and

victory." Having heard all that the Heathen Priests had promised, Mara went to our Teacher at Kamhah, and asked him what party would prevail. The Teacher shrewdly replied, "The party that is right with God." "Aye," said Mara, "that is our party, for we have not done anything against Christianity; whereas, the Tongans are wrong by fighting in Feejee:" and he went and encouraged the people, by stating that the Teacher had said they would be successful. It is evident that the most important results depended upon the success or failure of the Tongans at Kambah.

Many Labourers Needed.

The work of Christianizing Feejee is now properly commenced; and the greatest efforts are now demanded, to secure help from every quarter, The Vunivalu is very desirous that Feejee should become Christian. He says that, if the work is not now attended to, evil will spring up, and that nothing can possibly save Feejee from its revolting crimes, cruelties, wars, and degradation but the Gospel, taught and enforced by messengers sent forth.

The great difficulty now, is want of native help. The demand is so great and sudden, that we are completely in a fix. When Bau became Christian, we wrote to the Friendly Islands, desiring thirty Local Preachers; and to Lakemba for the same number. From the former we have received four, and from the latter seven; but what are they among so many islands, districts, and towns that are all now crying out for help? places where there is not any person who knows how to pray or teach anything in religion. It is most distressing to receive earnest applications for Teachers, without being able to supply even one. At the large and populous island of Kandavu, persons have *lolued* at twenty-one towns. When lately visited, the number was upwards of seven hundred; and it is probable that soon there will be several thousands professedly Christian, on that island of nearly one hundred towns; and to it Mr. Moore can supply only four persons for the work. At Ban we applied to King George for a canoe to take letters to Lakemba, again pressing our urgent demands for much help. The case of taking our letters was easily met, as one of his canoes was shortly to sail to Lakemba, in order to be employed by Tui Nayau in conveying property to Lakemba from his outer islands. At Rewa, I again called upon King George, and told him that calls for immediate help were perplexingly numerous and urgent, and that, if men were granted from Lakemba, I feared there would be no conveyance for them. He promptly decided, though the property to be collected by the canoe was for himself, and said, "Of what importance can attention to Tui Nayau's commands be, when compared with the obtaining of Teachers when they are so much needed? The canoe shall return direct with Teachers." He had already shown that his heart is in the work of God, when I met the Local Preachers and Class-Leaders, about eighty in number, who are now with him from the Friendly Islands. On that occasion I had urged them to vigilant attention to their own souls, and to those who are under their care, and laid before them the case of Feejee. He then spoke out plainly, saying, that only a want of love to souls kept them back, as there were numbers of Local Preachers in Tonga whose services were not required there. He was also very kind in bringing many things from Vewa to Rewa to meet Mr. Moore's present wants.

Our work will suffer much by the delay in getting labourers, and also from our being compelled to employ many persons who are not prepared for the work, and, indeed, would not be employed if we could otherwise help ourselves. And after our friends in Tonga shall have so far sympathized with Feejee, as to send a considerable supply of labourers, which I expect they will do, and when Lakemba shall have given till they are made poor themselves, by forwarding many to these destitute and populous parts,—even then the number will not be at all adequate.

The places being partly supplied with men,—most of whom will thus be prevented from being brought under necessary training,—will greatly lessen the number of suitable persons obtainable for instruction. Yet special efforts must be made for qualifying as many as possible of our native agents for this great work. The converted natives who can read, and who give evidence of being called by God to the work of preaching and teaching, absolutely require much pains-taking labour with them, in order to make them at all efficient agents, to be depended upon. They never had, nor can have, opportunities and advantages which are enjoyed by the lowest in our own country; and if very much is not done for them, it is impossible for them creditably to preach, teach, or manage any part of our work. Their knowledge is very limited; and they are deprived of comments and other useful books to qualify and guide them aright. In order to raise and advance them to a state of efficiency, they should be placed with a Missionary whose heart, mind, and time are given to this special and most important work; and no other branch of our work would ultimately produce equally valuable results. The demands of Feejee are so very great, and it is so certain that the carrying on of the work must mainly depend upon labourers raised up from among themselves, that it is a paramount duty to labour hard to prepare those instruments which God puts into our hands for the proper discharge of the duties that shall devolve upon them. While each Missionary is doing something in this respect, amidst various and oppressive engagements, for those to whom he intrusts the sacred work, it is clear that one Missionary, at least, ought to be specially devoted to this employment, in order that some of the Native Teachers may become valuable auxiliaries, who will be

qualified to stimulate and benefit others also.

Now that Feejee is open to our labours, and invites them, *more Missionaries ought immediately to be supplied*. Before they can learn the language, and get fully into the work, it is not unlikely that some now employed will find their health fail, or have other reasons for occasional absence. And unless the number of Missionaries be increased, the work of instructing, preaching, voyaging, training native agents, exploring and evangelizing all Feejee, and exercising a pastoral care over the churches, cannot possibly be done. We have, through God's blessing, brought Feejee to its present state; and we are bound to meet the craving demands which we have created. Let Feejee, then, have what it so urgently needs. Without squeezing out the widow's mite, and getting from such persons all that they possess, if some were to relieve their coffers and their consciences, by giving somewhat liberally of their abundance, the case would be fully and easily met as it regards the money difficulty; and men who are called to the work, and desirous to come forth to endure some hardships and fatigue for the salvation of Feejeeans, will not be wanting. The work in Feejee is so manifestly of the Lord, that I am persuaded it will be carried on and effected; so that cannibal and much-debased Feejee shall yet become a praise in the earth: and I trust that the carrying on of this Mission will be an honour to the Southern Conference, and a proof to the world that it was right to intrust these Missions to their care, zeal, and benevolence. The case of Feejee commends itself to every feeling heart and thinking mind; and no considerate person who knows its urgent needs, and the most probable good that will result from an increased number of labourers, can feel comfortable if he withholds what he can easily supply to accomplish the work.

Pacification of Ovalau.

June 15th—Captain Dunn, of the "Dragon," has again shown his strong desire for general peace; and has persuaded Tui Levuku, Mara, and the Whites of Ovalau to settle their differences with Bau. He has to-day brought them from Ovalau to Bau in the "Dragon;" but the Chiefs have not yet returned from Kandavu, and Captain Dunn cannot wait. However, I now trust that peace will be established with them without further delay.?

Affairs in Rewa.

By the Rev. William Moore

Extract of a Letter from the Rev. William Moore, dated Rewa, Feejee, February 19th, 1855.

Appointment to Rewa.

IT would be very difficult to give you anything like an idea of the constant state of excitement in which we have been kept since we came to Rewa. It has been six months of sorrow, hope, and Divine comfort. You are aware that these parts have for years been engaged in war; during which time Rewa has been burnt two or three times, and numbers killed; but in the course of the last year things have been quite in favour of Rewa; so that it was thought it would destroy Bau, and thus become the greatest kingdom in Feejee. We had long waited a favourable opportunity to re-open this station, upon which so much labour and suffering have been expended. This was thought to be the time; and, the Chief being willing to receive us again, I was appointed to labour here at our last District-Meeting. As we had had a good share of removals and building, the brethren were willing to help us to get settled as quickly as possible; and a wooden house, brought by the Rev. Samuel Waterhouse, was purchased for us, so that we had the prospect of soon getting settled in our new station, without that anxiety and labour generally attending such a work.

Trials of a Mission Among Cannibals.

Our trials soon commenced. We found that we were in the midst of those engaged in active war, Feejeean war. The fruits were soon seen: men like fiends dragging their fellow-men to their gods, to their ovens, and then to some secret den to gratify their revenge; for I do not believe they have a relish for human flesh. Thank God, the Gospel has triumphed so far, that they are ashamed, at least, of this sin; and thus we are saved from the horror of seeing men eat men. On the first Sabbath I spent here a human body was brought; which gave me an opportunity of trying the Chief. I went to him and had a conversation, on the evils of war, and the blessings of the Gospel; and then begged that he would not allow any human flesh to be eaten by the Rewa people. He consented at once, and I therefore concluded the body would be buried. Some hours after, I learned that it was in the oven. I hastened to see, and found it was true. I sent to learn why the Chief had not kept his promise. He said, "I have given it to some visitors, and not to the Rewa people." I then requested to have it buried. He

yielded so far as not to allow it to be eaten in Rewa, but said it must be eaten, as revenge for some of his people who had been taken in a former war.

Sunday being over, and the wind being unfavourable for the "Wesley," and our respected Chairman, Mr. Lyth, being anxious to get to Vewa to expedite business, we left here with a fine morning, and a full tide to sweep us down the river. Everything seemed happy except the people, who rushed out here and there from their fortified towns, to inquire where we were going. All went on well until we came within a few miles of Bau, when five canoes put out from under the mangrove-bushes, and called to us to stop. We were in haste, as the tide was falling, and we might be left on the reefs; so we kept on, the canoes following us; and, finding that they did not gain on us, they commenced firing, and scattered some twenty balls about our boat, reminding us that "in the midst of life we are in death." We have been in danger since; but the Lord has been mindful of us, and we live still to praise him.

Death of the King.

After getting a little settled here, I went to visit Ovalau, which is included in this Circuit; and on my return I found the Chief very ill with dysentery. He had been subject to it for years, and was now very weak. He applied for medicine, which I gave: and he was evidently getting better; but he would not restrain his appetite. He became worse, and I could do nothing for him. He died January 20th, 1855; and this brought fresh trials upon us. The report got spread abroad that our medicine had killed him; and the multitude who met together to bury him consulted and intended to destroy the Mission-premises, and take the property. This was prevented by the old men of the place, who sent a guard to watch the premises. The Chief was buried, and only one lady strangled, many others being saved from that fate by the influence of the Gospel and our intercession. Never was such a Chief of rank buried in Feejee, and only one human life taken.

Burning of the Mission-Premises.

Things settled down again for a few days, and all was going on pleasantly, with the prospect of peace between Bau and Rewa. Messengers had come and gone; and while we mourned the loss of the Chief, (for he had been exceedingly kind to us,) we were yet rejoicing in the hope of tranquillity, and the spread of Christianity. We retired to rest on the 9th of February, all well and happy, and slept until about one o'clock in the morning, when I was awoke by the roaring of fire. I rose, and found an old house, some three yards from our wooden house, all in flames. I gave the alarm: our house soon caught, and we had only just time to make our escape in our night-clothes. We went to some distance, and sat in the dew, "watching for the morning." The house was soon burnt down to the ground, the natives getting some few things away; but the store, and all it contained, was burnt. We shall never forget that night. Such a sight we never beheld. The house was in flames, the natives in multitudes were rushing in with spears, clubs, and guns, shouting, some dragging us we knew not where; and we have been since informed that one Chief from another town raised his club to strike Mrs. Moore, and that a Rewa Chief pushed him away, threatening to club *him*. It was a very anxious night: we quite expected the enemy was in the town, and that the fire would be the signal for the whole army to plunge into the place. Thank God, the morning came without any blood being spilt. Soon after it was light, we made preparations for leaving here for Bau. Mr. Pickering, a white resident at Ovalau, being within a mile or two of this place, kindly sent to see about us, and offered to take us to Bau, which offer we gladly accepted. We reached Bau the same day, and received the sympathy and kindness of Christian brethren and sisters from our friends there. After spending two days there, I returned to see how things were going on at Rewa, and found the people anxious that we should not leave them; and as I do not believe that any party in the town burnt the house, but that it may have been done by some one who dislikes the peace, I concluded it was best to stay, and to see how things will go. The brethren at Bau and Vewa very kindly said, that if it was our wish to go to the colony, they could not object. Mrs. Moore and the children *may* go; but I cannot make up my mind to leave the brethren in such trying times; and to leave Rewa just now would be like throwing away so much labour, suffering, and expense, and perhaps the loss of a multitude of souls. I want no *excuse* to leave Feejee; and as I do not see my way clear, I cast myself on the Divine guidance and protection, and wish to be the Lord's, in life, in death.

The loss to the Mission will be great,—about £400 or £500; and our own loss is about a similar sum. My books alone were worth £200. Our loss, however, does not trouble us. "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord." But this getting unsettled in our work, and this constant excitement, reminds us that we are human. O pray for us, that our faith fail not. Do not get the notion that the work in Feejee is done, or that we can do without the prayers of the church. Never did Feejee need them more, never did we need them more. "Brethren, pray for us."?

Affairs of the Year in Bau.

By the Rev. Joseph Waterhouse.

Extract of a Letter from the Rev. Joseph Waterhouse, dated Huntville, Bau, Feejee, June 11th, 1855.

Affairs in 1854.

IN anticipation of the "Dragon's" departure for Australia, I hasten to record an account of the trials through which our people have passed during the last year, from which you will be enabled to understand the position which Christianity is now assuming in Feejee.

The Methodistical year was ushered in under the genial rays of political prosperity. But, alas! the portentous clouds of civil war and internal dissension soon enveloped us in political darkness. A pseudo-Priest is inspired, and tidings of woe are announced, in consequence of the late profession of Christianity. Another, late the High Priest, becomes the shrine of the great and much-feared God, and declares that the King and his Chiefs are to be punished in a signal manner for their presumption in imputing frailty to the Feejeean deities. The King demands an apology from the Priest, and then whips him publicly, to evidence that he no longer fears the would-be gods of Bau. The populace are amazed—they are soon alarmed.

Three towns, within two or three miles of the city, beat the drum of rebellion. A number of influential Chiefs, including two of the King's younger brothers, abscond in a war-canoe and join the enemy, whilst it is rumoured that they have arranged with certain Chiefs in the city to assassinate the ruler, so soon as they can bring an army within sight of Bau. Whole districts soon join the rebels, and Bau itself, for the first time since the bloody revolution of 1837, is placed in a state of defence. The kingdom of Rewa now initiates the aggressive, assisted by the Bau rebel Chiefs, and the ruling party in Ovalau. The King of Rewa sends a letter, warning the Missionary to leave the city, as it would soon be burnt, and he feared that he would be unable to protect us from the ruffian warriors.

A Sabbath Disturbed by Suspected Treason and Open War.

And there is cause for alarm. A hostile army is hastening to the rendezvous at Kambah. On the Sabbath the troops are disembarking at Thautata, two miles distant. This is noticed by all; but other thoughts engross the attention. The King's cousin, whose father was killed by the present ruler, is expected to massacre the King, in revenge, either at chapel or on his way to it. The Missionary himself trembles for the issue of that eventful Sabbath. The family is removed to Vewa, and the dawning of the Lord's-day is awaited in a state of the most anxious suspense. With the death of the King there will probably be a relapse into Heathenism, and there will certainly be a fearful slaughter in the town. The bell is rung. But the demon of fear stalks in every street and lane, and no one appears. After a time a few men approach slowly; but they are armed, and they sit down outside of the chapel. Presently the King arrives, accompanied by an armed guard, and then his cousin, at the head of a similar force, enters the building. The service is commenced; but every man eyes his neighbour, none the Preacher. We pray. A man belonging to the King remains standing as sentry with a loaded musket. The service is short, the congregation is dismissed, and so far, thank God, the crisis is over. But the disembarkation of the hostile army is continued. Is it lawful to disperse their fleet on the Sabbath? By all means; never allow your enemy to land on your own coast when you can prevent them. A fleet of twenty picked canoes is despatched, and succeeds in scattering the hostile naval armament, and thus separating the enemy's forces and preventing the union of the two divisions.

A few weeks afterwards the enemy attacked a town five miles distant, but were repulsed with severe loss. The Bauans engaged in public prayer before they made the charge, and completely routed the enemy. This engagement was regarded by the populace as a trial between the gods of Feejee and Jehovah, and afforded them more proof of the truth of our religion than all the works ever written on the evidences of Christianity would do.

Simultaneously with this, the Bau party, headed by the King's cousin, who now took a decided part with the reigning Chief, and who assured the Missionary that he would no longer endeavour to take revenge for the death of his father, gained (as they say, by prayer) a great victory at Koro, where the rebels had obtained possession of one half of the island. A town, well fortified with a stone wall and cannon, was taken after an assault of three days, and all its inmates were spared, although some of the besiegers were clamorous for their extermination. Several hundreds on both sides *lotued* as the sequel of this expedition, and peace was established at Koro, all the other towns being spared on the condition that they would become Christians.

Persecution.

Soon after this, the Bau Chiefs assembled in council, and decided upon seizing, by a *coup de main*, the canoes belonging to the rebel Chiefs. But, in consequence of the King being advised to forbear a little longer, the order was countermanded. Although this step originated with the King, yet the common people, secretly encouraged by mischievous Chiefs, blamed the Missionary for the measure which, as they thought, deprived them of very considerable plunder. The Chief of the Lasakauans asked why our house should not be burnt for this act of interference, as he termed it. This was sufficient encouragement to stimulate his wicked men to annoy us, which they did in their own effectual way. They spoke openly of stoning the Missionary and they robbed our premises almost hourly. A constant discharge of stones was kept up for several evenings. Two attempts were made to enter our house by night, but were frustrated. The King intreated us, with tears in his eyes, to endure this harassing persecution, it being out of his power to protect us at the time. "You are suffering," said he, "because you uphold my authority. Those who ill-treat you are traitors who desire to deliver me into the hands of my enemies."

The King of Rewa again sent, urging our departure from Bau, or he would not be answerable for the consequences.

Our own King made offers of peace to his old adversary, which were rejected with scorn. "We shall see," said he of Rewa, "whether Jehovah your God, who is 'a Spirit,' can save the body of Thakombau."

A spy taken in the act of bribing the people of Nakorowau was recommended to *lotu*, and escorted in safety to his own town. A few months ago he would have been clubbed and eaten.

A few days afterwards the King had a conference with one of his rebel brothers, and freely forgave him; but he refused to submit to his authority,

Mediation of Captain Denham, of H.M.S. "Herald."

The King then accepted the invitation of Captain Denham, and went on board H.M.S. "Herald" at anchor at Ovalau, and publicly offered to meet all those who had grievances to make; but none of the rebel party came near.

Thus closed 1854. Although the King's proposals for peace were rejected in every instance, yet we had cause for gratitude to Almighty God for the partial change which Divine grace had effected in this modern Nebuchadnezzar.

Affairs in 1855.

A stormy blast burst upon us with the new year. The rebels prohibited us from visiting some of their towns, and a Teacher whom we had sent in the boat with letters to Mr. Moore was very roughly treated. On every side the enemy advanced to destroy Bau and Christianity.

But man's extremity is often God's opportunity. When all was lost but faith, the King of Rewa suddenly died. And he died so far deprived of the faculty of speech, that he was unable to bequeath the war as a legacy to his followers,—a bequest which would have compelled them either to conquer or be utterly vanquished before they surrendered.

A treaty of peace was immediately made with the kingdom of Rewa, one of the articles of which was freedom of conscience at Rewa in matters of religion.

The Bau districts, however, still remained in a state of hostility. Upon my visit to Kambah, I found the people engaged in strengthening the fortifications, and preparing to renew the strife.

Soon afterwards King George arrived from Tonga, on a friendly visit, accompanied by many of his principal Chiefs. He and his court sympathized heartily with the Bauans in their sufferings, and we soon heard that the combined forces were to attack the enemy's stronghold, Kambah, unless it submitted, upon summons, to the authority of the King. A herald was despatched; but his mission was fruitless. All the Heathen oracles predicted the destruction of the Christian "powers that be," and the Heathen waited with impatience for the day in which Christianity was to be "upset." Both sides prepared for the conflict. The enemy sent a body of five hundred picked men to assist the Kambans, and sought by costly sacrifices to propitiate their numerous deities; whilst our people endeavoured to humble themselves under the mighty hand of God.

Kambah was assaulted and taken in a few hours, and the Lord mercifully preserved our Teacher and his little flock, who were in the town. The Bau side only lost twenty men, whilst the Heathen suffered a loss of two hundred killed, and a great number of prisoners. The result of this victory was the almost instant submission of all the disturbed districts, with the exception of Ovalau, whither the King's rebel brothers fled for refuge, and still refuse to submit to his authority.

In the midst of these wars our trust has been in Him who has said, "Be still, and know that I am God." Upwards of seven thousand have embraced Christianity during the year; we behold Satan fall "as lightning." His strongholds are being razed to the ground. The "stronger than he" appears, and will "overcome him." The day of the Lord's power is dawning, and the Gospel trumpet shall soon be sounded throughout the length and breadth of Feejee.

You will, perhaps, hear from Mr. Moore of his own misfortune. Just after peace had been proclaimed between the two powers, some wicked men, who were opposed to the peace, and who, perhaps, suspected our esteemed brother of having killed the King of Rewa with his medicines, set fire to his premises at midnight. The fire awoke Mr. Moore, and his bed was in flames in two or three minutes afterwards. The natives intended to massacre our brother and his family; but the Lord restrained them. When they arrived at Bau, the poor children were in their night-clothes, and the excellent Mrs. Moore was without bonnet and shoes! They have lost everything. Such is Feejee! No one could have paid more attention to the late King than did Mr. Moore. He personally administered the medicine, and supplied the most suitable food; he even went so far as to wash and dry the King himself, lest the King's attendants should be negligent, and bring on a relapse.

Of ourselves, we may say that, during the past year, we have been familiar with danger at home and abroad. More than once have we seen, from our own residence, some poor creature, sometimes a member of our congregation, killed, and carried off to be cooked and eaten. If we have gone a mile or two from home, we have sometimes heard a bullet whizzing over our head. For months we had reason to apprehend injury by night from the hand of the incendiary. At all hours of the night have we been aroused with tidings of impending danger. But our trust in the good Providence of God has been unshaken; whilst we must admit the inroads which these extraordinary excitements have made upon our constitution.

"Brethren, pray for us."

Providence has now opened out an extensive field for daily preaching in this Circuit. "Faith cometh by hearing," "and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" We are now entering upon our more legitimate work,—that of preaching the Gospel to these perishing, but redeemed, creatures. Who will pray that our labours may be abundantly blessed? We have descended into "the well," who is holding "the rope?" British Methodists *will not, cannot, dare not*, forget those whom their piety and liberality have sent to Feejee. Do you ask us, individually, what each Missionary wants? Our answer is but one, We want the prayer of faith.

The Lakemba Mission.

By the Rev. John Polglase.

Extract of a Letter from the Rev. John Polglase, dated Lakemba, Feejee, April 23d, 1855.

I SEND you an extract from my journal of a visit to the Thithia and Vanuambalavu branches of this Circuit; but it may be proper first to state, that my object, at this time, in going was not so much a visitation of the classes,—for this is not practicable in a Circuit so extensive as Lakemba, with only one Missionary, as it would necessitate his spending too much time away from the Station, and must, therefore, to a great extent, be left with the Native Assistant Missionaries,—as to acquaint myself with the general state of the work, and to inspect the characters and qualifications of the officers employed for carrying it on, being persuaded that if these are right-hearted, and possess the requisite ability, the probability is, that the work, under the Divine blessing, will go on.

Journal,

March 21st, 1855.—I sailed in the Mission canoe for Nayau, fifteen miles distant from Lakemba, and arrived at noon.

Travelling in Feejee is very inconvenient to any but natives, because a person is obliged either to take provisions with him, and apparatus with which to prepare them, or to submit to native fare, which is frequently not cooked in the most cleanly manner, nor does it always present the most tempting aspect when served up. There is no domestic comfort for the Missionary while visiting the out-islands; and he must either encumber himself with bedding, saucepans, plates, knives and forks, and a variety of other articles, or take native accommodation in every respect. A banana-leaf for his plate, one mat serving the threefold purpose of a seat, table, couch; if he has the luxury of a fowl, he has to separate its parts with his fingers; and, after he has dined, the husk of a cocoanut, or a banana-stalk, serves him instead of water and towel. The means of transport are

none of the best. It is trying to a person accustomed to a temperate climate, to sit on a native canoe, under a tropical sun, day after day, until his complexion becomes so changed by the influence of the solar rays, that his friends would scarcely recognise him at first sight. There is also the danger of sailing, for any considerable distance, in so frail a bark. In fine weather it is not very objectionable; but, when stormy, it is far from safe.

In the afternoon I preached, and then met the resident Teachers, in order to get the information I required respecting the state of the work of God. On my return from the chapel, I was pleased at hearing the sound of prayer and thanksgiving going up to the God of families from almost every house. This is a part of religion even with those who have only its form.

22d.—I was fully occupied in meeting the office-bearers, and in examining candidates. And as these duties—in connexion with questioning and instructing candidates for baptism, &c., in those places where there were any whom the Native Assistant Missionaries or Teachers thought proper to recommend to my attention—occupied the principal part of my time in every town I visited, I give, once for all, a brief statement of my proceedings. I examined a Local Preacher on trial; his account of the state of his heart was satisfactory; but his knowledge of our doctrines was not sufficiently intimate to warrant his being fully received. Two men, who had been recommended for trial, were then called in, examined, and, having acquitted themselves creditably, were received. The Leaders then assembled were questioned as to the state of their hearts, and also as to that of their classes, together with their mode of treating, or rather instructing, the individuals under their care, and such remarks were then addressed to them as the circumstances appeared to require. Two of them, being on trial, were interrogated more particularly respecting their knowledge of the plan of salvation, and, having given satisfactory answers, were received as accredited Leaders. Three others, who had been recommended for trial, were then called in, and, having given satisfactory evidence of being saved through faith from the guilt and power of sin, and having also displayed, from the answers they gave to questions proposed, a pretty accurate knowledge of God's method of saving sinners, were accepted. In the afternoon I met the school Teachers, heard them read a portion of Scripture, and questioned them on its principal subjects. They could all read well, but were not adepts at answering questions. We want more efficient agents to instruct them.

23d.—Fastday. I conducted the prayer-meeting in the morning, and then sailed for Thithia, twenty miles from Nayau, and in a direct line from Lakemba. The sun was hot, and, the wind being light, it was three o'clock before we arrived. Moses Mamafainoa, whom you now know by name, was waiting on the beach to receive me, having heard of my coming on the preceding day. After a walk of a mile and a half over a sandy beach, I arrived at the town in which he resides. On entering his house, I was introduced to the principal Chief of the place, and was greeted by as many natives as could well enter, with a shake of the hand in a most Methodistic manner. After which I sat for a quarter of an hour, and received the salutations of those who were outside waiting for an opportunity of manifesting the pleasure they felt on my arrival. They entered the house in a stooping posture,—the Feejeean mode of showing respect,—advanced towards me, shook my hand cordially, and retired in the same manner as they had entered. I had a dinner served up, consisting of two fine fowls and some yam; and, after having partaken of a portion, had the drum beat to assemble the people to the prayer-meeting, which was well attended, and conducted by Moses. After the close of the meeting, I took a walk on the beach, to enjoy my own meditations and the evening breeze.

26th.—Noon. Having finished the duties requiring my attention in this part of the island, which is under the immediate care of Moses, the statistics of which, for the sake of brevity, I omit, I prepared to leave for the residence of the other Teacher. While thus engaged, several people were seen approaching the house, laden with provisions, which were placed at my disposal, and consisted of several baskets of cooked yams, a pot of fish-soup, five or six bunches of bananas, four bundles of sugar-cane, and three baked pigs. This was not the first time that there had been an abundance of such things presented to us during our stay in this place. Indeed, this is where the Feejeean generally errs, and I have frequently been grieved at seeing so much provided; the consequence of which frequently is, that a great deal of these creatures of Divine Providence are thrown away as useless.

After a long and tiresome walk over sand, rocks, and through long grass, I arrived at the house of the Teacher, under whose care are placed two of the towns on this island. I soon obtained a draught of the delicious cocoanut, and felt much refreshed. Our canoe not having arrived, for it had to beat its way outside the reef, I was unable to get a change of clothes, and had, therefore, to sit at work till eight o'clock P.M. in my wet apparel.

27th.—Thankful that I felt no effects from want of dry clothes, I sailed with a fresh breeze for Mango, an island in the Vanuambalavu group, lying forty-six miles north-north-west from Lakemba, where we arrived in the afternoon. The town lies some distance from the landing-place, and the island being elevated around the coast, and depressed at the centre, so that there is no view of the sea from the interior, we were almost about to enter the town before the people were aware of our arrival. To this place a Teacher has been sent since the District-Meeting, and the work of the Lord has prospered in his band. In the evening I met and examined nine candidates for baptism, who not only gave evidence of an acquaintance with the first principles of the doctrine

of Christ; but some of them were living in the possession of the faith which brings pardon and peace to the soul.

28th.—I assembled the people in the chapel, gave a short address on the fall and redemption of man, explained the nature of baptism, and administered the ordinance to those whom I had met the preceding evening, and also to some children, after having explained to the patents their duty with respect to their offspring. All present appeared deeply interested in the service, and, I hope, were profited. At twelve o'clock we again set sail, and steered for Kanathea, at which place we have a hired Local Preacher. The wind being fair, and the island easy of access, it being high-tide, we arrived in three hours. A Somosomo Chief took passage with us, with whom I had some conversation on the subject of Christianity. He is quite favourably disposed to the *lotu*; and if all the Chiefs at Somosomo were so well disposed as himself, I believe we might send Teachers at once. He promised, on his part, to use his influence with them, and I engaged, on mine, to send them Teachers as soon as it was evident that they really desired instruction. The people at Kanathea have embraced the form of Christianity, and have just completed a commodious chapel, entirely at their own expense, at the opening of which I preached in the afternoon. It can scarcely be said that there is a Society formed here, as there are not more than one or two members. The attendance at the opening of the chapel was good. My text was Luke xviii. 9—14; and I think that I never saw people listen more attentively to the word of life. May it be received into good and honest hearts, and bring forth fruit to perfection! On retiring from the chapel, I spoke to the principal Chief, together with some others, and exhorted them to rest in nothing short of the power of religion.

On this island the flies almost dispute possession with the natives; I think in no other place have I seen them so numerous. They are a constant source of annoyance to all, and especially to a stranger, in whatever way he may be employed. I think, however, if the natives kept their houses, and the ground in front of them, cleaner, they would not have so many of these persevering little tormentors.

29th.—I sailed for Vanuambalavu, and arrived at the principal town in the Lomaloma division of the island, and in which Matthias Vave, the Native Assistant Missionary, who has charge of this branch of the Circuit, resides. It being afternoon, and as I was desirous of redeeming time, I met Matthias as soon as possible, obtained the information I required respecting the state of the work of God, and of other matters requiring my attention, and made my arrangements for the prosecution of what lay before me. In the evening I took a walk in the town, and had pointed out to me the scene of the late massacre, to which reference is made in the Report for 1854.

30th.—I went with Matthias to Mualevu, the principal town in the Yaro division of the island. Our path lay along the beach, which for the most part was sandy; and considering the heat of the day, our walk would have been very fatiguing, were it not that there were large trees growing along the shore, which, extending their branches, clad in unfading green, towards the sea, afforded us a cooling shade. During my residence in Feejee, I have more fully felt the force and beauty of such passages as Isai. xxv. 4, than I ever did in England. In such a land as this, "a shadow from the heat" is sought by all. Arrived at the place, and having rested a short time, I began to pursue the object of my visit. During the day I took a walk through the town, and, on my return, was introduced to the Tui Mavana, which is the title of the principal Chief of the place. He was seated under a large tree, his body partially covered with native cloth (*nyatu*); his hair and beard were white, and there was something venerable in his appearance. Since the war of last year, he has become professedly Christian, but is not yet married. I was pleased, however, while in the chapel examining some candidates for baptism, to receive a message from him, expressive of his desire to be married that day, together with several persons of note; but, as this subject had not been previously communicated to the Teachers, and there being nothing definite known with respect to the ladies whom these persons wished to select for their wives, I was under the necessity of sending him word that, as we required time to deliberate on such an important subject, their nuptials could not be solemnized that day, but must be left for Matthias to arrange at a subsequent period. I, however, gave him to understand, that it afforded me great pleasure to know that he was desirous of assuming, in Christian form, such a relation. On returning to the house of the Teacher stationed in this town, I was presented with a stone of an oval shape, weighing perhaps thirty-six pounds, which was stated to have been worshipped as a god, and had a temple dedicated to it. When the people wanted rain, they anointed this stone with oil, supposing that the fruitful shower would, by this means, be produced; but it was not stated that it succeeded. My walk back to the town left in the morning was rather a trying one, as I had to walk over sand and rocks bare-footed, as it was then high-water. We arrived at sunset.

Sunday, April 1st.—I conducted Divine service in the morning. The chapel was crowded, and several remained outside. I baptized thirteen adults, whom I had met the preceding day, together with several children; after which I preached from Mark xvi. 15, 16, and was much pleased, notwithstanding the length of the service, that the interest was kept up to the last; and many appeared deeply affected. In the afternoon I preached again, and administered the sacrament of the Lord's supper to the members of Society.

Through fear of extending this communication to an unpardonable length, I omit the particulars connected

with my visit to the three remaining islands, namely, Thukombia, Munia, and Tuvutha, and will only state, that at twelve o'clock on the night of the 6th instant, we sailed from Tuvutha for Lakemba. The moon shone clearly, but some parts of the heavens were enveloped in clouds. A part of the night was spent in sleep, and a part in gazing at the heavens, the expanse of ocean, and our frail bark; and I was often amused while listening to the natives cheering each other in the performance of their duties. The man holding the sheet-rope would encourage the one at the steer-oar, and the man looking out a-head would stimulate the one baling out the water,—for it must be borne in mind that one, at least, is almost constantly employed in this way in a canoe,—and thus we glided smoothly onwards. At length day appeared, and we found ourselves near Lakemba. The wind having headed us, we had to beat to the landing-place, and arrived at one o'clock P.M., thankful to our heavenly Father for having preserved us during our cruise.

A remark or two may properly close this letter:—

- The state of the work in the islands visited is encouraging. In very few cases had it been necessary to resort to disciplinary measures. The schools, both infant and adult, were reported well of. At Thithia, even the aged and blind go to hear the word of God read; and at Vanuambalavu, several young men, whom I baptized, are making rapid improvement, and will probably soon be appointed as Local Preachers or Class-Leaders, such persons being much needed there.
- The plan of managing this important and extensive Circuit, by the aid of Native Assistant Missionaries, succeeds well. They are men of God, zealous and happy in their work; and the Teachers, of whom they have the oversight,—subject, of course, to the constant inspection of the Missionary,—they regard as brethren, and rule them in a spirit of love.
- It is my firm conviction, as well as that of Mr. Lyth, with whom I frequently conversed on the subject, during the year I was under his superintendence, that this Circuit should be kept entire,—that is, that these men should not be removed from this Circuit,—where the work is comparatively in an advanced state, and a systematic plan of operations introduced, to other parts where there are comparatively few members, and where, consequently, the plans as adopted here cannot yet be carried out,—unless there are other persons found capable of taking their places.

The Nandy Mission.

By the Rev. Samuel Waterhouse.

Extract of a Letter from the Rev. Samuel Waterhouse, dated Nandy, Feejee, November 15th, 1854.

MY last communication addressed to you was forwarded to the colonies last August; since which period many events of importance to us have transpired.

When the "Wesley" visited our Station to land our stores, I was confined to bed by an alarming attack of spasms in the bowels. The treatment of our esteemed but now absent Chairman, Dr. Lyth, with the Divine blessing, gave relief from pain and arrested disease; but for some weeks subsequently I was very weak.

Since this, Mrs. Waterhouse has had another attack of dysentery; but, through the goodness of the Missionaries' God, it yielded to treatment. The climate, however, is still the cause of much suffering to her.

My respected colleague, Rev. J. S. Fordham, with Mrs. Fordham, are, I am glad to say, enjoying as good health as can be anticipated by those who are not climatized. The hot season is now advancing, and they begin to feel more of its enervating influence. About two months ago their first-born son was given to them; and we are thankful that both mother and babe are doing well. It was, however, a time of prayerful anxiety, as no medical assistance or experienced person was available.

Our neighbourhood is still at war, and it is with peculiar feeling that we adopt the prayer, "Give peace in our time, O Lord."

Upon our return from the District-Meeting, we found that eight of our members had, through fear, gone to assist a Heathen Chief, in a hostile attack. Although the majority of them had done no more than aid by their presence, we deemed it our duty, however painful, to expel them from the Society; and this act of discipline will, I trust, be a saving benefit to some of their number. The zest with which these people engage in war may be gathered from a remark made to me by a Christian native who was condemning the conduct of these men. "They ought," he said, "to have endured, and not to have gone. It is true we all love fighting, and each of us would wish to go; but we have to *endure*," (the word used implies *unwelcome endurance*,) "as war is bad and sinful"

The majority of our people refused to engage in this war, and thereby aroused the anger of the Heathen, who were unsuccessful in their attack upon the enemy's town.

They sent us very threatening messages, and prepared to attack us. Our people acted nobly and consistently, following my advice as their Pastor in every respect. On two successive nights we retired to rest, with the fear

that the first sound the morning's dawn would bring, would be the war-shouts of hosts of enemies. Guards were appointed to watch during the night, and in those hours of the holy Sabbath when we were assembled for Divine worship. For two nights I slept with my loaded gun by my bedside, as the number of the Heathen far exceeded that of the Christians; and in the event of the Christians being discomfited and fleeing, we should be left to the tender mercies of the Heathen, who would covet our property, and who neither regard God nor man, when their evil passions are aroused. Not that the Heathen have any personal enmity towards us; so far from that, they ever treat us with kindness when we visit them; but cupidity is one of their ruling passions; they often murder for the sake of realizing a small amount of property; and it is a generally-received truth in Feejee, "When once the club is in motion, none can tell where it will fall, or when it will stop."

A feeling of concern for my beloved partner, which must be experienced to be known, at first took possession of my mind; but whilst cheering the trembling Christians, by reminding them of the ever-gracious providence, and the un-failing promises, of God, I felt that we were

*"As far from danger as from fear,
Whilst Love, Almighty Love, is near."*

O how inexpressible is the consolation we experience in such circumstances, if we can realize that "the Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge!"

The Heathen, however, did not venture to attack us; and soon were, to use an illustration of their own, "filled with fear." Subsequently they sent our people a peace-offering, with expressions of their good-will. There is in my mind a deep impression that this is the result of the moving of an unseen but almighty Power, in answer to prayer. My own heart found sweet solace in prayer, and I cannot but thus recognise the goodness of Him "who heareth prayer."

There remains, however, a strong party, along the coast, who cannot forgive our people for refusing to aid them in war, and whom I cannot visit, as I should thus endanger the lives of my boat's crew. Our people have been warned that in several towns "the club is hanging up with which they are to be killed." You will from this be able to judge of some of the trials to which we are exposed, and how desirable it is that we should be remembered at the mercy-seat.

We have been cheered by seeing a few instances of religious awakening, and several Heathen have bowed the knee to the one living and true God. Much patience and long-continued and oft-repeated instruction is necessary to the removal of the prejudice and darkness of the Heathen mind, before Heathenism is renounced; and that event appears generally brought about by some arrangement of Providence, after this course of enlightenment.

Since I last wrote, four women in our neighbourhood have been saved from strangling, directly by our influence, or that of our people. But, whenever I speak of this, my heart prompts me to recognise the succour and assistance of the ever-blessed God, and to give unto him the glory which is so eminently his due.

Allow me to add an extract from my journal, which will present you with an illustration of the nature of our work, and an evidence of the deep depravity of those among whom we labour. It also, to my mind, exhibits the fear existing in the Heathen mind, of the influence of Christianity, when brought to bear upon the fiend-worthy practice of strangling widows; as in this case, the coming of that influence was anticipated.

"Sept. 30th.—Across the beautiful bay, by the side of which the Mission-premises are situated, is a small Heathen village. It is not more than a mile distant; and, looking across the blue waters, the eye can distinguish the houses. Being so near, I have often visited and urged the Chief and people to *lotu*. This morning, tidings were brought that the Chief of this town was ill; that yesterday *his wife was strangled by her brother* IN ANTICIPATION OF THE HUSBAND'S DEATH; and that now preparations were being made for *suffocating the man himself* Without a moment's delay, I despatched a party of influential natives by land, whilst I proceeded with others in the boat. The lads pulled with their utmost vigour, as they did not know but that life or death might be suspended upon the promptitude of our arrival. After landing, we had to walk about a quarter of a mile, part of the way being a steep ascent, and soon reached the town. I found the man alive, and far stronger than I expected. He was sitting up and conversing with his friends, whilst the grave in which he and his wife were to be laid was being dug. The Chief who had come to suffocate him was sitting by his side. I presented him with a whale's tooth, and urged him to desist from his intention. I reminded him of that God who hears the cry of blood; told him that the man might recover; and begged him to allow me to take the sick man with me and attend to him. I said, if he remained he would die, and if I removed him, he could no more than die; and that was the point they were aiming at. The Chief at once consented, and we constructed a litter upon which to carry him to the boat. Whilst the people were doing this, I went into the house in which the corpse was lying. The woman was not above twenty-eight years of age; her face was blackened, but there was no distortion of

features. She seemed as if asleep, being in perfect health when the fatal cord was tied. There was none of that peculiar stiffness or chilly clammy feel with which death is associated in a colder clime. By her side were seated her three young but now orphanless children, and at a little distance was seated the *brother who had imbrued his hands with his sister's innocent blood*. Yes! there he sat with a smile of complacency and heartfelt satisfaction! Exultation was written on his countenance! I spoke very faithfully to him; but his mind was so dark and ignorant, that he was at first unconcerned. But, as I presented to his attention the solemn and awful truths of God's word, his indifference abated, and his countenance changed. The women with which the house was filled listened with deep attention. They spoke with gratitude of our labours to save their fellows; and I reminded them that it was only by embracing Christianity that they could hope for deliverance from the same awful and cruel fate.

"When the litter was prepared, the sick man was brought out, and was suddenly seized with faintness, which I feared was the harbinger of death. After a while he recovered. He was very desirous of life; very anxious to accompany us. Four natives then carried him on the litter to the beach. We had to pass in front of the house in which lay his strangled wife, and also the open grave waiting for its prey. In descending the hill, the natives had a very difficult task; but they endured nobly. Unencumbered as I was, I could hardly preserve my balance. On reaching the water's brink, we lay the man down to rest a little. The boat was brought in, and we were preparing to lift him in, when he complained of faintness, stretched himself out, gave one long gasp, and died!

"His wife was thus prematurely strangled, in order that no opportunity might be given of our proceeding to her rescue. *She was strangled secretly by her brother!* Some of the Heathen Chiefs expressed their displeasure at her early death, which was *an infraction of their customs*; and they begin, I hope, to see the sinfulness and unprofitableness of strangling widows."

The Vewa Mission.

By Mrs. Wilson.

Extract of a Letter from Mrs. Wilson, dated Vewa, Feejee, April 16th, 1855.

From England to the Friendly Islands.

WE had a most agreeable voyage to Auckland in the good ship "Artemesia," and, after a pleasant sojourn there of five or six weeks, re-embarked in the "John Wesley." A run of seven days brought us to Tongatabu, where we parted with Mr. and Mrs. Vercoe, who went at once to reside at Hihifo, on that island. After spending two or three days, and calling on King George, we went on to Haabai, stayed a day or two with Mr. West's pleasant family, and then repaired to the District-Meeting at Vavau. Amid the lovely scenery of this island we passed five weeks, while the vessel took Mr. Amos to visit the outer islands. We were much pleased with the large and orderly and devout congregations we saw at all these places. Christianity has evidently made a great change in these people. After having seen Feejee and felt the contrast, we look back on Tonga as a comparatively Christian and civilized land.

School at Ovalau.

The return of the "John Wesley" was the signal for our departure, and we parted from our kind host and hostess with no small regret; and on the 9th of July, 1854, hailed the shores of Feejee with strangely mingled feelings. At Lakemba, we spent but a few hours, took up Messrs. Lyth and Polglase, and proceeded to Vewa, to attend the District-Meeting. And here our wanderings ended, for this has been our Station for the year, with Mr. Calvert: though we have paid short visits to Nandy and Bua on the Vanua-Levu, and the large and beautiful isle of Ovalau, where Mr. Binner, the schoolmaster, is located. He lives at Livuka, where the white men reside; and though they obstinately reject the truth, and choose to live after the dictates of their own wicked hearts, yet, among their wives and children, Mr. Binner is very useful. We spent a morning in his school; there were a hundred and ten children present, nearly all half-castes. The instruction is conveyed through the medium of Feejeean, (for that is their mother-tongue,) and evidently is an exercise for their intellectual faculties, and not a mere test of memory.

Murder at Nandy.

Mr. and Mrs. Fordham, our fellow-voyagers, are stationed at Nandy, with Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Waterhouse. We heard the other day of the opening of two new chapels in that Circuit, and of the general

spread of Christianity in that dark neighbourhood. While we visited them, a woman was murdered, because they expected the death of her husband, and feared the interference of the Missionary if the strangling were delayed till the usual time. The murder of their unborn children is fearfully common throughout the group. The degraded condition of the women is one of the saddest features of Heathenism in this land: they are given away in marriage to whomsoever the Chief pleases, without any concern for the wishes of the woman; if she has taken the liberty of giving her heart to some one else, and will not submit to the will of the Chief, she runs away to another town, from which the Chief and his party will probably attempt to bring her by force; and here is a frequent source of Feejeean wars. But, worse still; they lend them to ships for some paltry consideration, and give or sell them to foreigners living among them to abuse at their vile pleasure. The influence of Christianity does away with the worst of these evils; but it will require time and instruction to raise these poor creatures to their proper level.?

H.M.S. "HERALD," AND CAPTAIN DENHAM.

H.M.S. "Herald" was at Ovalau in November last; and as we were there at that time, we had the pleasure of spending a day on board with Captain Denham, and were charmed with his urbanity and kindness. They have thoroughly surveyed that island, and the surrounding reefs and waters; and went back to Sydney by way of Solomon's Isles. We are now expecting their return. Captain Denham came up to Bau in one of the ship's boats, and visited Thakombau, and stayed a few days at Vewa.

Progress of Events.

Recent events in Feejee are full of interest, as they are likely to exercise an important influence on its political history, and on the spread of religion. A year ago to-day, Thakombau, the notorious Chief of Bau, embraced Christianity, with many of his people. He has since been remarkably consistent, sparing the lives of his enemies when they were completely in his power, sending back the bodies of those slain in war, decently wrapped in mats, to be buried by their friends, constantly striving after peace, and urging all to become Christians. He had been brought very low by the revolt of many of his towns; and his most formidable enemy, the King of Rewa, was boasting that he would soon eat him, when death stopped the boaster's mouth. Ratu N'Gara, this King of Rewa, had been building a temple, making presents to the Priests, and trying in every way to please the gods, that they might give Thakombau into his hands. The Mission had just been re-established: he had again heard the truth, had refused to receive it, preferring to put his trust in lying vanities. God would not be mocked, and took him away in his sin. Many in Rewa have since embraced Christianity, and they have made peace with Bau. The Popish Priests are there; but the people seem to think that system little better than their old Heathenism; and, by the last accounts, have deliberately preferred Protestantism. King George's visit, so long expected, is now paid, and is likely to contribute much to the settlement of affairs in Feejee. A canoe which he sent to Ovalau was fired upon without provocation by a party of natives and half-castes, instigated by Mara, a Chief who has rebelled against Thakombau. George called on him to explain; he refused, resisted, and the town of Kambah was attacked and burnt; but the Chief escaped. He is following him up, while he does his utmost to save life and prevent fighting. The result of the whole, up to the present, is, that several towns have hastened to make peace with Bau, and to embrace Christianity, as the security for peace. But these matters are still pending; and, while we anxiously watch the progress of events, we wonderingly admire the manifestations of God's wisdom, in promoting his own cause by *all* means.

Extract from the Journal of Mrs. Wilson,

Addressed to Her Father, the Rev. Peter M'owan.

JAN. 27th, 1855.—We have just heard of the death of Ratu Ngara, the ruling Chief of Rewa, and one of the heads of the party against Thakombau; perhaps, for determined hostility, *the* head. Nothing could save him. Mr. and Mrs. Moore did their very utmost, by suitable food and medicine, to arrest the disease; but his own obstinacy and folly combined to hasten this fatal catastrophe. He persisted in laying aside the warm covering which had been given him, and lying in the draught in the very crisis of his illness. He has gone to learn, as we fear, in the everlasting endurance of His wrath, that verily there is a God that judgeth in the earth.

Feb. 11th.—On Friday night we received news that Mr. and Mrs. Moore, and their two little ones, had arrived in Bau, houseless, homeless, and almost without clothing, their new wooden house having been reduced to ashes, and they having escaped in the dead of the night, in their night dresses. It appears to have been set on fire by some ill-disposed persons. We had all been rejoicing that day in the prospect of peace between Rewa

and Bau; for messages had been exchanged, and peace-offerings accepted. All the Bau and Rewa flags had floated in the breeze, native drums had been beaten all the day long, and our nicely-toned Vewa bell had rung in honour of the glad occasion. But evening fell and brought its dolorous news, warning us to rejoice with trembling. But, though this is a drawback and discouragement, yet it is only like the shade in the hopeful picture which the Rewa Mission presents. We view it as the last impotent effort of diabolical rage and malice to hinder that which he cannot now hope to prevent,—the overthrow of idolatry in Rewa, and the establishment of the worship of the true God.

At the death of Ratu Ngara, though an exceedingly powerful Chief, but two women were strangled, and only three little fingers cut off. Some few burnt their faces and their bodies; but when Mr. Moore and Mr. Calvert spoke to some women who had fixed a day on which they were to cry and burn their persons as a sign of respect for the dead, and requested them not to do so, but to mourn as Christians, they replied that people would say they had no love for the dead. "Tell us," said the Missionaries, "do you feel love to the dead when you do such things?" "No, indeed," answered they, "but much hatred and anger that he should cause us such pain in mourning for him." Thus they were persuaded not to follow the custom. On the Sabbath after Ratu Ngara's death, twenty women and two men *lotued*: there was to have been a general *lotu*; but Mr. Moore's misfortune will delay it for a week. The seed of life has truly been sown in tears; but not the less certain or joyous will be the harvest.

While the Chief was ill, many intimated that Mr. Moore's medicine was killing him, and threatened, that, if he died, the Missionary's life should be the forfeit; so the week after was a time of fear and peril. But God was their shield, and made even their enemies to be at peace with them. Then, on the night of the fire, they did not know, for some time, whether they would not be clubbed the next moment; for a party of blackened men with spears and clubs seized Mrs. Moore, and forcibly dragged her from the burning house. They proved to be friendly; but their kindness certainly assumed a suspicious aspect. Of course, we have all contributed what we could to supply their necessities until stores can be procured from the colonies. The people saved some boxes, but only for themselves; so that Mrs. Moore has the mortification to see her nice things worn and spoiled by these greedy Heathens.

March 22d.—Mr. Moore arrived from Ovalau and Rewa yesterday; he brings good news of the progress of religion at Rewa. Two of the "eyes of the land," old men to whom the land belongs, and who are consulted by the ruling Chief on all occasions, have bowed in worship to the true God. One of their Chief Priests announced a dream which he had had. He saw the gods of Rewa and the neighbourhood sitting together low down, and he saw, also, the God of the *lotus*, very great and high,—so high that he saw only the lower parts: His head was hidden in the clouds. "This," said he, "is the great God, the only true God." Did not He whose throne is high and lifted up, and around whom are clouds and darkness, send this dream to lead on this Heathen Priest, and through him the people of Rewa, to the truth? Another told them that the gods had met together, to consult what was to be done about this new religion. "It grows and grows, and rises and rises," said they: "what shall we do." They agreed they would not hinder it; but they had better wait and see the result. At a meeting of the Chiefs of the people, to decide whether they should embrace Popery, or Christianity as taught by our Missionaries, they determined that all should follow the religion of the Missionary,— "and as for the few who will not *lotu*, we will *eat them*" Remember that this resolution was carried at an assembly of *Heathens*, who wished to express, in the strongest way they could, the firmness of their resolution. A young lady of very high rank, the niece of the late King, lately professed Popery; and no doubt the Priests congratulated themselves on so important a convert, for she is married to the present young Chief. But short has been their rejoicing; she says she will give it up and worship with the Missionary, and that she only *lotued* with the Priest for *waekata kata*,—literally, "hot water," i.e., tea. If matters go on in this way, I should think the Abbe Mathieu will have to run away, and confess himself foiled.

The Tonguese fleet made its appearance yesterday in our waters. There are about forty canoes, most of them large, carrying one hundred men, it is said.

March 14th.—Mary Wallis, the chier lady of Vewa, visited the baby to-day. Were I to speak the plain truth, I should call her the *chief beggar* of Vewa, for she is inveterate. For example, she came three days after baby's birth to beg a dress; that is, new print for one, as she has had several lately. Mrs. Calvert thought it necessary to refuse her. She then asked to see baby, but that was impracticable, for I was too weak to be disturbed; so, to keep her in good temper, Mrs. Calvert gave her a large bundle of *dalo* that was in the room. *Dalo* is an edible root of a species of areca; she accepted it, and asked whether it would not be good for her to have the *little* bundle too. My lady got it, and went away without the slightest perceptible gratitude. This is the lady who, when her husband died, resolved to starve herself; but Mrs. Wallis (see "Life in Feejee") saved her life by persuading her to eat.

June 8th.—The proceedings of the Tonguese have caused important changes in our prospects, and they seem to have been used by Providence in a remarkable manner to bring down the pride of the lofty, and to raise

the low, so that all might be prepared for peace.

Mr. Wilson, who can now preach to the natives in their own tongue with comfort, has been at Vungalai, to be present at the giving of offerings to ratify peace between that town and some neighbouring ones, with whom it had been at war. In this way several of the minor differences and grounds of quarrel between towns have been lately settled. Their petty wars have kept the people poor, by preventing the cultivation of the land. The paths being forsaken through fear, become so overgrown by the luxuriant vegetation, that they are almost lost.

King George of the Friendly Islands, and his little son, eleven years old, dined with us last week. He has come to see Thakombau, and take home a canoe which the Chief gave to him, when in the islands before. By a train of un-avoidable and unforeseen circumstances, he has been brought into collision with the enemies of Bau, and has conquered several towns, while others have hastened to submit themselves. As the unvarying advice of both George and Thakombau to all is, that they should become Christians for the maintenance of peace, it seems as if all things were tending to the advance of religion. George is a sensible, intelligent, thoughtful man, who values human life, and does not rashly engage in an enterprise without considering the result of his actions.

London: Printed by James Nichols, Boxton-Square.
The Social, Political, and Moral Aspects, of Popery.
Speech of the
Rev. Hugh Stowell, M.A.,
Hon. Canon of Chester,
At the
Eighteenth
Annual Meeting of Protestant Association,
Held in Exeter Hall, May 11, 1853,
R. C. L. Bevan, Esq., in the Chair.
London: Published by the Protestant Association, AT THE OFFICE, 6, SERJEANTS' INN, FLEET STREET;
And May be had of all Booksellers.
Price Twopence, or Twelve Shillings per Hundred.

The Social, Political, and Moral Aspects of Popery.

MR. BEVAN, and my fellow Protestants, it was my privilege last evening to bring before a solemn and attentive audience the spiritual aspect of the Romish controversy, and to prove that no man can be loyal to Christ who is not antagonistic to antichrist: that no man who knows the Gospel as "the power of God unto salvation," and knows Popery effectually, and as she is, can he savingly possessed of "the truth as it is in Jesus," unless he abhors 'the lie as it is in Trent.' My object this morning will be to take you more to the social, political, and moral aspects of Popery; but ere I do so will you bear with me if I just correct one little mistake of a preceding speaker, and if I just explain one little interruption? First, then, it was not Lord Grey, but Colonel Charles Grey whose name was appended to the letter of acknowledgment with which I was favoured in the case of the Sermon sent to her gracious Majesty. We needed no indication—and perhaps it would be too much to interpret it as such—we needed no indication whatever to convince us that the heart that throbs in the breast of Queen Victoria is full of the blood that flowed in the veins of old George the Third, her noble grandfather, who would have laid aside his crown, and forsaken his palace, and betaken him to some lowly cottage, as a humble and retired subject of the realm, rather than he would break his Coronation oath, as he deemed it, by signing such a Bill as that of 1829. I feel that I owe also an explanation of the slight interruption which I ventured to make to the speech of my dear friend Mr. Bickersteth—a worthy name, and worthily represented; and may he long tread in the footsteps of his beloved and sainted uncle, not only in the amplitude of his catholicity but his abhorrence of the bigotry of Rome! I called him to order for designating a certain scarletly-attired man a cardinal in her Majesty's dominions. My reason for doing so was, that if her Majesty's Executive do not see fit to enforce the laws of the land, we her Majesty's subjects will at least obey them ourselves. The title of Cardinal, as given to a subject of our beloved Protestant Queen by a foreign usurping Potentate, has never been recognized or legalized by the laws of England, and until it has been, I, as a loyal man, and a lover of order and of the glorious constitution of our country, will never pollute my hps or defile my pen by writing or speaking of the intruder as anything else than simple Dr. Wiseman. If he complain of the discourtesy he has the remedy in his own hands; let him betake himself to the source from which his muddy honours come—the Banks of the Tiber. His absence will .be more welcome to Protestant England than his presence; and I would move that her

Majesty's Government should charter a steamer to land him at his own place. And as I cannot recognize his usurped title neither can I recognize the usurped title of his co-fraternity; and I must say, it is little to the credit, the sagacity or the vigilance of the Protestant press of England that it should have lent its endorsement to those fictitious titles and illegal claims for territorial jurisdiction within our beloved land, when there is actually a law prohibiting the assumption or the use of those titles. I would therefore entreat my reverend brethren and my lay friends, and the gentlemen of the press, and all the Protestants of England, to ignore utterly and absolutely the title of Dr. Wiseman and every bishop who claims territorial jurisdiction in this land. This is not a slight matter, Romanists know well the value of names, and the importance of familiarizing our ears to their usurpations, so that by getting in the thin edge of the wedge they may drive it home, till at last they split up our Constitution, and cause it to fall in pieces.

It has been asked, and I dare say may be asked again, to what purpose are these your Protestant gatherings? You bring together a large multitude, you excite them, you animate them, you stimulate them, and to a certain extent you inform them; but where is the issue and the upshot? I answer, that if there were no further upshot than to inform their minds and intensify their spirits on the great subject of common Protestantism, very much would be done for the preservation of that Protestantism and the resistance of its great antagonist. For, let me remind you, we live in a country so entirely free, I had almost said, that public opinion, right or wrong, rules us. You must get right opinion to rule, and then we cannot be too free; get wrong opinion to rule, and we lose our freedom in grasping at the shadow.

Now, Mr. Bevan, let me just point out the mighty power of enlightened, determined Protestant opinion. Look at it in the case of the poor released Madiai. We are not going to forget the Madiai. No, no. Though they are set free, we will emblazon their names on our Protestant banner, and we will say, when we are told of the love and tenderness of the Church of Rome, "Look at those poor fettered prisoners, and remember their sin." Their sin? Reading the Word of God, and daring to tell others of the peace it had given them and of the grace they had found. Oh! for more such rebels! May there be rebels in every land that dares to prohibit the Word of God! If it is rebellion against the Pope it is loyalty to the King of kings. And pray, what set the Madiai free? God's gracious interposition supremely. But what instrumentally? Was it any relenting on the part of the Vatican? Was it any faltering on the part of the Cardinals? Was it any change of mind in the poor, earnest, honest, devout, but pliant tool, the Duke of Tuscany? He was only the cat's-paw used by crafty cardinals to answer their own end and purpose. His confessor told him to do it; and he dare not but do what his confessor bade him. What then loosed the chains, what opened the prison doors, and set them free? The Protestant opinion of Protestant England expressed through a free press, uttered on a thousand platforms, echoed from a thousand pulpits, caught up within the walls of our national assemblies, taken up by excellent Christian noblemen and gentlemen, like my Lord Roden and my Lord Cavan, and Captain Trotter—men whose names are embalmed in the hearts of Englishmen; for England is never ungrateful to a public man, much less a nobleman, who does his duty; and there are no men so popular at this moment as the Protestant noblemen who do their duty. Need I mention my Lord Shaftesbury? Need I mention my Lord Roden? Need I mention my Lord Cavan? Need I mention that lovely character, the Marquis of Cholmondeley? Need I mention such names? No; English Protestantism is not ungrateful to its champions. Need I mention the name of that hoary veteran, Richard Spooner, who dares to stand with his "grey hairs, a crown of glory," because "found in the way of righteousness?" There, amid all the storm and hooting and disapprobation of the Irish brigade, and of the combined latitudinarianism and liberalism that may be found in the House of Commons—there he is with his simple reply, 'It is truth, it is truth,' fixed as he is in the love of truth. It was the free expression of Protestant opinion in England, caught up in Holland, caught up in Sweden, caught up in Denmark, echoed back from Prussia, sent across the Atlantic, returning in thunders from our beloved Protestant child the noble United States—it was this mighty sound that gathered round the Vatican, and pealed like thunder in the ears of its trembling tyrants, and caused them to say, 'Let these poor, petty, Madiai get free; it makes such an uproar that there is more danger in holding them than in letting them go.'

Therefore, Mr. Bevan, if Protestant enlightened public opinion told mightily in that case, it can tell mightily in other cases. And here I will tell you a little secret, my fellow Protestants. It was debated—and I had it from one who was present—at the house of one of the cardinals, at his table, where the head of the Jesuits and the grand Inquisitor were present—it was debated what they should do when England would be theirs; and they expressed no doubt that it would be theirs ultimately. Ah! but there is a third person to be consulted there; there is the mighty nation of Protestant England to be consulted; and while we have a heart to throb, or a head to think, or a hand to move, never shall England belong to the Vatican! But there was one present more crafty than the rest—the head of the Jesuits—and he suggested that it were better to inquire, what are the difficulties and dangers in the way? The difficulties and dangers were referred to this astute man, and he with his usual craft and cunning thus dilated upon them: 'You have very little to fear from the Aristocracy of England: they are for the most part so enervated by luxury and so enamoured by rank that you have only to show them, as you easily

can, that the Catholic church will endorse their position and maintain their titles and prestige and rank, and they will welcome you as deliverers and defenders.' It is a libel on a large portion of the noble Aristocracy of England! But let that pass. 'You have as little to fear,' said he, 'from the Church of England, for we have got our faithful little party within her bosom, and they will do the work we have given them to do.' We have had proof this morning that they are doing their work; and the fact Mr. Bickersteth mentioned is pregnant with meaning, and I must say that unless Dr. Pusey and his friends clear themselves from all misprision of Jesuitism we shall have reason to suspect every man who is for dragging the abominable confessional of Rome into the Church of England, or bringing back the idolatry of the host—we shall have reason to suspect that man of having matriculated in the Protestant University in order to do the work of the Vatican. But he added still further: 'We have very little to fear from the monied interest'—hear it bankers and merchants and stockbrokers of this great metropolis!—'for,' said he, 'they are so enamoured of Mammon, so alive only to their fiscal interests, that you have only to keep up the funds, and take care not to disturb trade, and they will care very little whether St. Stephens or the Vatican is in the ascendancy, if only they have got plenty of money.' Now, though that may be true of some—and I regret to say that we are a mammonized nation to a fearful extent—I am sure it is not true of such men as Sir John Dean Paul, I am sure it is not true of our excellent Chairman, I am sure it is not true of a glorious galaxy of our princely merchants, who would not only give the last farthing in their banks or their safes for Protestantism, but the last drop of blood in their veins. 'But,' said the crafty counsellor, 'we have but one great danger, and but one;' and that arose from what he was pleased to designate, 'the mob,' the English mob, meaning the humbler and the middle classes, the intelligent artisans and the lower classes of Protestant England; 'for,' said he, John Bull has got such a horror of Popery, as he calls it, that if you only set a red rag before the animal on a thorn bush, and he will get into such a rage, that he will run and gore it, and turn everything upside down in his terror of the phantom of his own creation. Therefore,' said he, 'whatever you do, take care you do not rouse the monster too soon; get him safely in your toils, get your net about him before you rouse him; then let him bellow and roar as he may.'

Now his fear is, under God, our hope. If the public opinion of the intelligent middle and lower classes of England is the danger that Popery sees a-head, let us increase the danger every way we can. Yes, let us inform that public opinion, let us organize it, let us keep it up to high pressure. Some men are afraid of our carrying this too far. I have no fear of it. No, no; Protestantism never persecuted but when she had just got out of the slough of Rome, and carried a little of the mire along with it; true Protestantism is too full of Jove to Christ and goodwill toward men to burn one hair of the head even of the persecutor; it teaches us to bless those that curse us, and "pray for those that despitefully use us and persecute us." The Protestant opinion of the middle classes of England is, under God, the hope of England. My dear friends, we have too long trusted to public men. Sometimes we were glad when Sir Robert Peel came into office; then we were glad when Lord Derby came into office; and then some were glad when Lord Aberdeen came into office. For my part, I have ceased to be glad of any man coming into office. I must see the man's measures when he is in power, not his professions when he is out of power. I must see how far he will follow the dictates of what appeared to be his principles before he was minister—how far he will follow them after he has got into that intoxicating atmosphere, and reached that giddy height. It seems to me, Sir, that some men leave their consciences with their cloaks when they go into the House of Commons, and put aside their old honored principles when they put on the robes of office. There are some Protestants whom I could wish to see in power. Oh! that we had such men as Lord Shaftesbury, such men as the Earl of Harrowby, such men as Mr. Spooner, such men as Mr. Napier—men, who, I believe, have their hearts in the right place in Protestant matters. But, my dear friends, I would not trust even them with the ark of our common Protestantism; we won't let it go out of our own hands, out of our own keeping, out of our own power; but, trusting in God we will protect it ourselves; we will gather round it and shelter it with our hearts; and we will tell any statesman and all statesmen, any Parliament and all Parliaments—'You shall not betray our Protestantism; rather will we lay down our lives in its defence,' Yes, my Christian friends, we must organize our Protestant energy and our Protestant effort. Thank God, it is being done: in the North of England a new organization has been formed, in Leeds there is another, in Newcastle there is another, in Sunderland there is another, in Bishop Wearmouth there is another, and in Darlington we are forming another. The whole of the North of England is being organized. Organize the South of England; organize the West of England, my reverend brethren. Let every minister do his duty; let him protestantize his school and his parish Organize the whole body of the people. Let us have a little band in every county and in every parish. Bring the whole Protestantism of England into one focus, and where is the minister that can withstand it? where is the Parliament that will not quail before it? We only want justice. We want not to oppress Romanists, but only to hinder Romanists from oppressing us. But, Mr. Bevan, we must have some definite objects in view. Let me bring them before you in detail as briefly and as clearly as I can.

First of all, then, we must have the Acts of Parliament that are in existence made effectual and carried into operation. There is nothing that so encumbers a tree, and hinders the growth of its foliage and its fruit, as pieces

of dead timber. Take a pruning knife, and cut them off, and the tree will revive. So is it with the tree of our constitution. There is nothing so dangerous as dead law, obsolete law, effete law. What abuses have not accumulated for want of carrying out the law! They are, in many respects, the best laws that are the best carried out: the best laws in themselves are worthless if not put into operation. The executive, therefore, makes or mars the law in the long run. Now, we have a great deal of law bearing upon Rome that is mere dead law, law that is never carried out. There is a law requiring that all Jesuits should be registered in England—that no Jesuit should be allowed in England after a time long gone by. Why is this law not carried out? Why are not the laws against Jesuits put in force? Are we not a laughing-stock to other nations when they behold this Protestant country deliberately enacting laws which she has not the courage to carry out? It is said, 'The Jesuits will elude you—they will assume another guise—who can find out or catch a Jesuit?' Why, we have policemen very clever and crafty; they manage to catch clever thieves and housebreakers and pickpockets in your metropolis; and I think if they were put on the trail of these spiritual thieves and conspirators they would find them out too. But even if we could not prevent covert Jesuitism we could prevent overt Jesuitism. The Jesuits have no right to build colleges, as they do, as Jesuit colleges. Look at the college at Stonyhurst, and the college of St. Ignatius at Liverpool, the foundation-stone of which was laid by the late Daniel O'Connell, avowedly as a Jesuit college. Where is our English determination that our laws shall not be a dead letter? England stultifies herself, weakens her moral force, by allowing her laws to lie inoperative. If a poor man brought into the dock and condemned for stealing, were to say to the judge, 'I do not deny that I am guilty, I do not deny that I ought to be transported, and that the law ought to be enforced; but let there be evenhanded justice: why do you enforce the law against me, and not against the Jesuits,' I think her Majesty's representative would feel exceedingly perplexed and puzzled by the question; and if the poor man were sent back to prison, and his sentence kept in abeyance until the law was enforced against the Jesuits it would be more like evenhanded justice than by drawing this distinction between the crafty and the simple, the rich and the poor, the mighty and the impotent. Why should we act thus? Is it because Jesuitism is strong and we are unable to grapple with it? Our fear is our peril. Jesuitism is bold when we are cowardly, it is cowardly when we are bold. Face it—it is a poltroon; fly from it—it is a hound at your heels.

But there is another point more important still—we must follow out the noble enterprize of emancipating the oppressed nuns of England. Mr. Bowyer or Dr. Wiseman may mystify and disguise the matter as they will; but so long as there are close nunneries with gates bolted and barred, and their walls protected, as I saw in one instance, with something that looked very much like spikes, Englishmen have too much common sense and too much resentment of wrong and injustice not to say, 'If they are free, open your doors; if they are happy, they won't run out.' This is simple logic; it is putting the matter to a practical issue; and if they want to put down the Protestant agitation, or calumny, as they are pleased to designate it,—if they want to avert further legislation on the subject, then I say, 'Forestal us; open your doors; throw open your barred windows that we may hear the sweet notes of their happiness within.' Depend upon it their sweet notes are like the notes of the caged lark that sings amid its wires, but they lack that elasticity and freshness of the notes of the lark that sings in the bright blue sky. You have only to open the lark's cage to prove that it has not lost its love of liberty, and become enamoured of its wires: throw open that little wicket, and see how it springs into the air and mounts to the blue sky above. So may it be with these poor caged birds, these nuns in the closed nunneries, whose spirits are broken, whose sigh is only heard in heaven, or by those who have no heart to respond to it. Open the doors, and I will venture to say they will come forth and soar in the air of heaven. But we are told those bars and bolts are to keep out Protestants, and not to keep in nuns. I can only say that the men who use such arguments have good reason to fear lest Protestants should say, 'You judge of us by yourselves.' For, depend upon it, Englishmen do not break into ladies' schools. There are plenty in the neighbourhood of London, plenty in the neighbourhood of Clifton, and in all parts of the kingdom, but I never saw one with high walls and grated windows, and spiked battlements. No, no, if we do not break into Protestant schools we should not break into Popish nunneries. Ah! fellow Protestants, there is a nearer and more touching and more thrilling question than this. Are we to have, under the pretended name of Protestantism, nunneries for our own daughters? Mr. Chambers stated that we have a hundred

Mr. Chambers has explained this in a letter to the "Times" of the sixteenth of May, in which the following occurs: "After stating that by Roman Catholic returns, there appeared to be seventy-five convents in England and Wales in connection with that Church, I said that we had no returns as to Anglo-Catholic and other conventual institutions, but that I thought it would be safe to estimate the numbers altogether (that is, including the Roman Catholic) at not less than a hundred. I was misunderstood as affirming that a hundred existed, excluding the Roman Catholic convents."

Protestant nunneries—I cannot believe it—I believe if he had said ten it would have been nearer the mark; but if the number is only ten it is ten too many; nay, if there were only one there would be one too many. I do not mean to say that there may not be assemblages of Christian females choosing to live together, and to go

about on errands of kindness—I do not find fault with Romish nunneries on that ground, but I find fault with their being closed up and secret. But of all the nunneries in the world the most inconsistent, the most intolerable, are Protestant nunneries adopting Popish practices and Popish rules, and yet pretending to belong to the Church of England. I do not hesitate to say that our bench of bishops owe it to the public feelings of this country, to the Christian spirit of their clergy, to the whole people of this free land, that they should examine this matter, and if they find there are such nunneries that they should put them down, or turn out of the church the clergy who persist in upholding them. If they say the existing law will not enable them to do this, then we should at once go to Parliament for a law that will enable them; and if they do not do it then, we should go to Parliament and ask it to compel the bishops to do their duty. But I will not believe it of our Bench of Bishops. I believe it is in the hearts of most of them—oh! that I could say all of them—to put a stop to such things; but let it be known who are for and who are against them. Let the two or three who support such things stand out and be pilloried before this Protestant land for their sympathy with such horrible institutions as close nunneries in the Church of England. This is indeed a thrilling and touching topic. We cannot but feel it as fathers; we cannot but feel it as men. Of all oppression the oppression of woman is the worst. Our hearts burn when we read reports in the police courts of a husband beating and bruising the wife whom he ought to cherish—being the tyrant and the terror of her whom he ought to protect from every harm, and every breath of evil. This fills us with righteous indignation; but it is not so bad as the exposure of those poor nuns, shut up in popish nunneries, to the irresponsible tyranny of some old woman and some bachelor priest or two—who shall tell what passes within? They say, 'call in the police; if there is a case of oppression bring it before the magistrate.' But who shall report it? Some bird of the heaven? Some secret whispering voice? Some vision of the night? Some spirit or phantom of the air? Who else can do it? Can the poor nun herself? Will those that oppress her? Are they not leagued together? Open the doors! Such tyranny should never be tolerated. It is wrong on principle. I would trust no man living with irresponsible power—I would not trust an archangel with it. There is but one Being in the universe who can be trusted with irresponsible power; and that Being can be trusted with it because as He is infinite in power He is infinite in truth and grace and love. It is no creature that can be trusted with irresponsible power, certainly not a hoary-headed lady abbess, soured by age, embittered by bondage, revenging her own slavery upon the victims to her power; less still a bachelor priest who has had all the loving affections of his nature curdled up in his own bosom by a wretched constrained celibacy that alienates him from his kind, that makes him everywhere an exile, without a home, without endearing affections, without fond social ties—no tie but his church, no home but Rome. These are the characters to whom these poor nuns are consigned. My dear friends, I am not speaking unadvisedly. I never pass a popish priest without feeling an instinctive kind of shrinking—not from the man as a man—he is no worse than I am by nature, and if I differ, truth and grace have made me to differ—not as my fellow-sinner or my fellow-countryman do I shrink from him, but as an impersonation of that horrible system that makes it a virtue to subvert our liberties, and a duty to be alien to all that we love and value. Depend upon it, the popish priesthood are the most dangerous body of men that walk the face of the world. There is no body of men from whom the laity have so much to fear. They hold that men were made for priests, that you laymen are only made to be the scaffolding on which they are to mount, that they may stand on your heads, and live as demigods in the midst of the world. Ah! lay friends, take care of that great conspiracy, the priesthood; take care of hierarchical combination and aggression; take care of priestly pride and ambition, whether it is in the Church of England, or in the Wesleyan body, or in the Presbyterian body, or in the Baptist body, or in the Independent body—wherever it is, watch against priestcraft, for it is a crying evil and a fearful mischief. We are all of us "men of like passions with yourselves;" we need to pray for ourselves, and you need to pray for us, that we may not be tempted by the love of power to give ourselves to priestcraft. That has been one of the greatest impediments in the way of Christianity, and one of the greatest spots and blemishes on the visible church.

But, my dear friends, we have not done yet. We have entered on a righteous crusade against the unhallowed grant to Maynooth. That crusade, by God's blessing is prospering. The late division in the House of Commons was a good omen. We must pursue our course, we must never rest till we feel that the Babylonish garment is put out of the camp of England. But let me give you a bit of advice. Do not go to work in a piecemeal manner; go boldly at the thing; if it is bad, it is bad; if it is good, it is good; but do not say it may be bad, or it may be good. I hate mere inquiries into such places as Maynooth. You might as well issue a commission to ascertain whether it is dark at midnight, or whether the sea is salt, as to ascertain whether the Popery taught at Maynooth is unfit for Protestant England to support. What will you bring out? What has been brought out again and again? Delahogue and Bailey, and all those beautiful doctors of divinity, and teachers of lovely morality, in which Romish priests are compelled to bathe their souls. We must do, as good Mr. Spooner did, and grapple with the evil. We know Maynooth is as bad as any commission can show it to be. Repeal the Maynooth Grant, then, must be our watchword—petition for nothing else. But more than this. We must have before us, even if we do not follow it out now, the ultimate displacement of the Irish Popish band from the place they have abused

in the British legislature. After all, you can never effectually stop a stream but by stopping the fountain. The streams of Maynooth, the streams of Papal aggression, the streams of bitterness, that have so long been deplored in our country, are all to be traced up to the opening of that bitter fountain, the Bill of '29. Protestant England then took down her flag; Protestant England then invaded and made a breach in her glorious constitution; Protestant England then ceased in her constitution to be entirely Protestant. She gave an argument to latitudinarian statesmen and senators; for they began to say, 'You have gone so far that you might as well go all the way.' So, when we oppose the introduction of the Jews into Parliament, because we will not sacrifice our faith to their unbelief, we are told, 'You have let in the Romanists; why, then, not let in the Jews?' Then, when we resisted the Papal aggression, we were told, 'You have allowed the Romanists to legislate for you; why, then, not allow them to set up their ecclesiastical system?' Thus are we attacked by our own inconsistencies. Nay, they are not ours. The great majority of the nation of England has never been accessory to those humiliating concessions. They have been carried, not by public opinion, but in defiance of public opinion. But, after all, what wretched sophistry is this! It is as if you told a man, 'You have become a thief, you had better become a murderer: why are you so squeamish about being a murderer when your hands are already defiled with robbery?' Because we have done wrong we must do worse! Nay, nay, because we have done wrong we must right the wrong, and go back to where we were. If we are taunted by this Bill of 1829, the only way will be to grapple nobly and manfully with it—I believe it will come to that in the long run.

My friends, two supremacies cannot long coexist in this country—the supremacy of the Pope, and the supremacy of our beloved Queen. Who shall be uppermost? Who shall rule her subjects? No divided sceptre for Queen Victoria! Let her rule all her subjects from the highest to the lowest; in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as temporal, in these her dominions, she ought to be supreme; and whoever teaches the opposite doctrine, whether he be a clergyman or a lay member of the Church of England, is disloyal to his Queen, and unfaithful to his country. If the Queen ought to be supreme over her Protestant subjects, she ought to be supreme over her Romish subjects. Yet, my friends, they themselves being the judges, in their periodicals, in their feasts, in their social life, they show that though they live in the same country with us, they are not our fellow-subjects. We are subjects of the Queen; they are subjects of the Pope. We give the Queen the first place in our toasts; they the Pope. They drink the Pope's health with enthusiastic applause; the Queen's with very smothered and decent acclamations. That is the gauge of Popish loyalty—the Pope high above, the Queen underneath. They tell you it is a spiritual pre-eminence; but he that is lord of my soul is lord of my body; he that wields, as I believe, my eternal destiny, is mightier than all the potentates of the earth. The Pope is either a monstrous impostor, or Christ's vicar on earth. We believe him to be the former, they the latter. And according to their belief they are right enough in what they do; but then are we right to let them legislate for us, and to interfere with our Protestant rights? Since their admission to the House of Commons they are virtually our rulers. We used to have three estates of the realm—Queen, Lords, and Commons; but now we have four estates—the Queen, Lords, Commons, and Popish bands, the representatives of the Vatican. They were not chosen by the free will of the people, but at the bidding of the priesthood; they are not representatives of Ireland, but of Rome. It is even said by those who are supposed to be behind the scenes, that certain considerations have been offered to these men if they will only vote for the ministry. And is it come to this? That our country can only be governed on the sufferance of the Vatican—that the Popish representatives are to stultify the British House of Commons—that we are to have "a house divided against itself"—that it cannot stand?

Depend upon it, a great crisis is at hand. The struggle has begun all over the world. It has begun in America. A distinguished individual from America told me, that the struggle there might end in civil war. So crafty are the priests, that they manage the elections to a large extent, and are therefore courted by all the democratic movers in the Union. Look again at the continent—how liberty is trying to set itself up in Italy. An individual who is fostering the work of God in Sardinia tells us, that the Gospel is effectually planted at Turin and Genoa, so that it can never be rooted out of the soil; and even atheists and deists say, that nothing can be done for the country without the Gospel, and they submit their publications for inspection before they issue from the press, so that they may contain nothing hostile to Christianity. Look at Ireland. There, thank God, victory crowns truth and faithfulness. There is a noble mission to Romanists in Islington that is working well. Then there is Dr. Armstrong in Bermondsey, whom I respect and love for his noble efforts. In Manchester we are engaging an Irish-speaking clergyman, with four or five readers under him; and there are one hundred and fifty Protestant visitors engaged in the work; so that we are combined in a holy crusade that will give Popery no peace, though we come with peace to the poor Romanist. This warfare cannot be checked. The two great antagonists have come face to face. Is it to be Popery or Protestantism? Shall Christ, or shall man, be the head of the church? England, as the citadel of freedom and the land of Bibles, is the envy and wonder of the Popish world, and here the battle will be most collected. The Jesuits throughout Europe are preaching against "perfidious Albion." The usurper of France, who has shed so much blood to set himself on the throne, is, I believe, very much in the prompting of the Jesuits; and depend upon it, if he does not invade England, it will

not be for a want of will on their part, nor a kind of fatal necessity which he imagines existing in his own mind; but it will be because Protestant England is forewarned and forearmed. If we only come to the struggle with clean hands—if we get rid of Maynooth, and of close nunneries, and of the Pope's brass bands, we may smile at an embattled world, with God for us, and His truth on our side. Yes, if France does not try to invade us, if Europe does not combine against us, it will not be for want of will on the part of Popery. The great struggle is coming; and the question soon will be, who are on the Lord's side? and who are on the side of antichrist? May it be ours to make England, as she long has been, the land of liberty, the land of Bibles, the land of prosperity, the land of peace, on whose dominions the sun never rests; and then not to her, but to her Protestant faith, to the Word of God, to the blessing of Heaven, to the grace that Christ gives her, alone be the praise. Let her be true to Him and to the principles that have exalted her, and nothing shall succeed against her. Let her be faithless, and perfidious, and apostate, and God will forsake her, and her glory will leave but a terrible wreck behind.

Just Published,

The Eighteenth Anniversary Sermon of the Protestant Association, preached at the Parish Church of St. Giles-in-the-fields, by the Rev. Hugh Stowell, M.A., Hon. Canon of Chester, May 10, 1853, price 2d., or 12s. per hundred. May be had at the Office of the Protestant Association, 6, Serjeant's Inn, Fleet Street, London, and of all booksellers in the United Kingdom.

England the Fortress of Christianity.

By The Rev. G. Croly, LL.D., Rector of St. Stephen's, Walbrook, London.
(*The Preface to "The New Interpretation of the Apocalypse."*)

Fiftieth Thousand.

THERE is the strongest reason to believe, that as Judea was chosen for the especial guardianship of the original Revelation; England has been chosen for the especial guardianship of Christianity.

The original Revelation declared the one true God; Paganism was its corruption, by substituting many false gods for the true. The second Revelation, Christianity, declared the one true Mediator; Popery was its corruption, by substituting many false mediators for the true. Both Paganism and Popery adopted the same visible sign of corruption, the worship of images.

The Jewish history reveals to us the conduct of Providence with a people appointed to the express preservation of the faith of God. There, every attempt to receive the surrounding idolatries into a participation of the honours of the true worship, even every idolatrous touch was visited with punishment; and that punishment not left to the remote working of the corruption, but immediate, and, by its directness, evidently designed to make the nation feel the high importance of the trust, and the final ruin that must follow its betrayal.

A glance at the British history since the Reformation shows how closely this providential system has been exemplified in England. Every reign which attempted to bring back Popery, or even to give it that share of power which could in any degree prejudice Protestantism, has been marked by signal calamity. It is a memorable circumstance, that every reign of this Popish tendency has been followed by one purely Protestant; and, as if to make the source of the national peril plain to all eyes, those alternate reigns have not offered a stronger contrast in their religious principles than in their public fortunes. Let the rank of England have been what it might under the Protestant Sovereign, it always went down under the Popish; let its loss of dignity, or of power, have been what it might under the Popish Sovereign, it always recovered under the Protestant, and more than recovered; was distinguished by sudden success, public renovation, and the increased stability of the freedom and honours of the empire.

Protestantism was first thoroughly established in England in the reign of Elizabeth.

Mary had left a dilapidated kingdom; the nation worn down by disaster and debt; the national arms disgraced; nothing in vigour but Popery. Elizabeth, at twenty-five, found her first steps surrounded with the most extraordinary embarrassments; at home, the whole strength of a party, including the chief names of the kingdom, hostile to her succession and religion; in Scotland, a rival title supported by France: in Ireland, a perpetual rebellion inflamed by Home; on the Continent, the force of Spain roused against her by the double stimulant of ambition and bigotry,—at a time when Spain commanded almost the whole strength of Europe.

But the cause of Elizabeth was Protestantism; and in that sign she conquered. She shivered the Spanish sword; she paralyzed the power of Rome; she gave freedom to the Dutch; she fought the battle of the French

Protestants; every eye of religious suffering throughout Europe was fixed on this magnanimous woman. At home she elevated the habits and the hearts of her people. She even drained off the bitter waters of religious feud, and sowed in the vigorous soil, which they had so long made unwholesome, the seeds of every principle and institution that has since grown up into the strength of empire. But her great work was the establishment of Protestantism. Like the Jewish King, she found the ark of God without a shelter; and she built for it the noblest temple in the world; she consecrated her country into its temple.

She died in the fulness of years and honour; the great Queen of Protestantism throughout the nations; in the memory of England her name and her reign are alike immortal.

James the First inherited the principles, with the crown, of Elizabeth. His first act was, to declare his allegiance to Protestantism. From that moment Popery lost all power against him. It tried faction, and failed. It then tried conspiracy, and more than failed. Its conspiracy gave birth to the most memorable instance of national preservation, perhaps, in the annals of Europe. The gunpowder plot would have swept away the King, the Royal Family, the chief Nobles and Commoners of England at a blow. The secret was kept for a year and a half. It was never betrayed, to the last. It was discovered by neither treachery, nor repentance, and but on the eve of execution. Yet its success must have been national ruin. A Popish Government was to have been set up. The country, in its state of distraction and destitution, must have laid exposed to the first invader. The consequences were incalculable. The hand of God alone saved the throne and altar of England.

Charles the First ascended a prosperous throne; England in peace, faction feeble and extinct; the nation prospering in the new spirit of commerce and manly adventure. No reign of an English King ever opened a longer or more undisturbed view of prosperity. But Charles betrayed the sacred trust of Protestantism. He had formed a Popish alliance, with the full knowledge that it established a Popish dynasty.

By the marriage compact with the Infanta, the Royal children were to be educated by their mother until they were *ten years* old. But France, determined on running no risk of their being Protestants, raised the terra to *thirteen years*. Even this was not enough; for Popery was afraid of Protestant milk; and a clause was inserted that the children should not be suckled by Protestant *nurses*. The object of those stipulations was so apparent, that Charles must have looked to a Popish succession, and the stipulations were so perfectly sufficient for their purpose, that all his sons, even to the last, fragment of their line, were Roman Catholics. Even the King's Protestantism was doubtful. Olivarez, the Spanish Minister, openly declared that Charles, in treating for his marriage with the Infanta, had pledged himself to turn Roman Catholic.

He had lent himself to the intrigues of the French minister, stained with Protestant blood; for his first armament was a fleet against the Huguenots. If not a friend to Popery, he was madly regardless of its hazards to the Church and the Constitution.

Ill-fortune suddenly gathered around him. Distracted councils, popular feuds met by alternate weakness and violence, the loss of the national respect, finally deepening into civil bloodshed, were the punishments of his betrayal of Protestantism. The late discovery of his error, and the solemn repentance of his prison hours, painfully redeemed his memory.

Cromwell's was the sceptre of a broken kingdom. He found the fame and force of England crushed; utter humiliation abroad; at home, the exhaustion of the civil war; new, and arrogant faction, and old, intractable partisanship, tearing the public strength in sunder.

Cromwell was a murderer; yet in the high designs of Providence, the personal purity of the instrument is not always regarded. The Jews were punished for their idolatry by idolaters, and restored by idolaters. But, whatever was in the heart of the Protector, the policy of his government was Protestantism. His treasures and his arms were openly devoted to the Protestant cause, in France, in Italy, and throughout the world. He was the first who raised a public fund for the relief of the Vaudois Churches. He sternly repelled the advances which Popery made to seduce him into the path of the late King.

England was instantly lifted on her feet, as by miracle. All her battles were victories; France and Spain bowed before her. All her adventures were conquests; she laid the foundation of her colonial empire, and extended that still more illustrious commercial empire, to which the only limits in either space or time may be those of mankind. She rapidly became the most conspicuous power of Europe; growing year by year in opulence, public knowledge, and foreign renown; until Cromwell could almost realize the splendid improbability, that, "before he died, he would make the name of an Englishman as much feared and honoured as ever was that of an ancient Roman."

Charles the Second ascended an eminently prosperous throne. Abroad, it held the foremost rank,—the fruit of the vigour of the Protectorate. At home, all faction had been forgotten in the general joy of the Restoration.

But Charles was a concealed Roman Catholic.

He had solemnly professed Popery on the eve of the Restoration,

He attempted to introduce his religion; the star of England instantly darkened; the country and the King alike became the scorn of the foreign courts; the Royal honour was scandalized by mercenary subserviency to

France; the national arms were humiliated by a disastrous war with Holland; the capital was swept by the memorable inflictions of pestilence and conflagration.

James the Second still more openly violated the national trust, He publicly became a Roman Catholic. This filled the cup. The Stuarts were cast out, they and their dynasty for ever; that proud line of Kings was sentenced to wither down into a monk, and that monk living on the alms of England, a stipendiary and an exile.

William was called to the throne by Protestantism. He found it, as it was always found at the close of a Popish reign, surrounded by a host of difficulties; at home, the kingdom in a ferment; Popery, and its ally, Jacobitism, girding themselves for battle; fierce disturbance in Scotland; open war in Ireland, with the late King at its head; abroad, the French King domineering over Europe, and threatening invasion. In the scale of nations, England nothing.

But *the principle* of William's government was Protestantism; he fought and legislated for it through life; and it was to him, as it had been to all before him, strength and victory. He silenced English faction; he crushed the Irish war; he next attacked the colossal strength of France on its own shore. This was the direct collision, not so much of the two kingdoms as of the two faiths; the Protestant champion stood in the field against the Popish persecutor. Before that war closed the fame of Louis was undone, and England rose to the highest military name. In a train of immortal victories, she defended Protestantism throughout Europe, drove the enemy to his palace-gates, and, before she sheathed the sword, broke the power of France for a hundred years.

The Brunswick line were called to the throne by Protestantism. Their faith was their title. They were honourable men, and they kept their oaths to the religion of England. The country rose under each of those Protestant Kings to a still higher rank; every trivial reverse compensated by some magnificent addition of honour and power, until the throne of England stood on a height from which it looked clown upon the world.

Yet, in our immediate memory, there was one remarkable interruption of that progress; which, if the most total contrast to the periods preceding and following can amount to proof, proves that every introduction of Popery into the Legislature will be visited as a national crime.

During the war with the French Republic, England had gone on from triumph to triumph. The crimes of the Popish Continent had delivered it over to be scourged by France; but the war of England was naval; and in 1805 she consummated that war by the greatest victory ever gained on the seas;

Trafalgar, Oct., 1805.

at one blow she extinguished the navies of France and Spain! The death of her great Statesman, at length opened the door to a new Administration.

February, 1806.

They were men of acknowledged ability—some, of the highest; and all accustomed to public affairs. But they came in under a pledge to the introduction of Popery, sooner or later, into the Legislature. They were emphatically "The Roman Catholic Administration."

There never was in the memory of man so sudden a change from triumph to disaster. Disgrace came upon them in every shape in which it could assail a Government; in war, finance, negotiation. All their expeditions returned with shame. The British arms were tarnished in the *four quarters* of the globe.

The retreat from Sweden, 1807.—Egypt invaded and evacuated, 1807.—Whitlock sent out to Buenos Ayres, 1807.—Duckworth's repulse at Constantinople 1807. All those operations had originated in 1806, excepting Whitlock's, which was the final act of the Ministry.

And, as if to make the shame more conspicuous, they were baffled even in that service, to which the national feeling was most keenly alive; and in which defeat seemed impossible. England saw, with astonishment, her *fleet* disgraced before a barbarian without a ship on the waters, and finally hunted out of his seas by the fire from batteries crumbling under the discharge of their own cannon.

But the fair fame of the British Empire was not to be thus cheaply wasted away. The Ministry must perish; already condemned by the voice of the country, it was to be its own executioner. It at length made its promised attempt upon the Constitution. A harmless measure

The granting of commissions in the army. Mr. Percival opposed this, as only a pretext; he said, "It was not so much the individual measure to which he objected, as the system of which it formed a part, and which was growing every day. From the arguments that he had heard, a man might be almost led to suppose that one religion was considered as good as another, and that the Reformation was only a measure of political convenience."

was proposed; notoriously a cover for the deeper insults that were to follow. It was met with manly repulse; and, in the midst of public indignation, perished the Popish Ministry of one month and one year.

March, 1807.

Its successors came on the express title of resistance to Popery; they were emphatically "The Protestant Administration." They had scarcely entered on office when the whole scene of disaster brightened; and the deliverance of Europe was begun, with a vigour that never relaxed, a combination of unexpected means and

circumstances, an effective and rapid renown; of which, the very conjecture, but a month before, would have been laughed at as a dream. The scene, and the success, were equally extraordinary.

Of all countries, Spain, sluggish, accustomed to the yoke of France, and with all its old energies melted away in the vices of its Government, was the last to which Europe could have looked for defiance of the universal conqueror. But, if ever the battle was fought by the shepherd's staff and sling against the armed giant, it was then. England was there summoned to begin a new career of triumph. Irresistible on one element, she was now to be led step by step to the first place of glory on another; and that Protestant Ministry saw, what no human foresight could have hoped to see, Europe restored; the monarch of her monarchs a prisoner in its hands; and the mighty fabric of the French Atheistic Empire, so long darkening and distending like an endless dungeon over the earth, suddenly scattered with all its malignant pomps and ministers of evil into air.

It is impossible to conceive, that this regular interchange of punishment and preservation has been without a cause, and without a purpose. Through almost three hundred years, through all varieties of public circumstance, all changes of men, all shades of general polity, we see one thing alone unchanged—the regular connexion of national misfortune with the introduction of Popish influence,—and of national triumph with its exclusion.

Those remarks were originally published on the eve of the year 1829. The Bill of that calamitous year replaced the Roman Catholic in the Parliament, from which he had been expelled a century before, by the united necessities of religion, freedom, and national safety. The whole experience of our Protestant history had pronounced that evil must follow. *And it has followed.*

From that hour all has been changed. British legislation has lost its stability. England has lost alike her pre-eminence abroad, and her confidence at home. Every great institution of the State has tottered. Her Governments have risen, and passed away, like shadows. The Church in Ireland, bound hand and foot, has been flung into the furnace, and is disappearing from the eye. The Church in England is haughtily threatened with her share of the fiery trial. Every re-monstrance of the nation is insolently answered by pointing to rebellion, ready to seize its arms in Ireland. Democracy is openly proclaimed as a principle of the State. Popery is triumphantly predicted as the universal religion. To guide and embody all;—a new shape of power has started up in the Legislature;—a new element at once of control and confusion; a central faction, which has both sides at its mercy; holding the country in contempt, while it fixes its heel on Cabinets trembling for existence; possessing all the influence of office without its responsibility; and engrossing unlimited patronage for the purposes of unlimited domination." Yet those may be "but the beginning of sorrows."

But, if we give way to Popery, we sin against the most solemn warnings of Scripture. We have the apostolic declaration,—*"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that MAN OF SIN be revealed, the son of perdition;—who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God showing himself that he is God. * * * * ** And then shall that wicked one be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming; even Him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." (2 Thess. ii.) This gives the portraiture of the great deluder of the European world in his external and imposing aspect. Another portraiture displays his internal evil:—

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron;—forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." Ending with the solemn injunction to all teachers of Christianity, "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine." (1 Timothy iv. 1.)

Finally, we have the denunciation of the prophet, declaring the Divine judgments:—

"And I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lighted with his glory.—And he cried mightily, with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils; the hold of every foul spirit.—And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, *Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.* For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." (Revelation xviii.)

This language is not used to give offence to the Roman Catholic. His religion is reprobated, because it is his undoing; the veil that darkens his understanding; the tyranny that chains his natural liberty of choice; the fatal corruption of Christianity, that shuts the Scriptures upon him, forces him away from the worship of that Being, who is to be worshipped alone in spirit and in truth; and prostrates him at the feet of priests and images of the Virgin, and the whole host of false and unscriptural mediatorship. But for himself there can be but one feeling;—a feeling of the deepest anxiety that he should search the Scriptures; and coming to that search without insolent self-will, or sullen prejudice, or the haughty and negligent levity to which their wisdom will

never be disclosed, he should compare the Gospel of God with the doctrines of Rome.

But whatever may be the lot of those to whom error has been an inheritance, woe be to the man and the people to whom it is an adoption! If England, free above all other nations, sustained amidst the trials which have covered Europe before her eyes with burning and slaughter, and enlightened by the fullest knowledge of Divine truth, shall refuse fidelity to the compact by which those matchless privileges have been given, her condemnation will not linger. She has already made one step full of danger. She has committed the capital error of mistaking that for a purely political question which was a purely religious one. Her foot already hangs over the edge of the precipice. It must be retracted, or her empire is but a name. In the clouds and darkness which seem to be deepening upon all human policy, in the gathering tumults of Europe, and the feverish discontents at home, it may even be difficult to discern where the power yet lives to erect the fallen majesty of the Constitution once more. But there are mighty means in sincerity. And, if no miracle was ever wrought for the faithless and despairing; the country that will help itself—the generous, the high-hearted, and the pure, will never be left destitute of the help of Heaven.

To the Reader.

At this awful crisis, when Popery has assumed so menacing an attitude, that she appears ready to seize on the reins of the British Government, the foregoing admirable Preface to the Rev. George Croly's Work on prophecy is most earnestly recommended to the serious consideration of the British Public, and especially to the enlightened and well-educated portion of it.

"It (Popery) has a restless spirit, and will strive by these gradations:—First, it will seek for connivance; it will then ask for toleration. Having obtained this, it will require equality. When this is obtained it will insist on superiority, and will never rest until it has effected a subversion of the true religion!"

—*Remonstrance of the Commons (by Selden) to King James 1.*

"The principles of the Church of Rome, being unchangeable, are applicable to all times."

—*Doctor Troy, lute R. C. Titular Archbishop of Dublin.*

"If any man will assert or pretend to believe, that modern Catholics differ in one iota from their ancestors, he either deceives himself, or wishes to deceive others."

—*Plowden, R. C.*

"The page of history has recorded the sanguinary product of the principles of Romanism in former days, and these principles remaining unchanged, must necessarily produce the same fruits when invested with the powers now sought by the adherents of the See of Rome."

—*Editor.*

But should proof be wanting that the Church of Rome adopts and sanctions *at the present day* the same intolerant, persecuting, and exterminating principles she ever has done, the reader has but to refer to the *Dedicatory Letter to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty on the Laws of the Papacy, set up by the Romish Bishops in Ireland to subvert the Authority of their Lawful Sovereign, in 1832.*" Published by the Protestant Association in 1847." Price 4d. each, or 25s. per 100.

Protestant Association, 6, SERJEANTS' INN, FLEET STREET; WERTHEIM AND MACINTOSH, PATERNOSTER ROW; SEELEYS, FLEET STREET.

MDCCCXI. Price 1d., or 7s. per 100.

No. 8. Macintosh, Printer, Great New-street, London.

Speech of Viscount Bernard, M.P.,

On Mr. Ward's Motion in the House of Commons, August 2, 1843.

With Notes Illustrative of the Early History of the Church in Ireland.

And

An Appendix,

From O'Halloran, a Roman Catholic Historian.

London: Published for the Protestant Association, By Hatchards, Rivingtons, Seeleys, Nisbet, Dalton, Baisler, and Jackson.

No. XLI. 1843. [Price or 20s. per 100.]

Mr. Ward's Motion.

"THAT an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, representing to Her Majesty that in the opinion of this House, it is not by measures for the repression of local violence that the discontents of Ireland can be

allayed, but by removing those grievances, which have formed for many years the subject of recorded complaint and remonstrance between the two countries.

"That amongst the most prominent of these is the law by which the whole ecclesiastical property of Ireland is assigned to the clergy of a small section of the population, and that this House, deeply impressed with the belief that such a law is not conformable to reason, or to the practice of any Christian country, pledges itself, after providing for existing proprietary rights, and for the claims of Her Majesty's Protestant subjects, cordially to co-operate with Her Majesty in effecting such a settlement of Church property in Ireland, as will remove all just ground of complaint, and give satisfaction to the Irish people."

No division, the House being counted out.

Speech of Lord Viscount Bernard, M.P.

Lord Bernard said, that after the length at which Irish subjects had been discussed in this House, during the last three weeks, and indeed during the whole past portion of the session, it was with no ordinary degree of reluctance he felt himself bound to address to the House a few observations. But on the present occasion, considering the object and aim of the Motion introduced by the Hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Ward) it was a duty which he (Lord Bernard) owed to those whom he had the high honour to represent—a duty which he owed to his brethren, the loyal and faithful Protestants of Ireland, not to remain silent—above all, he should be wanting in his duty to that revered Church of which he was a member, and to which he was most sincerely attached, if he did not firmly but calmly state the grounds on which he should give to the Motion of the Hon. Member his most decided opposition. And he must say that he, for one, felt that he had reason to complain that a Motion of such great importance should have been brought forward at this late period of a laborious and extended session, at a time when not only many who agreed with him in general opposition to the political views of the Hon. Member for Sheffield, were in the ordinary course absent, but very many also were now also absent, who, though in general adopting the same views with that Hon. Member, were at least, he firmly believed and fondly hoped, not prepared to support any measure or Motion for the destruction of the Protestant Established Church in Ireland. He said the *destruction* of the Church, for that, at which the Motion of the Hon. Member for Sheffield aimed, was no more nor less than (as a similar suggestion had been properly designated in another place by the greatest of living men) an attempt to repeal the laws on which the glorious Reformation and the Reformed No. 8., with all its blessings and advantages, were based. It was, he (Lord Bernard) fearlessly repeated, no less than that. And here let him ask this House, let him ask the reasoning men of all parties—let him ask the Roman Catholics of this House and of the country, if the existence in Ireland of the Protestant Established Church was deemed to be an offence and a grievance to that country, how long was it probable that a Protestant Government would be borne—how long was it likely that the Protestant succession to the Throne would be quiescently endured. He spoke now, as he always spoke, with the greatest respect for his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, with respect for their feelings and sincere regard for themselves. He felt it a pleasure to acknowledge that he had lived among them and mixed familiarly with many of them, and if a word of his was in the remotest degree susceptible of being interpreted into an offence, he meant it not—he should deeply regret it. But he would ask of the Protestant portion of this House, of those who in England adhered to and upheld the Protestant Church, whether they could really hope to conciliate, to win the respect, the estimation, and regard, and confidence of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, if they, the members of the Established Church, came forward to sacrifice the interests—to abandon, to destroy the Church of Ireland. When they (the Roman Catholic people), whom it was thus vainly essayed to conciliate and win, saw gentlemen thus faithless to their own Church, could they place much confidence in those Hon. Gentlemen as guardians of the *temporal* interests of themselves and of the community? And, on the other hand, could it be supposed that those conciliatory movements would be regarded as sincere, as anything better than temporary expedients and illusory promises? Had the Irish people so soon forgotten, or did the Hon. Gentlemen opposite indulge the fond imagination that the Irish people had so soon forgotten, the fate of a similar Motion to the present, and introduced by the same Hon. Gentleman (the Member for Sheffield)? Had that people forgotten that a former Government had based on it claims to confidence and to support, had introduced measures in the spirit of that Motion, declaring their determination by the fate of those measures to abide, yet had abandoned those measures and still retained their offices? But in immediate reference to the present Motion, and to similar suggestions, there was one argument reiterated so constantly, and urged so confidently, as to demand particular attention and particular refutation. That argument was—that the Protestant Church of Ireland was an intrusive Church, and that the dignities and revenues of the Protestant Church in Ireland ought to belong, and in justice did belong, to the Roman Catholic Church. Now he contended that the facts of the case were directly the reverse, and some of the facts he would take the liberty of submitting to the House, to show that the Church as

at this day established in Ireland was the ancient Church of that country, and therefore the legal, rightful, undoubted inheritor of all the privileges and revenues of that ancient Church. The first authority which he would adduce was that of Dr. Carew, not a Protestant authority, but a famous professor in the College of Maynooth. He wrote thus in his Ecclesiastical History:—

"The light of the Gospel appeared at a very early period in her horizon, before St. Patrick engaged in the conversion of the Irish people."

Hume,

Vol. i. chap. ix-. p. 466. A.D. 1172.

the historian, speaking of the early independence of the Irish Church, says:—

"The Irish Church followed the doctrines of her first teachers, and never acknowledged any subjection to the see of Rome."

Bede

Bede, lib. iii. 25. Usher's "Religion of the Ancient Irish," p. 103

tells us that when the celebrated St. Colman, an Irishman, was Bishop of Lindisferne; a council was called upon to dispute the point of the celebration of Easter. St. Colman argues thus:—

Here we may observe the apostolic succession of the Irish Church clearly pointed out. St. John the Evangelist; Ignatius, the immediate disciple of St. John; Polycarp, the disciple of Ignatius; Pothinus, Iræneus, and others, the disciples of Polycarp, who preached the Gospel with great success in Gaul, through whose means flourishing Churches were established in Lyons and Vienne, of which Pothinus was the first Bishop. From thence the Gospel sounded forth throughout all that country. Bishops Lupas and German, the descendants of these holy men, ordained St. Patrick and made him chief Bishop of their school among the Irish, and from St. Patrick to the present day we have a regular succession of bishops, not from Rome or through Rome, but through the successors of the Apostle John, the patron of the Irish Church.—Dean of Ardagh's "History," p. 29.

"This Easter, which I used to observe, I received from my elders, who sent me bishop hither, which all our fathers, men beloved of God, are known to have celebrated after the same manner, which, that it may not seem unto any to be contemned and rejected, is the same which the blessed Evangelist St. John, the disciple especially beloved by our Lord, with all the Churches that he did oversee, is said to have celebrated. I marvel (he exclaimed) how such men call that absurd in which we follow the example of so great an apostle, one who was thought worthy of reposing upon the bosom of his Lord; and can it be believed that such men as our venerable father Columbkil and his successors would have thought or acted things contrary to the precepts of the sacred pages!"

A writer of the life of Wilfred, who defended the Church of Rome, while St. Colman defended the Church of Ireland, Fridogenus, a Roman Catholic, informs us that St. Colman still further added thus:—

"We abide by the custom of our fathers, which was given to us by Polycarp, the disciple of St. John."

Dr. Moore, the eminent writer, who in every case was favourable to the Roman Catholic Church, in his history stated—about the year 553 a question arose about the three chapters, which, Moore expresses it, "awakened the alarm of the see of Rome." The Irish took a part opposed to Rome. Cardinal Baronius, in his Tom. VII., *Annal ad Annum* 566, No. 21, says:—

"All the bishops that were in Ireland with most earnest study rose up conjointly for the defence of the three chapters, and when they perceived that the Church of Rome did both revive the condemnation of the three chapters, and strengthened the fifth Synod with her consent, they departed from her, and clave to the rest of the schismatics, animated with that vain confidence that they did stand for the Catholic faith, while they defended those things that were concluded in the Council of Chalcedon."

See Harles's "Ecclesiastical Records," &c., p. 25.

And it was a most remarkable fact in history, that the doctrines of that Council of Chalcedon were distinctly recognised by the Act of the 2d Elizabeth, cap. 1,

The following occurs in St. Patrick's Letter, called the 'Confession':—"Ubique pergebam causâ vestrâ, etiam ad extremas partes, ubi nunquam aliquis prævenerat qui baptizaret aut clericos ordinaret aut populos cousummarit." "I went everywhere on your account, even to the remotest places where *never* before had any one come who could baptize, ordain, or complete (perhaps confirm) the people."

Moore's "History of Ireland," vol. i. p. 221. "It is supposed that to these western regions of Ireland the saint alludes in his 'Confession,' when he stated that he had visited remote districts where no missionary had been before, an assertion important, as plainly implying that in the more accessible parts of the country Christianity had been before his time preached and practised."

The result of the Council of Cashel was, that the Irish Church should be assimilated in its rites and discipline to that of England, but we are informed by the decisive testimony of Dr. Lanagan, that, wherever the natives maintained their independence, "*Clergy and people followed their own ecclesiastical rules as if the Synod of Cashel had never been held.*"—Dean of Ardagh, p. 78.

O'Driscoll (Roman Catholic historian) "View of Ireland," vol. ii. p. 210:—says, "There is something very singular in the ecclesiastical history of Ireland. The Christian Church of that country, as founded by St. Patrick and HIS PREDECESSORS, existed for many ages free and unshackled. For about seven hundred years this Church maintained its independence. It had no connexion with England, and differed on points of importance from Rome. The first work of Henry II. was to reduce the Church of Ireland into obedience to the Roman Pontiff; accordingly, he procured a council of the Irish clergy to be held at Cashel in 1172, and the combined influence and intrigues of Henry and the Pope prevailed. The Council put an end to the ancient Church of Ireland and submitted it to the yoke of Rome. That ominous apostasy has been followed by a series of calamities hardly to be equalled in the world. From the days of Patrick to the Council of Cashel was a bright and glorious career for Ireland. From the sitting of this Council to our time the lot of Ireland has been one of unmixed evil, and all her history a tale of woe."

Columbanus "Ad Ilibernos," letter ii. p.64, says:—"Ireland had been for ages industriously represented as a fief of the Church of Rome. In virtue of this imaginary right, the Irish clergy of the twelfth century, harassed by the feuds of their own chiefs, acquiesced in the donation of Pope Adrian IV. to Henry II., and also in the consequent confirmation of Alexander III."

Ibid., p.9:—"Are we to forget that during this horrible period both nations were Catholic, and that England was even more Popish than Ireland? For England not only received the doctrines of the Catholic Church in common with Ireland, but she did more, she obeyed the mandates of the Roman Church, which the Irish did not. I appeal to the history of King John laying his crown and bags of money at the feet of the imperious Randolph on the one side, and the Irish remonstrance of A.D. 1315 on the other." Showing that even after the submission to Adrian IV. and Alexander III., no friendly feeling existed in Ireland towards Rome.

O'Halloran, Roman Catholic historian, vol. ii., p. 280:—A chapter among other subjects is headed, "The Pretences of Rome to the commanding of Ireland inquired into and refuted."

Lord Lyttleton's "History of Henry II.," book iv., vol. v., p. 53.—In the above-mentioned year, 1139, while Innocent II. was Pontiff, Malachy, who had obtained the Archbishopric of Armagh, while his country was agitated with civil dissensions, went to Rome for a pall, which (to use the words of St. Bernard, "De Vitâ Malachiæ," c. xvi.) "*had been from the beginning, and was still wanting to the Metropolitan See*" Innocent, pleased with this homage from a Prelate whose predecessors had so long been independent, received him with great honours, taking off his own mitre and placing it on the head of his respected guest; but desiring to render the request of a pall rather the act of the Irish nation than their Primate alone, he exhorted him to assemble a National Council, and persuade them to sue for that favour. He did not, however, dismiss him, after such an application, without granting him what he knew would please him as well—the character of Legate in Ireland; availing himself of the plea that the Bishop of Lismore, to whom it had before been given, was grown old and infirm. Malachy, therefore, returned with the dignity into Ireland, and endeavoured to execute his new master's injunctions. But it seems that the Irish people did not readily admit the propriety of making the unprecedented petition to which they were urged, for several years passed away without its having been made; and when the Primate had brought his countrymen to apply to Pope Eugenius III., in the year 1138, for this gift, which Bernard calls *the plenitude of honour*, he died before he had time to convey to that Pontiff the request of the Council. Yet on the foundation he had laid, Eugenius, in the year 1151, sent Cardinal Pessero, Legate a latere, into Ireland with four palls for the Archbishops of Armagh, of Tuam, of Cashel, and of Dublin, the last of which cities was then first erected into an Archbishopric. Thus the badge of subjection to the Roman Pontificate was at last received by the Irish Metropolitan Prelates.

Again: Ibid., "We are told by St. Bernard ("In vita S. M.," p. 1937) that before the election of Ceallach (or Celene) to the see of Armagh, it had been held by eight successive prelates, who were all married men."

Henry II., soon after he came to the crown, proposed to undertake the conquest of Ireland, but having no title on which he could possibly found a legal claim to that Isle, nor any reasonable cause of war with the nation, he took the only method of supplying these defects by colouring his ambition with a pretext of religion. Nicholas Breakspear, an Englishman, was the Bishop of Rome, under the title of Adrian IV. To him Henry sent John of Salisbury with letters, wherein he desired the sanction of the Papal authority to justify his intention of subduing the Irish *in order to reform them*. A request of this nature, which supposed in the Pope a power which he *wished to assume*, could not fail to be favourably received at Rome. Henry's Minister brought from thence a ring of gold to his master, sent by the Pope as a sign of his investing that Prince with the kingdom of Ireland, and then delivered to him the following Bull, &c., &c.—See, Lord Lyttleton, vol. v., p. 56; G. Carbreensis, "Hiberniâ Expugnâtâ," c. 6, l. 11. For this Bull, see Rymer's "Fœdera," tom. i., p. 15.

To pass to another part of the history of the Church. The Hon. Member for Sheffield had used, for the purposes of his Motion, the argument, that in the time of Henry VIII., only two out of all the Irish prelates had conformed, and that all, save those two, had been banished from their sees, and stripped of their dignities and revenues, to make way for men appointed by the sovereign.

The very same Act, 28th Henry VIII., which enacted the Oath of Supremacy, alienated the whole of the temporalities of the Irish Church: alienated in fact, the temporalities of all who refused to conform. Here only two bishops refused to take the oath. In Ireland only two took it. Twenty-six out of twenty-eight bishops, and the whole of the parochial clergy, gave up their livings rather than hold them on such a condition. They all abandoned Church preferments. They acted as the Free Church of Scotland is doing at the present time.—Mr. Ward's Speech, Hansard, vol. lxi. p. 122.

When we endeavour to trace the Reformation in the reign of Henry VIII., we discover this vestige alone of its establishment, that it was nominally introduced into that country nine years before his death. The great antiquary Ware confesses, that he could find thus early no traces of Protestantism as an established religion. The piety and heavenly fortitude of Archbishop Browne beamed forth as a momentary gleam of sunshine amidst the Egyptian darkness that covered the land. The revenues of the Church continued in possession of the hierarchy, which the reformed ministers had ostensibly, but not historically displaced. In some instances the bishoprics were bestowed on Roman Catholics, and by the pope; in others, they who were in possession of them, pretending to conform, continued to enjoy them.—Newland's Apology, page 35.

King Henry, therefore, having succeeded in causing his supremacy in the Church of England to be recognised by the clergy, and authorized by Parliament, was desirous of establishing the like supremacy in the Church of Ireland. This, however, he found to be a matter of considerable difficulty, chiefly in consequence of his opposition to the measure, arising from George Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh, who was a zealous promoter of the Pope's supremacy in despite of the pretensions of the King, and whose influence induced many others to join him in his opposition. But a vacancy having occurred in the archbishopric of Dublin, in July 1534, an opportunity was afforded to the King in filling it up, of introducing into the Irish Church a prelate more likely to advance his wishes there, and whose personal character and abilities, combined with the influence derived from the exalted station which he was to fill, might serve as a counteracting force to resist the opposition of primate Cromer, and effect the acknowledgement of the King's supremacy in all the Church of Ireland. Accordingly the King's choice fell upon George Browne.—King's Primer of the Church of *Ireland*, p. 145.

Again, *Ibid.* In the following March, (Browne) being advanced by King Henry VIII., to the archbishopric of Dublin, he was consecrated with all the customary forms by Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and Shaxton, Bishop of Salisbury. Everything being transacted according to the Romish ritual, and the only deviation from the ordinary mode of consecration being, that instead of being indebted for the pall and other marks of his archiepiscopal rank to the Bishop of Rome, he received these symbols of his new dignity from the legitimate authorities of the Church of his own nation, and thus entered on his office unshackled by submission to the usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome. p. 147.

Newland, in his Apology says:—"It is no unusual argument with those who extol the omnipotence of Parliament, (meaning by thus praising its authority every vile revolutionary principle which disregards the sacredness of property,) to urge the example of Henry VIII., in defence of the power of the legislature to allocate the patrimony of the Church to the relief of the fiscal exigences of the State. But, however unprincipled or depraved, Henry VIII. does not afford the example required. . . . For let the two Acts of Parliament be referred to which embody the whole proceedings connected with the dissolution of the monastic institutions, and the appropriation of their revenues to the King, and our Anti-church reformers will not find even a trace to justify the system their thirsting souls desire to see accomplished."—p. 220.

In the first statutes by which Henry became possessed of the monasteries, it is expressly stated, "that all and singular such monasteries and religious houses as have been *given* to his Majesty by any abbot, &c."—28th Henry VIII., c. 16.

But more particularly is this transference of the estates of the abbots marked in the 33d Henry VIII., c. 5., it states unequivocally, that the relinquishment of their patrimony "is of their own free will and voluntary minds and assents, without restraint, coercion, or compulsion of any manner of persons." In another place, these properties are spoken of as surrendered *by them* to the King,—Newland, p. 222.

Again: Mr. King,—Primer of Church of Ireland, p. 153, says: "He (Henry VIII.) also did much harm to the Church of Ireland, and that in more ways than one, for when Primate Cromer died in 1543, he appointed as his successor, George Dowdall, a man strongly attached to the interests of the Romish See, and firmly opposed to the alterations then in progress: so much so, that although he was willing to receive his appointment from the King, he afterwards endeavoured, but ineffectually, to have it confirmed by the Pope."

But the Hon. Gentleman had either overlooked, or had neglected to state, the whole facts of the case; he had forgotten to remind the House that the whole of the chieftains or kings of Ireland had conformed, and had elected Henry King, with all the privileges attached to that office—that they (the chieftains of Ireland), who possessed the nomination of bishops, had altogether abolished the inferior title of "Lord,"—previously the Irish title of the sovereigns of England,—and had formally elected Henry King, yielding to him all—their theretofore

enjoyed and undoubted rights of sovereignty.

"The lords of English descent, irritated by a too successful rivalry—the Irish still brooding over the original treachery of the Church, and its bitter consequences to themselves, and both turbulent, eager for ascendancy, and accustomed to refer everything to the arbitration of the sword, would naturally rejoice in the downfall of this arrogant order. Accordingly, when Henry VIII. asserted his claim to the complete sovereignty of the island, all the nobles arrayed themselves on the side of the Crown. They abolished the subordinate title of Lord, the only one which the Pope had permitted to be assumed, and proclaimed him King of Ireland and supreme head of the Church."—(*Phelan*, p. 130.)

Again, what said the indenture between the chiefs and Henry VIII.?

"Indentured the 26th of September, 34 Henry VIII., between the Irish chiefs and Henry VIII.:—They will accept and hold his said Majesty, and the Kings his successors, as the supreme head on earth, immediately under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland."

Again, they found, in Elizabeth's time, at the Parliament held in Dublin by the Earl of Sussex, in 1560, out of nineteen Irish prelates who were present, only two refused to conform, those two being Walsh, the Bishop of Meath, and Leverus, Bishop of Kildare.

It is a remarkable fact that these two bishops had been irregularly intruded into their sees, during the reign of Queen Mary, A.D. 1554, June 29. The former, in place of Bishop Staples; the latter, of Bishop Lancaster.—See Bishop Mait, vol. i., 275. Cox's History of Ireland, p. 299.

It is observed by Archbishop Brambell, that no Papists ever did or could make the least objection against the ordination of the Protestant bishops in Ireland. For besides that, Archbishop Browne (the first Protestant bishop in Ireland) was ordained by the bishops of Canterbury, Rochester, and Salisbury, and many of the Irish bishops were ordained by Browne. The very Popish bishops did assist at the consecration of the Protestant bishops, and complied with the Government, and kept their sees till they had sacrilegiously betrayed the Church and alienated most of its possessions, one bishopric being left so poor that it had but forty shillings per annum, and another but five marks. Thus Loftus, Archbishop of Armagh, was consecrated by the Popish Archbishop Curwen. Thomas Lancaster, the first Protestant Bishop of Kildare, was consecrated by Archbishop Browne. John Merriman, the first Protestant bishop of Down and Connor, was consecrated by Lancaster when Primate. Bale, Bishop of Ossory, by the Popish bishops of Armagh, Kildare, and Down. Casey, Bishop of Limerick, was consecrated by Archbishop Browne, assisted by the Popish bishops of Kildare, Leighlin, and Ferns. (See Brambal, 438. Ware de Præsulibus, 27; *ibid.* 128 and '59; *ibid.* 148, 188.)—Cox's History of Ireland, p. 315.

Dr. Phelan, in his *Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland*, p. 166, A.D. 1568, says—

"For eleven years, her (Elizabeth's) measures were unmolested by the Papal Government, and received without opposition by the great body of the Roman Catholics. The laity everywhere frequented the churches. Multitudes of the priests adopted the prescribed changes, and continued to officiate in their former cures; and the majority of the prelates, leading or following the popular opinion, retained their sees, and exercised their functions according to the Reformed ritual."

So far, then, whatever value may be contended for, as applying or ascribable to the line of succession in the prelacy, that value, unquestionably attached to the bishops of the Church established in Ireland at the present day. In that Church the true line of Episcopal succession had continued unbroken. But another argument had been brought forward—an argument of a very different character to that to which he had been soliciting attention, and an argument on which much reliance was now placed—that the Established Church of a country ought to be the Church of the majority. Let him ask those who used that argument, and those who either lent a ready support, or seemed to yield an assent to that doctrine—whether they were prepared to carry it to its full extent—were they prepared to apply that doctrine to England? were they indeed prepared to hold forth to the Dissenting community of this country, that, if at any time the numerical majority of the English people should be found to be Dissenters from the Church, that then the Established Church should fall? He supported the Protestant Church in Ireland on other and still higher grounds. He supported it, not only because it was the Church of the majority of the people of this United Empire—not only because its establishment and security were solemnly guaranteed by the terms of the Union, and because it was essential to the maintenance of the Union itself; but, above all, because he conscientiously believed that it was an Institution absolutely necessary for the maintenance of true religion, and for the upholding of the civil and religious rights and liberties of all—Roman Catholic, as well as Protestant subjects of the British throne. It was asserted that the revenues of the Protestant Church were exorbitant—enormous. Now, he believed that a greater fallacy than this had never existed—yet, had it been long continued, and though again and again exposed, it had been again and again perseveringly repeated.

In 1787? the Bishop of Cloyne (Bishop Woodward) wrote a pamphlet

"The Present State of the Church of Ireland." By Richard, Bishop of Cloyne, p. 82.

"If the publication could have been postponed without defeating the purpose of it, viz., that of undeceiving

the public with regard to the extent of the revenues of the parochial clergy, before the meeting of Parliament, accounts might have been returned from every diocese similar to those which follow. But as the list subjoined comprehends a number of the best-endowed dioceses, it will appear, I believe, to every candid inquirer that the average income of the clergy throughout the kingdom cannot be greater than that stated below." After making the calculation, he goes on to say, "which would leave the net sum of 133*l.* 6*s* for each clergyman, if the national allotment were distributed in equal portions."

to refute the false impressions on the subject of that day. More lately, Lord Althorp, when he brought forward the subject of Church Temporalities, had stated that he had, before close inquiry, laboured under great misapprehension on the subject. He (Lord Bernard) would not refer to the statement of the Hon. Gentleman the Member for Sheffield, with regard to the amount of their revenues, which had been so ably refuted by the Noble Lord the Secretary for Ireland,

He (Lord Eliot) would read a Return which he had procured from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of the actual Revenues of the Irish Church. The total income of the Protestant Church of Ireland was 432,023*l.* 4*s.* 5*d.* This sum consisted of these items: rents of lands, houses, &c., duties, fees, reserved by lease, 62,945*l.* 9*s.* 7*d.* Value of demesne and glebe lands, &c., not reserved by lease, 28,128*l.* 13*s.* 3*d.* Fines or renewals, 83,556*l.* 13*s.* 11*d.* Rent charges, 239,047*l.* 18*s.* 6*d.* Ministers' money, 11,249*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.* Dividends on Government stock, 926*l.* 15*s.* 2*d.* From other sources, 6,168*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.* The following statement would place the question in a clear view:—

"Funds applicable to purposes of vestry cess and first fruits, (besides the tax of 7 per cent.) is 7,094 + 38,076=45,170*l.* There are 1,376 parochial clergy, and 744 curates. Their average income, including deans and chapters who have property exclusive of parochial benefices, is 306,300*l.*, say 2,150 is 142*l.* each subject moreover to numerous charges."—See Hansard, vol. 71, p. 168.

but he trusted that the House would pardon him for trespassing for a few moments on their attention while he read a few statements with reference to the diocese in which he resided. In the diocese of Cork, during Bishop St. Lawrence's incumbency—10 unions had been broken into 22 benefices; 28 curates had been promoted; 25 new places of worship had been erected; 81 scriptural schools had been established; additional resident clergymen—20 rectors, and 23 curates, had been provided. Since 1831—in Cork, Cloyne, and Ross—new churches, 12; churches building, 2; licensed places of worship, from want of churches, 45; glebe-houses built by clergymen, 3, the Commissioners being unable to build them, which fact proved the fallacy of a surplus revenue;—in Ireland in 1726 there were but 141 glebe-houses; in 1800, after nearly a century, but 295; in 1820 there were 768 glebe-houses, an increase of 473 in twenty years; in 1806, resident beneficed clergy, 693; curates, 560; in 1830 the number was nearly doubled, amounting to 1,200, with about 750 curates, about a total of 2,000; in 1843 the number of officiating clergy exceeded 2,000, with Church property reduced 70,000*l.* per annum, and a quarter from the remainder. The reduction of clerical income since 1833, amounting to 40*l.* per cent., has prevented the dissolution of unions and employment of additional curates. On the other hand, in his evidence before the Lords, Dr. Doyle stated the average income of the Roman Catholic clergy of Kildare and Leighlin amounted to 300*l.* per annum; the income of the Scottish clergy averaged 200*l.* per annum, exclusive of house and glebe. The building of glebe-houses, except from private sources, has ceased since 1833. But as one of the most stringent arguments to show that not only were those revenues not exorbitant, but really insufficient for the demands which existed in Ireland, he need only refer to the fact, that an Institution existed,

The additional Curates' Fund Society for Ireland, received for the year ending December 31, 1842, in subscriptions and donations, 1,858*l.* 17*s.* 5*d.* But this sum is wholly inadequate to meet the demands made upon the Association for additional parochial assistance.

supported by voluntary contributions, for supplying additional curates in that country, of which Institution he was himself a member; and he could assure the House that, had that Society the means at their disposal, they would be called on to supply ten times the number of curates which their present funds permitted. Let Hon. Gentlemen remember that the Protestants of Ireland, that this House and the country had, in 1829, received the strongest assurance, as far as solemn and oft-repeated pledge could go—as far as any solemn pledge could bind any party—that the Roman Catholics would be content if they got the civil privileges they then sought, and that there existed neither intention nor wish to injure or meddle with the rights and property of the Established Church in that country. But on that subject he would not now dwell. The Hon. Member for Sheffield had spoken with severity of the errors committed in past times. He (Lord Bernard) had very little wish that the Established Church of Ireland should be judged by the times of Archbishop Boulter, and the unhappy defects that then existed. He deprecated such judgment—he regretted as strongly as any man could the unwise, and indeed ruinous policy that had been in those distant days adopted. He regretted that means had not been taken to instruct the Irish people in and through the Irish language; and he felt assured that if in the reign of Henry VIII.,

28th Henry VIII., chap. 15, sec. 3; 2 Eliz., chap. 2, sec. 15. Leland, speaking of this section, says, book iv.,

chap. 1, There is a remarkable clause in this Act, which from the style appears to have been inserted by Parliament after the first transmiss of the Bill, and possibly was procured by those who opposed it." instead of the statute forbidding teaching and preaching in that language, the very contrary course had been pursued, far happier would have been the results. But, in speaking of distant times, they must not forget the labours of such men as Ussher and Bedel. If the exertions of those great, learned, and pious men had been followed out by the Government of the country at that time, his firm belief was, that in the condition of Ireland there would have been no trouble at the present day.

As a proof of the inadequacy of the funds of the Church of Ireland to provide church accommodation, the following may be quoted from the Report Irish Eccl. Commis., August 15, 1842. "The state of the several churches throughout Ireland has continued to engage the anxious attention of the Commissioners, and such sums have ben granted for repairs and other works as the funds of the Board would allow. The sums granted amounted to 30,635*l.* 7*s.* 10*d.*, of which, 23,188*l.* 16*s.* 9*d.* were set a part of repairs, and 7,446*l.* for rebuilding and enlarging; but the latter sum has been expended for the most part in completing works of this nature, which had been undertaken in the preceding year, *the Commissioners being obliged to postpone, by reason of the limited state of their funds, to provide for some cases of rebuilding and enlargement of a very urgent nature.*" He came gladly forward to bear his humble testimony to the excellence and great worth of the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland. He had known much of learning and worth in England, but never, until he went to reside among the clergy of Ireland, did he know what the true spirit of devotion could do. And as to the way in which the merits of those men were appreciated, he might be permitted to refer to an exalted authority—to the statements of one of the bright succession to the Protestant Episcopal Bench in Ireland, and one than whom none in that bright succession was more illustrious for learning and piety—the late Bishop of Limerick, Dr. Jebb. That eminent man stated, in his place in the House of Lords, that petitions had been presented from the Roman Catholic population of the county of Limerick and that neighbourhood, praying that more, and many more Protestant clergymen should be sent to reside among them. He (Lord Bernard) had known the Protestant clergy, and had seen their conduct in days of sore trial and affliction, when they were assailed by distress, and when they were deserted by that Government, whose duty it was, and whose inclination it ought to have been, to have protected them when they were, from want of means, compelled to withdraw their children from their ordinary schools, when their families were denied not only the comforts to which their station entitled them,—but even the necessaries of life were with difficulty obtained. Yet had he never known them to murmur. They had endured without complaining, and were willing to undergo all for the sake of their religion. If the hand of charity was to be extended among the people, either Catholic or Protestant, they were the first to contribute, in more than full proportion to their means. At the bed of sickness, in the house of want, in the maintenance and management of fever hospitals, dispensaries, and every other Institution that sought the alleviation of human suffering, there the Protestant clergy were ever found ready and faithful ministers of aid. And if (which he believed was the real charge) their fault was that they had done their duty, and by the discharge of that duty, had produced a great effect on the minds of the Roman Catholic population, and that from the feelings so excited had sprung up a deep and spreading agitation of thought, surely this House could not—surely the country would not blame men, because they had faithfully acquitted themselves of solemn duties—because they had fulfilled the solemn vows they had undertaken. Let him read a few words from the observations of that eminent divine before alluded to (the late Bishop Jebb), in his speech in 1824, in the House of Lords:—

"The great desideratum towards the internal improvement of Ireland is instrumentality,—a link between the Government, between the Legislature, between the great landed proprietor, and the people. It were folly, however, to speak of instruments in a mere mechanical sense. A moral instrumentality alone will cement together the frame of society, and in a country, from unhappy circumstances much demoralized, moral instruments are infinitely needful. Such instruments we have in the Irish clergy, to say the least of her as a body (with rare individual exceptions), an educated, liberalized, and well-conducted body of men, stationed at proper intervals throughout the country, regimented, so to speak, under the authority of superiors. Now, in what manner could we supply the place occupied by these men? Parliaments cannot create—Parliaments are not competent to create materials, such as we possess at this moment. Let Parliaments beware how they destroy. They will be altogether powerless to fill up the chasm. Take away the fabric of our Established Church, and you take away one teachers of our national improvement. A resident gentry we have not. A substantial yeomanry we have not. A body of capitalist manufacturers we have not. Humanly speaking, I do not see what it is, in the least improved parts of Ireland we have to rest on except the clergy. Here is the only provision extant for disseminating through all quarters of the land—the wildest and most remote equally with the most cultivated and peopled—an educated, enlightened, and morally influential class."

But not alone on Protestant testimony, however exalted and above suspicion, did the character of the Irish Protestant clergy rest. Dr. Doyle, an eminent Prelate, and famous champion of the Roman Catholic Church,

had, in reply to questions put to him on this subject, stated that they, the Protestant clergy, were characterized by the greatest benevolence to all persons of all creeds—that their wives and children were most beneficent and charitable; but, he added, their means were too small. He (Lord Bernard) felt that he should be acting wrong to trespass longer on the attention of the House at present. Perhaps he might be pardoned for slightly alluding to the testimony borne by a clergyman of the Established Church in Canada, who stated that those emigrants who had received the benefit of instruction from the Protestant clergy of Ireland, were far superior to any emigrants from any other country. He (Lord Bernard) asked Hon. Gentlemen in England to bear in mind what would be the consequences, if such a Motion as this were successful—they may be assured the Churches of both countries must stand or fall together. They may talk of separating the Churches, and acting with regard to Ireland on principles differing from that of England, but they would find in this as in other matters of policy—

"Cælum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt."

A small channel may divide the countries, but principle was the same in both. If they wished to maintain the Established Church in England, it was their policy as well as their duty to uphold the Church in Ireland. They had of late seen how easy it was to bring forward for England principles which had been applied to Ireland, particularly when the principle was false and bad. Let him now implore the House to come forward and reject this Motion. He had confidence in Her Majesty's Government; he had confidence in the decision which this House would come to; he had confidence in the Protestants of England. That those Protestant principles which had raised the country to a pinnacle of unexampled greatness, were not extinct; that they (the people of England) would feel that those principles for which their brethren in Ireland contended were those upon which their dearest liberties were based, the charter of their dearest right. But he had this higher and more abiding confidence—he had the confidence that if the Church of Ireland, true to her sacred trust, preserved within her bosom the undying flame of scriptural truth, that more than human arm, which had shielded her in the hour of trial and protected her in the time of sorrow, would preserve her amidst the fiery furnace of affliction.

Appendix.

Extracts from O'Halloran, Roman Catholic Historian.—Vol. ii. p. 7.

THE Christian religion, pointing the road to salvation by doctrines totally opposite to these of the Druids, we must suppose produced a sensible alteration in the conduct of its votaries, and it did so. At a very early period was Christianity preached in Ireland. The constant enmity between this country and ancient Rome prevented any kind of friendly intercourse. This doctrine came not immediately from thence here, but from the Churches of Asia; and this explains Tertullian's notes, "Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo veró subdita." Mansuetus, an Irishman, the first Bishop and patron of Toul, and canonized by Leo IX., is said to have been a disciple of St. Peter. St. James, the son of Zebedee, it is affirmed also preached the Gospel in Ireland. To me it would seem, that Mansuetus, and the other early Irish Christians were rather the disciples of St. John the Evangelist, and I ground my opinion on what the Venerable Bede relates, with regard to the famous controversy about the celebration of Easter. He tells us, that in defence of the Irish time of celebrating this feast in opposition to that of Rome, Colman, the Irish Bishop of Lindisferne, among other reasons declared—"that he had received it from his forefathers, who sent him to Northumberland as their bishop; and that it was the same custom which St. John, Christ's especially beloved disciple, with all the Churches under him, observed." In the reign of Con, in the second century, Ireland sent forth the famous St. Cathaldus to preach the doctrine of Christ, and he became bishop and patron of Tarentum in Italy. In so flourishing a state was Christianity soon after, that in the next age, Cormac—as great a legislator and as wise a prince as any nation produced—became before his death a Christian, and died in that faith, as we have observed already; soon after which it is expressly said in the *Calha-Crabhra*, that the Irish General Fion went to Rome. In the next reign we read of an Irish bishop's suffering martyrdom in Britain; and it is evident by the poem of Torna Eigis, chief bard to Niall the Grand, beginning with—"Dail Catha idir core and Niall," that he himself was a Christian, and Colgan offers his reasons for thinking his master one also.

The preceding chapter has shown the flourishing state of Christianity in Ireland before the days of St. Patrick, and if what is generally taken for granted be true, i. e., "that the more polished nations were, the speedier this doctrine spread itself among them," we must rank this country amongst the most civilized states of Europe; and what *Cambrensis* meant as an insult, was the highest encomium on the people, for he upbraided the archbishop of Cashel for that amongst the numbers of saints and confessors which Ireland boasted they could not produce one martyr.

Topogr. Hib. dist. iii. cap. 29.

But persecution and death for religious tenets was never the practice of truly polished people.

The missionaries in the fourth century not only preached, but founded churches and opened colleges in Ireland. Amongst these was the holy Dima, whose name a church near Adare in this county (Limerick) still

bears. Heber, or Ibarus, soon after founded an academy at a place called Beglire, in Leinster, where, as Ussher notes,

Ussher, Primord, p. 801.

"he instructed very great numbers of Irish as well as foreigners in sacred and polite letters." Colman says, Vita St. Abbani.

"that the people from all parts crowded to his schools to be instructed in Christianity and letters."

St. Albe, Archbishop of Munster, and his contemporary,—Ussher, says—after preaching through the whole kingdom, founded his church and schools at Emly. St. Kieran and St. Declan, also preceded Patrick and founded churches; and when this apostle required their acknowledging him as Arch bishop of all Ireland, it produced some dissensions, "Ibarus particularly protesting against giving the supremacy and patronage of Ireland to any one but a native."

The zeal and success of the Irish missionaries in Britain and on the Continent at this time, sufficiently proved to the Roman Pontiff in what a respectable state Christianity must have been in Ireland; and though, as we have already observed, this doctrine was not introduced amongst us by Roman preachers, no more than amongst the early Gauls, (else, why would these last in that terrible persecution raised against them in the latter end of the second century prefer their complaints, and paint their distresses to their brethren in *Asia* and *Phrygia* rather than to the faithful in *Rome*?)

Fleury, Hist. Eccles. torn. i. p. 433.

) yet they naturally wished to establish their authority here. To this end, in the year 431, and in the reign of the present Emperor Loagaire, Pope Celestin sent Palladius, archdeacon of the Romish Church, as archbishop and apostle of Ireland with twelve Irish missionaries. This is affirmed by the Venerable Bede,

Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 10.

who tells us, "that in the eighth year of the reign of the Emperor Theodosius, Palladius was sent by Celestin, bishop of the Roman Church, to the Scots believing in Christ, to be their first bishop."

Prosper,

Chron. ad annum 431.

treating of the mission of Palladius, says, "that he was ordained by Pope Celestin, and sent the first bishop to the Scots believing in Christ." The great Primate Ussher, whose zeal for his country was equal to his erudition, contended that the word Primus was foisted into later copies of Prosper, and his reason for supposing this was, lest it might be thought that there had not been Christians in Ireland before this period, a point which he strenuously contends for.

Prim. Keel. Brit. p. 798.

That there were, cannot be controverted, and yet it does not, nevertheless, lessen the authorities of Bede and Prosper. The political enmity betwixt Rome and Ireland cut off all communication between them. The Irish received the faith from the early Asiatic or African Churches, and Palladius was therefore the first bishop sent from Rome to establish the Roman hierarchy here. This becomes more clearly illustrated by what Prosper says afterwards in speaking of Celestin, "that having ordained a bishop for the Scots or Irish, whilst he endeavoured to keep the Roman island, i. e., Britain, Catholic, he made the barbarous island, i. e., Ireland, Christian." The evident sense of which is, that whilst he attended to the care of Britain, which always acknowledged the power of Rome, he forgot not the same zeal and concern for Ireland, though it never admitted of Roman jurisdiction. A confession highly honourable to this country, and a farther evidence of the truth of our ancient history. His mission was attended with no great success, for we must suppose by the opposition given to St. Patrick's ministry in the beginning, that the Irish were very unwilling to acknowledge spiritual supremacy in a people whose temporal power they manfully and successfully opposed. His stay was but a few months in Ireland, during which time he founded three new churches, and then retired to Britain, where he died soon after.

It is recorded of Patrick that during his mission in Ireland he consecrated no less than 365 bishops, and ordained 3,000 priests, none of whom were received, who had not given the clearest evidences of an holy and pious life and conversation. This number of bishops may surprise some readers, and therefore merits an elucidation. Amongst the other causes of Patrick's great influence on the people, one was, his attention to avoid whatever could alarm the national pride, or alter the established police of the kingdom.

As to the first we find no hint at a foreign supremacy during the whole of his mission, nor any disputes whatever about the tonsure, and time of celebrating the feast of Easter; though it is most certain that before, during, and for two centuries after his death, the Irish Church adhered most strictly to the Asiatic Churches in these modes of discipline. The same prudence governed him with respect to the internal police of the kingdom; and, provided religion was not materially hurt, he passed over small things. In Ireland all posts of honour and profit were hereditary in families.

Though St. Patrick had been preaching and converting souls in other parts of Ireland since the year 432, yet he came not to Munster till 448. Two reasons are to be assigned for this: first, the flourishing state of

Christianity in this province for a considerable time before this period; secondly, some preliminaries were to be adjusted between him and St. Albe. At length Aongus the King, invited Patrick to his court, and to do him the greater honour, attended by his nobility, his prelates, and clergy, he met him at some distance from Cashell. In his suit were St. Albe and St. Declan. A synod was soon after called, at which the king presided, and it was decreed—"That St. Albe should rank as a second Patrick, and Patron and Archbishop of Munster; and that St. Declan should be called the Patrick of the Deasies and their chief bishop. After this they blessed the King, and giving the kiss of peace, each returned to his particular charge. * * * * *

Bollandus, Tellemont, and even Fleury, in his "Ecclesiastical History," have asserted that the Irish were unacquainted with letters till, the days of St. Patrick; nor should I attend much to these remarks of foreign writers, who, having no opportunities of consulting our annals, might be well excused for their mistakes, did I not see the same falsehood roundly asserted by English, and even some modern Irish writers too. To admit this is to annihilate all our pretensions to history and antiquity, but it will be hard to reconcile it to the Christian preachers being at the same time the founders of seminaries for letters, and to this doctrine's blazing with such superior lustre amongst us. Besides, since we had Christian teachers from the first century, who founded Churches and made converts, must we not suppose that they must have known the use of letters? We undoubtedly must. But to bring it to a point, if Patrick introduced any letters into Ireland, they must be the Roman alphabet. But will any one affirm that the Roman letters were in the same order or structure as the Irish! The Irish alphabet was arranged in an order peculiar to itself, beginning with the consonants. It consisted of but seventeen (though I think more justly but of sixteen, the F being an interpolation) letters; but will any scholar advance, that in the fifth century from Christ, the Roman alphabet contained no more? Will he be so hardy as to say, that even this number of letters (seventeen) were the same in structure with the Roman ones? If he does, Julius Cæsar shall be my witness of his deception: for, he tells us, that the British and Gaulish letters, in his days, were like the Greek, and such is the Irish at this day. Now, if this letter was not totally different in figure from the Roman, where is the necessity for this remark of Cæsar's? But as a gentleman of great eminence in the republic of letters, though he admits the Irish to be as early in the possession of letters as any nation whatever, yet contends, that St. Patrick absolutely destroyed their original letter, and in its place substituted the present one, which he brought from Rome; it merits some discussion, more from the reputation of the author than the solidity of his arguments. He affirms, that Patrick gave them the same number of Roman letters which their ancient alphabet contained, and subject to the same rules. We have seen the Greeks by degrees reject the signs annexed to some of their original Cadmean alphabet, for new letters, and it was an useful alteration; the Saxons did the same, and so did the northern nations of Europe, who, like them, took their original alphabet from Ireland. But to suppose a learned nation to substitute one alphabet for another, without any visible advantages for the better, as in the present case, is absurd. Besides, by the testimony of Cæsar, the Gaulish and Irish letters must differ from the Roman, as in effect they did. But, what confusion must not arise in the public records of the kingdom from such alteration? Would all the bishops in England prevail on the Parliament to alter the present letter without some uncommon advantages? In Ireland, by this hypothesis, none was pretended; the great influence, the veneration for, and miracles of, St. Patrick, are held forth by our writers in a most conspicuous point of view; everything relative to him has been preserved with uncommon reverence, the officers of his household, and even his meanest domestics are on record, and yet not the smallest notice taken of this wonderful change, except the crude assertions of ill-informed foreigners! It is then an incontrovertible fact, that our present letter is the same we had from the most remote antiquity, the same the early Greeks adopted; the same the Gauls used in the days of Cæsar; and, what we find the oldest MSS. in Europe are wrote in.

Thus it appears to demonstration that in the days of St. Patrick, first, the order of the Irish letters was different from that of the Roman; secondly, that our alphabet had seven letters less than theirs; and, thirdly, that in structure they differed totally from the Roman! It is indeed confessed, that before the death of this apostle, the Christian bishops, in imitation of the Romans, altered the old form of our alphabet, such as we have exhibited in the second book of this history; and, instead of beginning it with the consonants, like them, commenced it with the letter A; and that in process of time the whole nation adopted the same mode. It is not improbable but that Patrick introduced amongst us the Roman alphabet, and that he gave copies of it to different churches in order to celebrate the rites of the Church in Latin; but, it may certainly with as much propriety be inferred, that because the Jesuits in China made their converts, especially the clergy, acquainted with the Roman alphabet, that the Chinese were totally illiterate before this period—as that the Irish were so before the days of St. Patrick.

My account of this great apostle shall close with some remarks on the celebration of Easter, because they are curious and historical, and display the genius of the people, the state of the Irish Church at that time and for many centuries after, and the great good sense and moderation of Patrick. We have already noticed that the first Irish converts were the disciples of St. John, at least that they received Christianity from the Churches of Asia, and adopted their mode of tonsure and time of holding the festival of Easter. The Jews had their Pascha or

passover to commemorate their being unhurt on the night that the destroying angel killed the first-born of man and beast throughout the land of Egypt. The apostles after the death of Christ judged that nothing could be more expressive of our deliverance from sin than the institution of a similar festival. The Jews were commanded to celebrate their Passover the fourteenth day of the moon of the first month, which corresponded with our March, this being the time of the vernal equinox, when the sun is in Aries, the days and nights of equal length, and the new year beginning to spring. They had put Christ to death whilst they were celebrating the feast of the paschal lamb; and this circumstance determined the Christians to celebrate theirs at the same time. St. Peter and St. Paul, after quitting Palestine, judged that the keeping this feast on the fourteenth day of the first moon was rather adopting the Jewish, than forming a new festival; they, therefore, transferred it to the Sunday after, unless that Sunday fell on the fourteenth. But St. John and the Churches of Asia and Africa adhered to the first institution. It was, however, a matter of mere discipline in which Christians might differ without sin or schism. St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and an immediate disciple to St. John, came to Rome, A.C. 158, on purpose to confer with Pope Anacetus on this subject. He defended the Asiatic custom on the authority of that saint; and the Pope defended the Western Church on the general tradition from St. Peter and St. Paul. But though they did not agree on this matter, yet they remained in peace and communion as before.

Fleury, *Histoire Eccl* torn. i. p. 375.

In the year 196 this question was agitated with great heat between Pope Victor and the Asiatic bishops. Several councils were held, and one by the bishops of Asia at the request of this pope, at which Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, presided. But the result was, that they were more unanimous in adhering to the original institution.

Ibid. torn. i. p. 518.

The Asiatics and all the Churches deriving under them continued this practice of celebrating Easter till the year 325, when the Council of Nice issued a decree for observing this feast everywhere on the Sunday immediately following the vernal equinox, and this decree was enforced by command of the Emperor Constantine.

But notwithstanding all this, numbers in Asia and the Church of Ireland, with all those deriving under it, as the Britons, the Picts, and Dal-Riada, adhered firmly to the discipline of St. John in this point. What Patrick's opinion on this head was does not appear. We do not even find any mention of it during his mission; and yet it is most certain, that the Irish did then observe this feast after the Asiatic manner, and did treat the decisions of Rome on this point with great respect. Not only this, but such of them as spread Christianity and founded Churches in foreign countries strongly inculcated their mode of celebrating Easter. Such was the great Columba, apostle of the Picts, Columbanus in France, St. Aidanus, Finian, Colman, &c., in Britain, &c

The Venerable Bede,

His. Eccl. Brit. lib. iii. c. 4.

though he praises Columba and his monks of Huy, as well as his successors to his own days, for their piety and virtue, yet censures them for their obstinacy in this point of Church discipline. In France, Columbanus, with all the monks of his house, followed it. He was of the noblest blood of Ireland, and early dedicated to the service of God. Holy abbots, at that time and for centuries after, erected their retreats in the most sequestered places, that nothing might disturb their prayers and meditations. Scarce an island or solitary spot of ground in Ireland that spiritual retreats were not already made in and churches and abbeys erected, the remains of most of which are yet visible, exhibiting at once the wonderful piety of our ancestors and the degeneracy of their successors at least of the present age.

Columbanus

Floury, *His. Eccl.* torn. viii. p. 18, 19, 191.

, with a number of disciples, retired to France, and in the year 590 founded in the midst of a desert in Burgundy an abbey for himself and his followers; but these became so numerous that he was obliged to raise two others. The fame of his piety, austerity, charity, and miracles, drew after him numbers of followers, and this perhaps was the true reason that persecutions were raised against him. He with his monks celebrated the feast of Easter on the fourteenth day of the first moon, without at the same time pretending to stretch this custom beyond his own authority. The Gauls complain to Gregory the Great of this schism. Several councils are called, and Columbanus is cited to appear before them. He appeals to the pope, and with great learning, sense, and modesty defends his opinion and those of his country and ancestors on this head, and at the same time writes to the Gaulish bishops assembled on this occasion. He observed, that it was established by St. John, Christ's especially beloved disciple, by St. Philip, and the Churches of Asia; that it was proved by the calculations of Anatolius confirmed by St. Jerome. That those of Victorius (employed by Leo the Great in the fifth century to adjust the lunations and the exact time of the equinoxes) were vague and uncertain. He requests the holy Father's decisions on this matter, but adds—"that whoever opposes his authority to that of St. Jerome will be rejected as an heretic by the Western Church; that is, the Church of Ireland." "After all," he observes to the bishops assembled, "if I am in ignorance bear it with charity, since I am not the author of this discipline. Let me live in obscurity in this desert, near the remains of seventeen of our brethren already dead. We wish to adhere to

the customs of our ancestors to our deaths. You should rather console than distress poor, aged, and afflicted strangers. In a word, if it be the will of God that you should expel me from this desert, to which I came from so great a distance for the love of Jesus Christ, I shall only say with the prophet, If I am the cause of this storm let it cease by my being thrown into the sea."

In the year 664, a council was held in Northumberland, to withdraw the Saxons and Britons from this custom, which they borrowed from the Irish. St. Colman, at the head of his Irish clergy (as Columbanus did), defended this custom by the authority of St. John, and the Churches of Asia, by the calculations of Anatolius, and by the practice of his ancestors, bishops, and teachers, who being pious, learned, and godly men, strictly adhered to the same. In a word, finding the majority of voices against him, rather than swerve from the discipline of his ancestors, he resigned his bishopric, and returned to Ireland, bringing with him a number of Saxon monks, for whom he founded an abbey in an island, in the county of Mayo, which was in a most flourishing state in the days of the Venerable Bede, and for centuries after.

His, Eccl. lib. iii. cap. 25.

From the remarkable attachment of the Irish to this custom we have still stronger proofs of the uncommon wisdom of Patrick. He probably endeavoured to reconcile the Irish clergy to the practice of the Universal Church; and very likely laboured also, to make them acknowledge the supremacy of Home. But he saw clearly, by their firmness in these matters, that should he insist much on them, he would endanger his own authority. His silence on these points accounts for his journey to Home, after his establishment of Christianity here. He laid before the consistory, the dangers that he apprehended from insisting on these heads, and we must conclude that the Pope approved of his conduct; since we see, upon his return, that the Pope presented him with a pallium, and that he observed the same prudent silence on these matters that he did before. I as freely censure my countrymen for their obstinacy on this occasion as any man can. We plainly see, that the custom was not peculiar to them; and that they defended it, from its antiquity, the practice of many of the disciples, the authority of the Churches of Asia, the astronomical calculations of Anatolius, *and from its being the constant usage of their ancestors*. They were the last to submit themselves to the decisions of Rome on this head; but they submitted from conviction. These points of the Irish Church discipline, which, before me, no one has attempted to explain, convey facts of the utmost consequence to Christianity. They prove to demonstration, that the Church of Christ, as established by his disciples, immediately after his crucifixion, and before they dispersed themselves into the different quarters of the globe, remained invariably the same, in the different succeeding ages. We have seen in the second, third, and fourth centuries, no differences whatever between the Church of Rome and the Asiatic Churches, save about discipline; and this was confined to the tonsure, and the celebrating of Easter. The Irish, from political interest and their dread of a foreign yoke, *were the eternal and avowed enemies of Rome*. This hatred was as conspicuous in the days of Christianity, as we have seen, as in those days of Paganism; and it will not be now controverted that they owed not the seeds of Christianity to Roman missionaries. Yet, and indeed it is wonderful to be told, we plainly see that in the fifth century, in articles of faith, the Churches of Rome and Ireland were in perfect union, though it was the first time they met! We see the same miraculous conformity, (I think myself justified in the expression,) in the beginning and beyond the middle of the seventh century, when for the second time they met, and not in the most friendly manner. The question about Easter was agitated at this time both in England and France with great warmth. The Irish are charged with perverseness and wilful obstinacy in this matter of discipline, but not the least hint at holding heterodox opinions, either in themselves or in their ancestors. "If it be thought (says Colmanus, the Irish Bishop of Northumberland, in his defence of his country) that our most reverend Father Columba, and his successors, virtuous and godly men who kept Easter after the same manner, either believed or lived contrary to the Scripture; especially their piety being so conspicuous that God confirmed it by miracles."

Bede, His. lib. Hi. c. 25.

From this period to the middle of the twelfth century Rome and Ireland had no connexion or correspondence, and yet upon the landing of Cardinal Papiron at that time the most exact conformity in faith and discipline was found between both Churches! facts highly meriting the attention of every reflecting Christian. But whilst I remark this correspondence between the different Churches of the Christian world, let me not be supposed to contend that there never were heterodox opinions advanced and opposed to the sentiments of the Universal Church. Every age proved there were, but then these visionaries were but a few, from whose enthusiasms the flock was carefully guarded.

As it is universally agreed upon that it was in the reign of Mortogh

O'Halloron, vol. ii. p. 320.

that the famous Council of Kells, in Meath, was held, in which Cardinal Paparo presided on behalf of Pope Eugene III., and in which he distributed palliums to the Irish archbishops, the state of the Irish Church since the last General Council of Uisneach, merits our attention.

In that council great advances were made by the clergy and by the national states towards acknowledging

the absolute supremacy of Rome in spirituals. The archbishops gave up the power which their predecessors since the days of St. Patrick enjoyed and exercised, of creating bishops at will: the bishops agreed to a reduction of their number, and the monarch and estates exonerated the clergy for the time to come from temporal laws and temporal taxations! Still more was to be done before the power of Rome was completely established. Different great families, having the power of presentation to bishoprics, deprived the popes of the full exercise of the power of making bishops for the future to depend immediately upon themselves. As this was an affair of the utmost consequence to Rome, no wonder all the artillery of her advocates, both at home and abroad, should be employed to destroy so great an obstacle to her ambitious and interested views. From this cause, says St. Bernard,

Opera p. 1937.

"arose that universal dissolution of ecclesiastical discipline, that disregard of censure, and decay of religion over all Ireland." The holy primate Celsus seemed so sensible of this, that dying he sent the staff of St. Patrick to St. Malachy, declaring him his successor in the see of Armagh; and he conjured by letters and messages to Mortogh the Monarch, and to Domhnal, King of Leth-Cuin, that they would use their influence and authority to confirm his nomination; "For (says St. Bernard) a most pernicious custom had been established by the diabolical ambition of some men in power of getting possession of the seat of St. Patrick by hereditary succession, nor would they permit any to be elected bishops who were not of their own sept and family; for fifteen bishops of the same blood had successively governed this Church." The abbot had, with much more intemperance than Christian charity, already given a most horrid account of the state of religion in Ireland, and to this hereditary succession of bishops he attributed all these disorders; but he confesses that in the early days of Christianity, Ireland abounded with most holy and edifying ecclesiastics, and yet nothing is more certain than that ecclesiastical dignities were hereditary in families all over the kingdom at that time, and from that period down to his days! From this custom he also dates another flagrant abuse, "Hence (says he), a practice became established unheard of since the promulgation of Christianity, of multiplying bishops at the pleasure of the metropolitan." And yet this also was practised by St. Patrick and by his successors to the great advantage and increase of Christianity, as Bede and almost all other ecclesiastical writers acknowledge! Patrick consecrated himself no less a number than three hundred and sixty bishops in his lifetime, and his successors not only consecrated their domestic bishops, but also dignitaries for the British, Gaelic, and German missions! Thus it appears, contrary to the assertion of the abbot of Clare-vale, that, in the days of the highest splendour of the Irish Church, in those days when by universal consent the country got the title of *Insula Sanctorum*, the hierarchy was not only hereditary in families; but the successors of St. Patrick and St. Ailbe consecrated bishops at pleasure! If then from the fifth to the ninth and tenth centuries, when the piety, learning, and zeal of the Irish nation were so universally admitted, these customs of her Church, far from injuring, highly served the cause of religion, how account for their producing so contrary an effect in the twelfth? Nor was there then "*that universal dissolution of ecclesiastical discipline*" in the Irish Church, which St. Bernard affirmed; since in the enormous volume of his works now before me, of which the life of St. Malachy is a part, he acknowledges that through the recommendation of his preceptor Imarius, St. Gelasius ordained Malachy deacon and priest, "though he had not then arrived at the exact age prescribed by the canons, *which were then strictly observed*," that is twenty-five years for deacons, and thirty for priests' orders! For Gelasius himself was of the hereditary line of the successors of St. Patrick, as was Malachy also. But as this work of St. Bernard's is the grand reservoir from which all succeeding defamers of the Irish Church and nation have drawn their authorities and arguments, it necessarily demands a more critical examination. St. Magonius, the patrician, was endowed with uncommon privileges by Pope Celestin on his mission to the Irish nation, all which he exercised in the fullest manner. After remaining twenty-nine years preaching and converting the nation, he returned to Rome early in the year 461, to give an account of his mission to Leo the Grand, then pope, who received him with distinguished honours. He remained in Rome near two years and then returned to Ireland, where he continued till his death. Benignus and his successors in the see of Armagh, even in the lifetime of St. Patrick, exercised these privileges, which seemed peculiar to the Irish Church; and Patrick himself frequently convened synods and councils, at which he presided as legate, to direct the affairs of the Church.

It is not particularly said, but I think it must be admitted, that the powers originally granted to St. Patrick were, on his return to Rome, confirmed to his successors, because we see them exercised even in his own life-time (and he lived to 493) without the least restraint, and had they been irregular or usurped he certainly would forbid them. Thus the unlimited powers of the Irish archbishops were powers they derived from Rome, and which they employed for the advancement of religion only. It is certain, now that all Europe became Christians, that this power was too great, and seemed to eclipse, in some measure, that of Rome. The Irish clergy were admonished on this head, and we see that thirty-nine years before St. Bernard wrote the life of St. Malachy (i.e., A.D. 1111) they, in full convocation, resigned it; *though he adds it to the other charges against the nation!* We see, also, in that famous council, that they agreed to lessen the number of Irish bishops, and St.

Malachy himself, in 1139, made a surrender of all the other exclusive privileges of the Irish Church to Innocent II., "who was so pleased, that after appointing him legate, he placed the mitre that was on his own head on the head of Malachy, gave him the stole and manipule which he used himself at the altar, and giving him *the kiss of peace*, he dismissed him with his benediction." St. Malachy, on his return to Ireland, called synods in different parts of the kingdom, "and everywhere," says St. Bernard, "*were his counsels and instruction received and submitted to, as if they had come directly from heaven!*" These surely are not marks of a barbarous people, Christians only in name! Thus we see, at the very time Bernard was employed in writing the present work, that Ireland acknowledged the supremacy of Rome, but the Popes, though they got the power of *approving* of future Irish bishops, had not yet that of *nominating* them. This was the grand desideratum, and the want of this the source "of that universal dissolution of Church discipline, and that decay of religion over all Ireland," which has been so confidently affirmed, though by no means proved. Had the Irish ecclesiastics, like the Saxons in the reign of Alfred, been so totally ignorant as not to understand the Latin tongue, or could it be recorded of them, as we find it in a council held at Oxford A.D. 1222, where the "archdeacons are directed to take care that the clergy shall rightly pronounce the formulary of baptism and the words of the consecration in the canon of the mass," there might be some pretence for so severe a charge. As to the hereditary Episcopal right, it is to be noticed that in Ireland all posts and public employments whatever, were confined to certain septa. When Christianity superseded Druidism, those great families who founded bishopricks reserved the power of nominating to them, to their own blood. Persons were set apart for the clerical function, but none were nominated or ordained who had not given the clearest proofs of pious and irreproachable lives. Hence the remarkable piety and humility of the Irish ecclesiastics proved in every period of our history. We have but two instances where the impetuosity of our ecclesiastics hurried the nation to war, and both were in defence of clerical power, and yet, in both instances, were their proceedings condemned and themselves censured, though both of the blood royal; namely, St. Columba in the sixth, and the Abbot of Iniscatha, in the tenth age. But we have thousands of instances where they have been indefatigable in their endeavours to restore peace and concord between the princes of the land. As to our princes, certain it is that they were proud, haughty, and ambitious, fond of war, and ready to decide every contest by the sword. But, amidst all these excesses and ravages, *I challenge any nation under the sun to produce so few instances of proscriptions or deliberate cruelties*. But to return from St. Bernard. The privileges exercised by the Irish Church were, it must be confessed, too great, and held longer, might engender a schism. It was a wise measure to reduce them, but we see it was unjust to suppose them usurped, or that "an universal dissolution of Church discipline" was the consequence: it was not, and the moment the Churches of Rome and Ireland became united proved it, since all the difference found between them was, *that the Irish nation paid these small dues called Peter's pence to the see of Armagh*, which the rest of Europe paid to Rome! The bishops, in full convocation in 1111, surrendered up to Rome the rights which they till then enjoyed, and great pains were every day taken to lessen the other privileges of the Irish Church. What then remained for Malachy to do but, as the successor of St. Patrick, to make a formal surrender of his see to Rome, in his own name and in the names of his successors? But it required no small difficulty to persuade these princes and chiefs, who hitherto inducted to bishopricks, to resign so great a power. This it was that Innocent required of Malachy. For this purpose he appointed him his legate, and to promote it did he assemble so many synods in the different parts of the kingdom. Early in the year 1148 a finishing hand was put to the great work of reformation, for at a council then held at Holm-patrick, composed of Gelasius, successor to St. Patrick, and fifteen bishops, with two hundred priests, many abbots, and others, and in which St. Malachy, as legate, presided, it was agreed to send him again, to Rome, with full powers to compose all differences between the Church and the Irish nation, but he died at Clarevale in his way to Rome. Immediately after, through the interest of St. Bernard, Christian I., Abbot of Mellefont, and who had resided some time at Clarevale, was appointed legate, and soon after Bishop of Lismore. In 1150 he repaired to Rome with fresh authority from the princes and clergy on the same business, and the following year he was dispatched, in company with Cardinal Paparo, but they did not arrive till early in the year 1152. A council was then held at Kells, in which the legate presided, and which, besides the prelates and principal clergy, was also honoured by the presence of Mortagh O'Neill (who, it appears, even at this time was ranked as monarch), with several other princes and nobles. Many useful regulations took place; among the rest, the state of the hierarchy was taken into consideration. In the General Council of Uisneach the number of Irish bishops was reduced to twenty-eight, under two metro-politans. The instructions to Cardinal Paparo were to have the Church under the government of four archbishops, namely, Armagh, Cashell, Tuam, and Dublin, but we find that it met with great opposition in the council. It was observed, that the most general division of Ireland was that of Leath-Mogha and Leithcuin; that in the days of St. Patrick it was so, for which reason he himself ordained St. Albe Archbishop of Munster. It is true that afterwards St. Jarlath had assumed the title of Archbishop of Connaught, and St. Conlaeth, of Leinster, but they were not regularly consecrated or generally acknowledged. That in the Council of Uisneach two Archbishops only were appointed, and under them a certain number of

Bishops, but if the present regulation took place, these must necessarily be deprived of some of their suffragans, or a new creation of bishops must take place. But the cardinal observed, that Connaught and Leinster were always particular kingdoms, and therefore entitled to those marks of distinction, but that the Archbishops of Ulster and Munster should not imagine that he intended to encroach upon their rights or lessen the number of their suffragans, he would, by virtue of the apostolic power, appoint particular bishops as suffragans to the new metropolitans. He was positive, though we are unacquainted with the reason, and it did not become new subjects to disobey the Papal authority. The following, taken from an *Ancient Roman provincial*, was the regulation then received and adopted. Under the Archbishop of Armagh, the Primate of all Ireland, were twelve suffragans, namely, Meath, Down, Clocher, Connor, Armagh, Raphoe, Ratlure, Duleek, Derry, Dromore, Breffni, and Clanmacnois. Under the Archbishop of Munster or Cashell twelve, to wit, the Bishops of Killaloe, Limerick, Inis-calha, Killfenuargh, Emly, Ross-Crea, Waterford, Lismore, Cloyne, Cork, Ross, and Ardfert. The Archbishop of Connaught had nine suffragans, who were the Bishops of Cilmac, Driach, of Mayo, of Enachdun, of Inis caltra, Rosscommon-Clonfert, Achonry, Killalalla, and Elphin; and under the Metropolitan of Leinster were the Bishops of Glendaloch, Ferns, Ossory, Leighlin, and Kildare. In all, thirty-eight bishops; and because it was known that the Archbishops of Connaught and Leinster had no certain fixed seats, it was decreed that Dublin should be the future residence of the Metropolitans of Leinster, and Tuam of those of Connaught. Some regulations were made in this council with regard to marriages, but this must certainly regard the clergy, because in no other country was the purity of blood more carefully attended to, as all posts of honour were hereditary. After this, Cardinal Paparo presented palliums to the four archbishops in great pomp and form, and remained, says M. Fleury,

Histor. Eccl. tom. xiv. p. 685.

in Ireland till the Easter of 1153.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New Street, London.

Publications of the Protestant Association.

Statement of Views and Objects of the Protestant Association. 35. per 100.

Claims of the Protestant Association on Public Support. By G. H. Woodward, A. B. Second Edition. 2d., or 12s. per 100.

Circumstances attending the Publication of the Bible with Rhemish Notes. By the Rev. Robert J. M' Ghee. 2d. Edit. 6d., or 40s. per 100.

England the Fortress of Christianity. By the Rev. G. Croly, LL.D. 38th 1000. 1d., or 7s. per 100.

The Jesuits Exposed. 3d. Edit. 3d. or 20s. per 100.

The Popish College of Maynooth. 10th 1000. 1 ½d., or 105. per 100.

The Reformation, a direct Gift of Divine Providence. By the Rev. George Croly, LL.D. 5th Edit., revised. 3d., or 20s. per 100.

Jezebel. By the Rev. H. M'Neile. 4d., or 28s. per 100.

Come out of Rome. By the Rev. E. Blckersteth. 3d., or 20s. per 100.

A National Standard of Civil and Religious Liberty. 1 ½d., or 10s. per 100.

Speech of Sir Robert Peel on Church Extension; to which is appended a Speech of John Pemberton Plumptre, Esq., M.P., on the same subject. 1 ½d., or 10s. per 100.

The Protestant Magazine. Published Monthly, in 8vo. 3d.

The Penny Protestant Operative. With woodcuts. Published Monthly, 1d., or 7s. per 100.

Handbills.

Popery the Enemy of God and Man. 5th Edit. 1s. per 100.

Popery Unchanged. 4th Edit. 1s. per 100. No Popery. 3d Edit. 1s. per 100.

Guilt of Assisting Popery. 3d Edit. 1s. per 100. Murderous Effects of the Confessional. 25th 1,000. 1s. per 100.

Idolatry of the Reigning Pope, Gregory XVI. 1s. per 100.

Loyalty and Patriotism. 1s. per 100.

Narrative Tracts.

Eleanor, the Irish Convert. 2d., or 12s. per 100. Anecdotes of our Protestant Martyrs. 1d., or 6s. per 100.

Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. 1d., or 6s. per 100.

The Persecution of the Church of England by Queen Mary. 2d., or 12s. per 100.

Special Fund for Printing Standard Protestant Works, by Popular Writers, in a Cheap and Attractive Form.

THE COMMITTEE OF THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION have resolved upon extending their operations by issuing in an attractive form

A Series of popular Works,

calculated to extend Protestant principles, and to counteract the rapid spread of error in the land, and propose to create a separate Fund, to enable them to prosecute with vigour this fresh work in the cause of TRUTH; and they now affectionately invite the kind pecuniary support, and the co-operation of their Christian friends throughout the country.

Already Published.

I. History of the Great Reformation.

By the Rev. J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE. Abridged by Rev. EDWARD DALTON, Secretary to the Protestant Association. 18mo., cloth lettered, with Frontispiece, 4s.

II. The Divine Warning to the church at this Time.

By the Rev. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. Third Edition, considerably enlarged. 18mo., cloth lettered, price 3s., or £3 for twenty-five to give away.

III. The Jesuits; their Principles and Acts.

By the Rev. EDWARD DALTON. One vol. 18mo., 3s.

IV. Thoughts on Popery.

By the Rev. DR. NEVINS. Revised by ISAAC TAYLOR, Esq., Author of "Ancient Christianity," "Natural History of Enthusiasm," &c. One volume, 18mo., 2s.

V. Life of Edward VI.

By the Rev. R. W. DIBDIN, M.A. One volume, 18mo., 1s. 6d.

VI. Serious Dissuasives from Popery.

By Archbishop TILLOTSON, and Bishops HALL and JEREMY TAYLOR.

With Introductory Essay by the Rev. EDWARD NANGLE, M.A. One volume, 18mo., 3s.

IN THE TRESS.

On the Idolatry of the Church of Rome.

By Rev. A. S. THELWALL, M.A. One vol. 18mo.

PREPARING FOR THE PRESS.

I. History of the Inquisition.

By the Rev. R. MACKLIN, M.A. One volume, 18mo.

II. No Peace with Rome.

By BISHOP HALL. With Introductory Essay by the Rev. EDWARD BICKERSTETH, M.A. One volume, 18mo.

III. Select Protestant Biography.

One volume, 18mo.

IV. The Pope's Looking-glass.

Revised by; he Rev. Dr. MARSH.

V. The Papal Antichrist.

By BISHOP HURD.

With Appendix from Bishop NEWTON, and Introductory Remarks by the Rev. R. W. DIB-DIN, M.A. One volume, 18mo.

VI. The Life of Luther.

One volume, 18mo.

VII. The Gospel Lever applied to Romanism.

By the Rev. EDWARD NANGLE, of Achill. One volume, 18mo.

VIII. Memoirs of the British Reformers.

One volume, 18mo.

IX. Accusations of History against the Church of Rome.

By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, Prebendary of Durham. Revised by the Rev. J. E. Cox, Perpetual Curate of Aldeby, Norfolk, Editor of a recent Edition of "James' Bellum Papale," &c.

X. The Nullity of the Romish Faith; or, a Blow at the Root of the Romish Church.

By MATTHEW POOLE. With an Introductory Essay by the Rev. PETER HALL, Rector of Milston, Wilts, and Minister of Long Acre Chapel, London. 8vo.

Other Works are under the consideration of the Committee, who are in communication with some of the most distinguished and learned advocates of Protestant truth, who will preface and revise the Works to be

published.

High-Churchism; or Semi-Popery Exposed,

In a Correspondence Between the Rev. Chas. H. S. Nicholls, Incumbent of Christchurch, Wanganui, and the Rev. Isaac Harding, Wesleyan Methodist Minister, with Strictures,

By I Harding.

"Prove all Things, Hold Fast that which is Good."—St. Paul:

Auckland: W. C. Wilson, Printer, Wyndham Street. 1867.

Preface.

THERE is a fashionable cry in those times against any argument of religion. We may discuss in science, politics, and literature, but a theological controversy has an odium about it which is often injurious or fatal to a good cause. Yet, why? Is it because the deepest interests of men are in their religion, and they do not like it touched? But the more solemn and weighty the subject, the more ought we to be satisfied of the soundness and safety of our doctrine. What kind of medical science should we have if a bar were put upon argument. It is freedom of discussion that opens the glories of modern science, and the same policy which forbids argument in religion forbid freedom in astronomy, and imprisoned Galileo for saying the world moved. But if it be the *spirit* of controversy against which the feeling rises,—rancorous and bitter party spirit,—then we agree; but there is no more need for a bad spirit in a religious argument than in a money question or a question in geology; and, if I am a reasonable man, I shall be no more offended when my neighbour convinces me that I am accepting false principles as true, than if he were to prevent my taking counterfeit money for currency of the realm. On the contrary I shall feel and express my deepest obligation to him for holding a lamp to my feet in a dark and dangerous road, and for leading me into the possession of the true riches of my soul, my greatest, best boon, and God's dearest, best gift for both worlds.

There is no spirit of championship in this our argument; we only desire to bring the truth as it is in Jesus out from under the bushel, and set it on a candlestick where all may see the Light that can enlighten every man that cometh into the world, free from all sectarian clouds and human prejudice, with the hope that some now in darkness or only seeing men as trees walking may by the blessing of God be brought to the brightness of His shining, and taste the riches of His grace, instead of groping sadly in the night as if the Sun of Righteousness had not yet risen, or there were nothing on earth of religion, but the corpse or the dry bones bleached in the valley of a stagnant church.

This is the Christian day. Let men go forth out of their narrow cells to its goodly brightness and genial warmth; and if this tract shall help any of them to turn the key or open the door, or look up to the open heavens and taste that the Lord is gracious, that his goodness abounds in offers of a free salvation, now to be accepted and enjoyed, not indeed in one church only, not in Jerusalem, nor in this or that mountain, but wherever the true worshippers worship him in spirit and in truth, then we will rejoice and be thankful that the occasion arose, and the words were written in truth and love.

Truth only needs for once to be spoke out,
And there's such music in her—such strange rhythm,
As makes men's memories her joyous slaves,
And cling around the soul as the sky clings
Round the mute earth, for ever beautiful.

Correspondence and Strictures.

Wanganui Parsonage, August 30, 1867.

Sir,—

I have been informed by members of my congregation that you have, upon more than one occasion, attempted to lead them away from their "first love," and the church of their fathers, by offering your ministration to them unasked.

Allow me to request that you will, in future, refrain from thus interfering with the members of the Church, who have no wish to change "the faith once delivered to the saints" for a new one. They are content to be saved in the way the Bible points out; be you content also to let them so be saved.

I remain, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

C. H. S. NICHOLLS,
Incumbent of Christ Church.
Mr. Harding,

Wesleyan Minister,
Wanganui.

Saturday Evening, 31st August, 1867.
Rev. Sir,—

I am in receipt of a note from you, addressing me in a manner quite unusual, and, before I reply to the subject of your note, allow me to ask if it was from design that you addressed me as Mr. Harding, being a member of another branch of the great Protestant Church. It may be that you do not respect my ordination to the office and work of the Christian ministry, and yet I can hardly think you would take such unusual action from that stand point.

Your speaking and mode of acting within your own church, under the restrictions of your own peculiar views, may be seemly when those to whom you speak, or before whom you act, hold your own views; but when you come forth and violate the common usages of society, you must not think it strange if men ask you to explain; and, in the position in which your letter places me, I must beg you to say, was it inadvertance, or was it of purpose? and, if the latter, then under what principle do you refrain from addressing ministers of other churches as you would those of your own?

You may also use my proper name in your next; not John Harding, but

I am,
Rev. Sir,

Yours, &c.,
ISAAC HARDING.

Rev. D. H. Nicholls,
"Incumbent" of Christ Church.

Wanganui Parsonage, September 2nd, 1867.
Sir,—

As you seem to expect a reply to your note of last Saturday, I will do my best to give you one. You seem annoyed, if I may judge from the tone of your note, that I should presume to exercise that liberty of conscience and opinion which I know Dissenters claim for themselves, and which I *believed* they allowed to others. You claim to be addressed as "reverend," according to the "common usages of society," *i.e.*, the world. This I cannot conscientiously do, and I will tell you why. I need not say that I mean nothing personally disrespectful to yourself by refusing to give you a title to which you, in common with most dissenting teachers, consider you have a fair claim. If I refused it to you upon the ground of supposed inferiority of education, worldly station, or character, I could only (to be consistent) claim it myself upon the ground of self-imputed superiority in these particulars—a degree of presumption of which I should be sorry to be guilty. Supposing myself to be a worse theologian, a worse scholar, a worse preacher, a worse man than yourself, I should designate myself "reverend," and should refuse so to designate you. And why? I claim this title of honour simply and exclusively in consideration of my office; I refuse it to you simply and exclusively because I do *not* consider that you have

been appointed to the same office.

We, of the Church, think no man *personally* worthy of holding the illustrious office of an ambassador of Christ, and calling himself by any distinctive title as such. St. Paul even thought the same of himself, for he declared himself "not meet to be called an apostle;" and he moreover gives a reason why it is *necessary* that we should be thus *personally* inferior to our station, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of men."

I have cogent reasons for speaking of persons in your position (as I did just now), as dissenting teachers, and not dissenting *clergymen*. And these reasons have not been adopted hastily or arrogantly, but are the result of more than thirty years' serious reflection.

The title of "clergyman" seems to me, like the prefix "reverend," to involve the whole question at issue between the Church and dissent. The proper meaning of the word "clergy" is the "lot" or appointment of God; and the clergy are set apart by Him, like the tribe of Levi, to be *His*. But I deny that dissenting teachers hold *any* appointment in the Church, except of their own fanciful creation, and upon their own unsupported authority; therefore I cannot conscientiously call them dissenting clergymen, any more than I can designate them as "reverend," although I had the greatest personal esteem and respect for them. And I think that this objection will apply with tenfold force to the Wesleyan preachers, inasmuch as they have thrust themselves into the pastoral office, and made a schism in Christ's body, in direct opposition to the—precepts of their "father and founder." "Let this be well observed,—I fear, when the Methodists leave the Church, God will leave them." "Are we not unawares, by little and little, sliding into a separation from the Church? O use every means to prevent this. 1. Exhort all our people to keep close to the Church and Sacrament. 2. Warn them also against despising the prayers of the Church. 3. Against calling our society the Church." (*Minutes of Conference*, 1770.) See also the reasons assigned by John and Charles Wesley against a separation from the Church of England. (*Works*, vol. 23, p. 116, &c.)

Oh! if "glorious old John" could walk upon earth again, would he not go about with a seourge to correct the proceedings of modern Methodism, and the gross departures from what he wished or intended?

Pardon my warmth; it arises only from the recollection of what I have seen and heard among the Methodists, in the midst of whom I have lived for years.

I think that I have now fully answered your inquiries, and having done so simply as a matter of courtesy, I require no reply, either to this or my first note, nor shall I pursue the subject any further.

You will, of course, require no apology for my not knowing your Christian name, as you have made a similar mistake with mine. I wrote "Chas.," which you read "D."

With every personal respect,

I remain, Yours truly,

CHAS. H. S. NICHOLLS.
Mr. Isaac Harding,

Whanganui.

Wanganui, Wesleyan Parsonage, 5th September, 1867.
Rev. Sir,—

Your note of the 2nd is to hand, and I beg to acknowledge the free expression of your views as more than I expected from one of a school usually remarkable for holding back from the clear and manly avowal of the church views which you have set out so promptly and so well.

Allow me yet a little further to incroach upon your attention, as I do not quite see in what point of view you place the leading terras in both your letters, and to ask you to say briefly what is your idea of "the church," and in what respects you desire to be understood as placing "the world" in opposition to the church.

Also the term "clergy," on what ground you confine the lot or appointment of God so as to exclude "dissenting teachers" from any part therein, and who do you compass under that title?

I am,
Rev. Sir,

Yours &c.,

ISAAC HARDING.

The Parsonage, Whanganui, September 13, 1867.

My dear Sir,—

Although I said in my last letter that I should not pursue this correspondence any further, I feel myself obliged to acknowledge your note of the 5th inst., and to thank you for the courteous manner in which you give me credit for straightforwardness, which I think it is best to exhibit on all occasions.

Although my time is much taken up, and my mind much distressed by the serious illness of my eldest daughter, I will endeavour to answer your questions briefly.

Our blessed Lord, in the 17th of St. John, speaking of His apostles, with whom He promised He would be present to the end of the world, says that they are "not of the world," evidently drawing a line of demarcation between the society which He founded through their agency, and those who did not belong to it, viz.: "*the world*." "*My idea of the Church*" is precisely that which is given in our 19th Article, to which I refer you. And, therefore, all who do not belong to a society so constructed, I consider as belonging to "the world," either the "religious world" or the purely secular.

For an answer to your third question, I refer you to the 23rd Article; and I call all persons "dissenting teachers" who dissent from the doctrines I have quoted, and who have not received Episcopal ordination. This is warranted by the challenge given by the celebrated Chillingworth to all dissenters, to prove "that for the first 1500 years of the Church's existence, there was to be found any body of religious people who were not governed by a bishop." This challenge has never been answered to this day.

I felt bound, in common courtesy, to say thus much, but for the reasons I have stated above, you really must excuse me from entering into the subject any further. I have engaged to some extent in polemical controversy during my life, but I am now quite tired of it.

Whenever I think I can do good by answering questions or objections respecting religious subjects, I do so cheerfully, as my duty, but I do not like to engage in argument unless I see some prospect of benefitting others.

May God give his blessing on what I have said, and grant that however I and others may differ on the subjects, we may never let our opinions destroy our charity.

I remain,

My dear Sir,

Yours very truly,

CHAS. H. S. NICHOLLS.

Mr. Isaac Harding,
Whanganui.

To the Revd. Chas. H. S. Nicholls, Incumbent of Christchurch, Wanganui.
Rev. Sir,—

Your note of the 30th August, 1867, dated from "Wanganui Parsonage," is now before me, and I beg to say that after thirty years' experience in the Christian ministry and some acquaintance with ministers of various branches of the Church of Christ in England, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand, and now and then a little kindly attrition with some one whose sectarian tumours stood out so as to disfigure the Christian character and damage the name by which we are called, yet your note is the most singular phenomenon, and the drollest oddity it has been my lot to come across at home or abroad. Tractarius in obscure villages, new fledged from Oxford with the feathers of tract 90, or among others in the colonies, hastily jostled into the ministry from the school room, the queerest thing I have seen of the exclusive high church genus, is certainly this grave complaining note of yours.

You speak of members of your congregation as "members of the church," as though your people alone were Christians, and heathen all beside. And you speak of the "*Faith once delivered to the saints*," as the exclusive property of your church and if any churchman should be induced to attend another ministry in this town, you regard that step as "changing the faith once delivered to the saints" for a new one. You then warn me not to

interfere with your people being saved in "the way the Bible points out," as though that sacred book pointed directly to Christchurch, Wanganui, and ignored any revealed truth and grace beyond that holy inclosure.

All this is sufficiently remarkable, but the burden of your note is even more so, and I do not remember another complaint of the same kind either lodged against me or any other minister of the Christian church with whom I have been acquainted. Indeed in the present case I am not sure as to what parts of my conduct the complaint is intended to apply. I may have visited persons sick or dying under bereavement or stricken down by sorrow, but as the question seldom comes up in such interviews as to this or that church, I have rarely learnt anything as to their membership here or there. All that appeared was simply that they were my fellow men in trouble, requiring some one to guide them to the "God of all consolation," even to the "Saviour of all men especially of them that believe." As to my refraining in future from offering my ministrations to members *of the church*, that is in your use of the term Christ Church, Wanganui, I reply:

1. That in order to avoid the offence of which you complain, in all cases it will become needful to know who the members of the church are, and how to distinguish them from the world, for you have so thrown me back upon the authority of John Wesley, who used to say "*the world is my parish*," that in labouring in his spirit to seek and save them that are lost, some may be spoken to who had not asked our ministrations, and so we may, without intending to do wrong, become chargeable with this grave offence of offering our ministrations on more than one occasion to members of the church unasked. I must therefore beg you to adopt some measure to make known the exact number of your flock, and so to distinguish them on the one hand from other Christians, and on the other from "the world," that in the one case I may be sure they are not of my own people, nor of any church whose minister would not feel the objection which you do, and then I need to be also assured that they are not of Wesley's parish which you have divided into the "religious world," "and the purely secular world," for by neglecting the spiritual wants of some of these I may perchance provoke again that great warmth for which you apologise in your second letter, and which seems to have been kindled in your breast by the very irritating reflection that the Methodists were guilty of gross departures from "what glorious old John wished and intended."

But am I really to understand that you are provoked to think how that Methodism is now not so pure and good as it was, and that you are so zealous for its purity and interests that you could even wish glorious old John could walk upon this earth again and with a scourge correct the proceedings of modern Methodism?

It is however, necessary ever to bear in mind that there is a power far above the ecclesiastical boundaries built by men's hands, even that divine charity which seeks the speedy salvation of perishing souls from sin and death, and whenever men for whom our Saviour died are found lost in sin and exposed to destruction, may we still have grace to reprove or admonish them, or in affection and trouble may we comfort and relieve them, or shrinking from the terrors of the last enemy, may we be able to minister to them in the time of need, and that without waiting to be informed as to their baptism here or there, their confirmation, or their present relations to this or that denomination.

I cannot but think after all, that you will reciprocate the conviction, that ministers of the Lord Jesus must feel that their solemn duties are even more than they are equal to do, when they confine their warfare to that three-fold enemy "the world, the flesh and the devil," and I take leave to admonish you in all seriousness to do your best to keep the sheep of your flock from this great power of evil, and to husband for this, your proper work, the time and zeal which you now think it needful to devote to the keeping of them from any influence that other christian ministers may perchance bear over some of them.

You look out for the wolf and the roaring lion, and keep these from your fold, and the sheep are quite able of themselves to stand up and ward off any improper or dangerous influences which you appear so much to dread from me or any other clergyman of the great Protestant Church not of your own particular branch thereof.

It is now time that I should state my reasons for writing in reply to your note, not answering your complaint, but asking the questions comprised in my first. This with all brevity I will do.

During my few months' stay in Wanganui while you and I have never spoken the one to the other, a great deal of direct evidence has come to hand tending to show that you maintain views which, in my judgment, are very derogatory to the rights of the great Catholic Church of Protestantism, and to the spirit of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, and believing that these views are highly injurious to the cause of truth, and in all ways tending to lower and weaken the Church of God, I wrote to elicit a fuller expression of the principles which were scarcely veiled under the brief forms in which you couched the feelings of a, churchman manifestly of a very exclusive school.

I was the more desirous that, having gone so far in your first note you should declare the church principles which under- lie the claims you assert, so calculated to mislead men of limited opportunity for research, and to convey a very narrow idea of the cause of God on the earth; for if, for instance, your members, say those who take the Lord's Supper at your church, make up the Church of God in Wanganui, as your language implies, then how very few are there in this town, who, in point of fact, have come out from the world and joined the Church

of God, and what a very grievous reflection is thus cast upon the rest of us who do not feel it to be any part of our duty to attend your ministrations or to belong to your church. Controversy is not usually desirable, but there are cases when it becomes a duty, and the very name of Protestant calls upon us to protest against injurious errors such as you have so plainly unmasked in your three letters, and anyone would be unworthy the standing of a protestant clergyman, were he to shrink from exposing such errors in the light of Christian truth. Nor can you object to the publication of your views so carefully expressed on matters of such grave consequence, or you would have refrained from giving them to a perfect stranger, to whom you have yielded no opportunity of acquaintance with you beyond this correspondence.

Regarding therefore the matters you have opened up in your letters, as a declaration of the principles you endeavour to propagate in Wauganui, and, being perfectly sure that they are anti-scriptural, un-English, and essentially Romish doctrines, it becomes my duty as a protestant minister to expose their fallacy and danger, and to warn our people against placing either themselves or their children under its influence, deluded as they may be by the venerable name of the Church of England.

I will now consider the contents of your second and third letters at some length. As to the term "Reverend," I set no value upon it whatever, but could even wish it were universally obsolete; but as you, being a minister, addressed me as though I were not a minister, the high church principles came all up before me entire, just as the naturalist, finding a footbone, or a tooth, at once sees the animal complete to whom they belong, so I just searched a little further into your ground, and when fully jointed together you present me with a matured specimen of the Romish clergyman in a protestant pulpit. This is the ground upon which I took any notice whatever of your first note. It will be readily observed that you have not refused the recognition of me only, as a minister of God, but of all whom you choose to call by a name of your own making, "dissenting teachers;" a name not in vogue as an English designation of any class of men in the community. Then you tell us we are none of us Christian ministers, but have "fancifully" created to ourselves, without any "authority," our appointment in the church. This is certainly a very grave statement for a Christian clergyman to write. If we are not ministers, we must be great sinners in taking that solemn office upon no authority beyond our own fancy. Our people too are no Christian churches; ministers and churches stand or fall together; and thus, by the powers so strangely vested in your high ecclesiastical pen, you blot out from the Holy Catholic Church more than half the Christianity of Wanganui; and, on the same principles, would blot out two-thirds of the Lord's ministers and people throughout Christendom, and had you the power, as you seem to have the will, would shut up in one day our mouths and our churches from offering salvation and peace to any portion of the redeemed family of our sinful world. So far is your mind from that of Moses, when it was told him "Eldad and Medad do prophecy in the camp," and he replied, "Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them."

Allow me, sir, in all simplicity, to show you, or, if not you, some of those whom such teaching may have misled in things so vitally connected with the very foundations of our entire faith,—allow me to show at least that the Lord has more than one tribe in Israel, and that many beyond the borders of Juda have a lot from our God, and do not rudely lay hold of the Ark unbidden, any more than do ministers of the Anglican Church.

You tell me that you have good reasons for adopting the exclusive views you now hold, having taken to them as "the result of more than thirty years' serious reflection;" to which my only reply is, that more than thirty years ago these "reasons" appeared to me as they still do, to stand without a single pillar of God's word to support them, and without any chance of sympathy with the true British spirit, and to rest only in the marshes of Popery, propped up by Romish materials, as they have from time to time been shaken by the flying shots from the armory of our free and holy Protestantism.

You say that "the title "clergyman" seems to you like the prefix "reverend," to involve the whole question at issue between the church and dissent.

But I cannot see what propriety there can be, in a country where there is no established church, in using the antithetical terms "the church and dissent" at all. To speak of the Church of England here as *the church* is to speak improperly, as much so as to speak of the Church of Scotland here, or the Wesleyan Church in that way, and any of us may with the same propriety call you dissenters as you may call us so; besides, the Wesleyans, and, I believe, the Presbyterians, never accepted the term *dissenter*, but regard themselves as *nonconformists*, a word which carries that mild and neighbourly tone of unhostile relationship which characterised both John Wesley and the people called Methodists, as "the friends of all—the enemies of none."?

As to your exposition of the term clergy, and its application to the ministers of your church, whom you regard as the "lot," or appointment of God, "set apart by him like the tribe of Levi, to be his," while you "deny that *dissenting teachers* hold any appointment in the church except of their own fanciful creation, and upon their own unsupported authority." We must tarry a while over this remarkable piece of ecclesiastical lore.

Webster's large dictionary derives the word from its Greek root, and says that it was probably applied to ministers of religion because a *lot of land* was assigned to them for their support.

The venerable Hooker, than whom you would hardly seek a higher authority in your own church, defines the clergy as "The body of men set apart and consecrated by due ordination to the service of God in the Christian Church, the body of ecclesiastics, in distinction from the laity; in England usually the ministers of the established church."

A definition much larger than you could give, and implying that in Scotland, and other countries than England, where there may be no ministers of your church, there may yet be a clergy, and that in England the term was only *usually*, and not exclusively given to those of the established church.

The term *cleros* is of the same import in Latin and Greek as *pur* in the Persian. The word applied to the feast of lots' celebrated by the Jews in memory of the lots cast by Hainan their enemy. We see lots used in many places of Scripture. God commanded that lots should be cast on the two goats offered for the sins of Israel on the solemn day of expiation, to ascertain which of the two should be sacrificed, and which set at liberty. The land of promise was divided by lot, while the priests and Levites in like manner had cities given them by lot. In the time of David the twenty-four classes of priests and Levites were distributed by lot to their order of waiting in the temple, and it would seem from Luke that the portions of daily duty were appointed to the priests by lot: as Zechariah's lot was to bum incense. The soldiers cast lots for cur-Saviour's garment as the prophet had predicted, and in the apostleship, after the death of Judas, lots were cast to decide which of the two persons proposed by the disciples should succeed into his place. See Calmet in *loco*.

In your remarks you evidently refer to this last use of the lot in the filling up of the vacant Apostleship, as we have it recorded in the 1st chapter of the Acts. Now taking the exposition of that passage, as given by one of the most eminent clergymen of the Church of England, Dr. Henry Alford, Dean of Canterbury, let us inquire and see whether there be any real parallel between that case, and the appointment or ordination of any of the ministers of your Church at the present day. At the instigation of Peter, the brethren (not the Apostles) to the number of about a hundred and twenty, nominated Joseph and Matthias for the vacancy; these it would appear were the only two, besides the eleven then present who had accompanied our Lord during the whole of his ministry and therefore the only two who could comply with the first conditions of apostleship, and it such were the case, the inference I think is unavoidable, that the apostles, *qua apostles* had no successors and could have none, and if you object to this, that Paul was an apostle in no sense behind the twelve, I would remind you that he vindicated his claim on grounds which none of his would-be successors, will readily take up. (Gal. i, 12; i Cor. xi, 23; xv, 3. And *vide Alford Prologg*, vol. I 1.3. 5). This however, by the way. After the two candidates had been chosen or nominated by the whole company of the disciples, the apostles, anxious to ascertain distinctly the will of God, "cast lots for them" not as in our English version, "gave forth their lots" The lots were in all probability tablets, with the names of the persons written on them, and shaken, by some one of the eleven likely, in a vessel or in the lap of a robe, Prov. xvi, 33, he whose lot first leaped out, being the person designated. Thus the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was "voted" not merely numbered with the eleven, the lot says our learned critic, being regarded as the divine choice, the suffrages of the assembly were unanimously given, not in form but by cheerful acquiescence to the candidate thus chosen. Such in substance is the light which Deem Alford throws on the term *cleros* but he does not certainly think it worth while to show us the connection that subsists between this term and the esoteric privileges of a High-church Clergyman. And how could he? for what connection is there? the voice of the church or christian people, and the casting of lots, are here set before us, as two methods of ascertaining the divine will. To the latter, the church so far as we know, never again had recourse. And we are therefore left with the former as the only expedient, we are now in ordinary circumstances at liberty to adopt. For nothing we believe can now settle the question of a divine call to the ministry but the voice of the brethren, the members, office bearers, and ministers, of the Christian Church, after testing the qualification of the candidate who believes himself divinely call to this sacred office and ministry. And with all respect, Sir, I beg to ask, can you produce any such credentials? On your own grounds, I suspect, you can establish no claim at all to the title of clergyman.—Matthias no doubt was the subject of divine appointment—but not the elect of Peter or of James or of John, or of any other person, but *of God and of the church*. And unless you can show that there was a casting of the *cleros* in your own case, or at least the choice and sanction of the church, prior to ordination, you will not be able, I fear, to identify the nature of your appointment with that of the one to which you have referred me. I do not regard it as any part of my duty to call in question, the validity of your ordination, or the possibility of your not being called of God to the ministry of the word—but I maintain, that those who have been set apart for this work without the expressed consent of the church, or only by the laying on of the hands of a single *presbuteros* or *episcopos*, can by no means lay claim to the same amount of New Testament authority, as those Ministers who can point back to the intelligent nomination of a Christian discipleship, by whom their character and qualifications had been tested, and also to "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," and that those men ought to be the last to call our attention to the *cleros*.

Perhaps, taking your stand on the popish dogma of the "Apostolical succession," you may tell us that

Matthias was an apostle,—that the apostles were authorised to transmit their appointment to their successors, who have therefore a divine warrant to ordain to the office of the ministry, all whom they regard as the chosen of God." On this subject we appeal "to the law and to the testimony," and for such a pretentious dogma, we must demand a "Thus saith the Lord." The apostles, *as apostles* we believe, had no successors. The Presbyters or Bishops who succeeded them in the oversight of the Church, were no doubt authorised to ordain other Presbyters, or bishops and also deacons, (a class of men who held a very different office from that of the diaconate of the Church of England, a fact frankly admitted by Dr. Vaughan of Doncaster, in his admirable lectures on the Church in The Early Days), but it was certainly the exception, not the rule that a *single* Presbyter or Bishop, should ordain other Presbyters or Bishops. We gather from Acts 1 and 6, that in all ordinary cases the express choice of the Christian people—as the best indication of the divine call—ought to precede the solemn act of ordination.

There is another point in your third letter we can hardly omit noticing, viz., your repetition of the hacknied challenge of Chilling worth, and your assertion that it has never been answered, which, allow me to say, betrays the fact that you are not well conversant with the great domain of Historical Theology. If you have never seen a refutation of this stale assertion, I refer you to the last which I have read, namely, the works of the late celebrated Dr. Cunningham, principal of the New College of Edinburgh. You mean to say, as I understand you, that we cannot point to a church community which existed anywhere during the first 1500 years of the Christian era, which was not governed by a bishop. Now in what sense do you use the term bishop? If you take it in the New Testament sense of the word, then we frankly admit that we cannot accept your challenge, and do Dot wish that we could. If on the other hand you understand the term bishop in the *prelatic* sense, *it* as signifying a bishop of bishops, or overseer, not of the church, but of the ministry of the church, then I can only express my surprise at your want of larger acquaintance with Biblical literature. The *Presbyterate* or Episcopate, spoken of in the Scriptures of the New Testament, are, not two offices, but *one and the same*; and I can hardly believe you ignorant of this most patent fact. When the apostle Paul, called together the elders (Presbyters) of the church at Ephesus, he addressed them as bishops, (Acts xx., 17, 28.) And in sending an epistle to the Church at Phillipi, he addressed it (Ch. i., i.,) to "the bishops and deacons," not to the bishop and Presbyters and deacons, and on the former of these passages I observe, the learned Dean of Canterbury, after exposing the silly remarks of Trenæus, and with the frankness characteristic of a great man, makes the following note,—"*The English version has hardly dealt fairly in this case, in rendering *episcopous* (Acts xx. 28.) *overseers*, whereas it ought there, as in all other places, to have been bishops, that the fact of *elders (presbyters) and bishops, having been originally and apostolically synonymous*, might be apparent to the ordinary English reader, which now it is not.*" The italics are Alford's. We can thus point to at least two Christian communities—that at Ephesus, and that at Phillipi in the first part of the fifteenth century, which were each under the government of a council of eiders. Of course you are aware of the spuriousness of those postscripts which have led the ignorant to suppose that Titus was bishop of Crete, and Timothy bishop of Ephesus. That they were bishops we know well, but we deny that they were *prelatic* or *diocesan* bishops. And it will not be difficult to show, if necessary, that the office they held and the work they performed, were very much the same as that which fell to the lot of Wesley in his day, or which has devolved on many a noble missionary of our own times. Timothy and Titus were bishops or presbyters, because they were ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbyters, but the work assigned them was pre-eminently that of itinerating preachers. I might further remind you of the fact, that the only genuine remains of the men who associated with the apostles, are most fully in keeping with the testimony of Scripture. You would not, I suppose, refer me to the spurious epistles of Ignatius; and Clemens Roman us in his epistle to the Corinthians, and Polycarp in his epistle to the Philippians, speak of those churches respectively, as being under the government of a council of presbyters. I am disposed however, to ascribe but a limited authority to the fathers; and yet it is interesting to observe how little support your theory meets with from those who were the immediate followers of the apostles, so little indeed, that some of those writers of your own church who have recently undertaken the defence of Prelatic Episcopacy, have found it necessary to take their stand upon the patristic authority of the third, and especially the *fourth and fifth centuries*. And it was this difficulty we doubt not, that led the celebrated and notorious Dr. Newman to abandon the attempt, and, instead of trying to defend Prelatic Episcopacy on apostolic or scriptural grounds, to adopt the well known "Theory of Development," and like an honest and consistent man, to exchange the Church of England for the Church of Rome.

I must now proceed to notice a very frank avowal of your faith in the ultramontane dogma, that the office of a christian minister or clergyman derives it authority from "appointment" altogether irrespective of all considerations of personal worth, religious and moral qualifications, and the ability to perform efficiently the functions of the office. These are your words:—"Supposing myself a worse theologian, a worse scholar, a worse preacher, a worse man than yourself, I should still designate myself reverend, and should refuse that title to you, and why? I claim this title of honor, *simply and exclusively* in consideration of my office; I refuse it to

you *simply and exclusively*, because I do not consider that you have been appointed to the same office."

Again in the same letter you say you deny that dissenting teachers hold any appointment in the church except of their own fanciful creation.

Now the doctrine of all this is clearly that a man destitute of a minister's qualification may yet be a minister; that a bad theologian, a bad scholar, a bad preacher, yea a bad man, being ordained in the Anglican establishment, is a true minister of the grace of God, while another man, a good theologian, a good scholar, a good preacher, and a good man believing in his own conscience after much prayer and godly council, that God has assuredly called him to the ministry, and having the appointment of a Christian Church, and ordination from its ministers is after all destitute of any appointment in the Church of God, except of his own fanciful creation and all this solely because he is not of your particular church. This is the doctrine of old Rome, not of the Bible: not of the Reformation, whose doctrine is quite the reverse. See what God said in old times of Levi, "My covenant was with him of life and peace; and I gave them to him *for the fear wherewith he feared me*, and was afraid of my name. The law of my truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with me in peace and equity and did turn many away from iniquity."

Now turn to Psalm 1., 16, and read "But unto the wicked God saith, what hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth."

Upon this very important subject of authority to exercise the office of a minister of God it is needful at this stage to make a remark or two. No man should lightly be told by another that he has not entered in by the door into the sheep-fold, and is consequently a thief and a robber. No man should lightly enter that fold without good evidence that he is called of God as was Aaron, not indeed to the same office, for Christ is our only Priest, not with the same circumstances, but with the same certainty called of God to minister as an ambassador in Christ's stead. Now, the Christian church is a spiritual church, and the call of sinners to repent is of the Spirit in their hearts, the testimony to their reconciliation to God is the Spirit itself bearing witness in their spirits that they are the sons of God, the new birth, the life of a Christian, and his graces are the fruit of the Spirit, and when a man is raised up of God to the ministry, the Holy Ghost saith, "separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work" where unto I have called them," and thus it is the Spirit who both qualifies and calls to the work of God. But it is for the Christian people who are well conversant with the manner of life, the preaching and the fruits of a person believing himself so called to the ministry, to test the truth of that call, and being satisfied that it is of God, then to give their sanction, and place him in the hands of ministers for ordination who on the principle that "the Spirit of the Prophets is subject to the Prophets," are to watch over and direct his labours in the church of God.

The intellectual and spiritual qualifications for a true minister of the Lord Jesus are so clearly the work of God, designing the character so formed for the work he is purposed to do, that we must either conclude there is no force in the general argument of design in creation, or that when a man is raised up and so fitted to act as a minister for God, that he wins souls to his allegiance and builds up the holy temple of God among men, he awakens the dead in sins out of their sleep, leads the brokenhearted penitent to Christ, with a Christian sympathy carries the lambs, comforts all that mourn, proves an angel of mercy to the dying, and is the bearer of consolation to the house of mourning. He breathes the spirit and leads the life of a disciple, does the work of an ambassador, heals the sick as a true physician, oversees the church as a true watchman and bishop of souls, nourishes the lambs and feeds the flock with all the efficiency of a true shepherd, and can humbly point to the fruit of his labours which God alone could cause to grow in human nature,—young men, strong men, fathers and mothers in Christ, as real and ornamental parts of God's temple as any others of the most apostolical churches upon earth. "The seal of mine apostleship are ye," said St. Paul, who, though he had inspiration and miracles, and had seen the Lord, brought forward this same argument as proof positive of his authority. "If I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you, for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord."—1 Cor. is. 2. Again, when addressing the Galatians, he lays the entire authority of a minister on this one link of doctrine so far as that false doctrine should be understood to disqualify the messenger, however he may possess other signs of apostleship. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, 1st him be accursed." Gal. x 8,9. St. John also bears similar testimony in his epistle to the elect lady, saying to her, "If any come unto thee and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into thy house," &c.—2 Epis. v. 10.

With these authorities before us, in each case so strongly put, we, in our day of ordinary agencies and kindred results from adequate causes, must conclude that, in the Christian economy, sound doctrine and godly fruits, enter essentially into the evidence of a man's call to the Christian pastorate, and if any shall yet plead for exclusive authority as the apostles' successors,—if they tell us that the "worse theologian, the worse preacher, the worse scholar, the worse man," may be the true minister of holiness, the Lord himself will surely humble him by his own condescending example, for when John had heard in prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and said unto him, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" Jesus answered and said unto them, "Go show John again"—again, as though once should have settled it,—*"those things which ye*

do hear and see: the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up and the poor have the gospel preached to them, and blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me."

Again, it is worthy of attention that you are accustomed to teach that prayer and not preaching is the great function of the clergy. And on this, which we admit to be a solemn duty of the minister of God, the restored blind man in the Gospel, could teach us that "God heareth not sinners" (as intercessors,) but if any man be a worshipper of God and doeth his will him he heareth," and even the Jews in their sharp retort upon him, appeal to the acknowledged truth of our doctrine in its application to the teaching—"Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us?"

But the contrary doctrine of Rome would teach us that God heareth the intercession of sinners for congregations, churches, and the world, if only they be ordained; and that the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man, being a minister, cannot avail in the absence of Episcopal ordination. We do not think that any advocate of the Romish view can point to an instance of a minister appointed by God, who had not all the qualifications required. It is indeed true that one of our Lord's apostles was the apostate Judas, but it is also true that when he fell into sin, he lost the apostleship, and the inspired narrative declares that he fell by transgression; but we will not dwell upon this case, as the most zealous advocate of the succession would hardly derive his authority to preach and baptise from Judas, although in cases where ordained ministers apostatise from the faith, it would seem needful to exclude them from linking themselves to any other apostle.

The high churchman may say, blessed are the people who sit under a minister in the succession, but our Lord hath said—"Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it."

Your next thrust is a sharp and vigorous attack upon the "Wesleyan preachers," upon whom you feel called to rush with an irresistible *argumentum ad hominem*, having taken, as you think, a very sharp sword from the armoury of good John Wesley.

"I think that this objection applies with ten-fold force to the Wesleyan preachers, inasmuch as they have thrust themselves into the pastoral office, and made a schism in Christ's body," &c.

Arrogant words these; and "who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea he shall be holden up; for God is able to make him stand." And have not Methodist preachers by their works shown to the wide world for a century past, whose servants they are, and has not their Master put upon their labours, the broad seal of his approbation, in converting many tens of thousands of souls from sin to holiness, raising up to himself a people who now constitute indeed, one of the youngest, but well-nigh the largest protestant church in the world. In point of fact, it is a question whether any other church has so large a number of communicants, taking them in all the world. Not that mere numbers are sufficient to constitute our argument, but numbers taken together with a discipline to say the least of it, as likely to secure sincerity, soundness of faith, and Christian character in the members, as anything to be found in the discipline of the Anglican community.

But there is no schism in the body of Christ thus caused. The Methodists have been gathered from out of the world, not even what you are pleased to call the "religious world," but generally the outer circle beyond that. Millions who never in any Bible-sense belonged to your Church, have been converted by the instrumentality of these preachers, from sin to holiness, and from the power of Satan to serve the living and true God. And that is not causing a schism in the body of Christ. A schism is a division, a rent,—and if anything of the kind had happened in the creation of the Methodist body—the clergy of the Church who shut their pulpits against Wesley, and wrote and did all they could to stay his labours, were the cause and chargeable with the sin of the schism, not Wesley nor his preachers, nor their successors unto this day.

You charge us with having acted in the matter of leaving the Church, in direct opposition to the precepts of our "Father and Founder." We are not aware of any precepts he ever gave us, and the words you quote from him, cannot in any proper use of language be called precepts. The Methodists do not look at Wesley as they do at St. Paul, nor are they bound by all he ever wrote, any more than all Protestants are bound by all that Luther ever said. Luther at an early period thought it impossible he should ever commit what he verily thought to be the mortal sin of leaving the Church of Rome, and yet he lived long enough to cry with a voice which raised Europe to her feet, "Come out of her my people."

And Wesley, years after he wrote the words you so vauntingly quote from him, against leaving the Church of England, took the most decided steps in that direction, warranting the belief from the rate of his progress while he lived, that had he continued till this day, he might have departed even further than his sons and successors have done.

You would not argue that because for many years Thos. Chalmers adhered to the Established Church of Scotland, therefore he could not afterwards have aided in founding a separate church, the very useful and prosperous Free Church of Scotland, for we all know that he did both. And we know well enough that Wesley was thrust forward in a similar direction, and in the lapse of time there is good evidence to show that he could

not have stopped short of distinct and separate Church organization. In point of fact what did he not do essential to the construction of a Church? He administered the Lord's supper in separate places, to the people called Methodists, he called out and appointed to the cure of souls many preachers who looked to him as their only bishop: He declared contrary to the doctrine of the school in which you have learnt, that Bishops and Presbyters are substantially the same,' and he ordained clergymen for the work of God in America and Scotland, yea he carried his practice to the extent of ordaining Dr. Coke a Superintendent or Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in that land, and when his brother and some others objected to his conduct as opposed to the very words of a former period, which you would bind us to observe as "precepts." C. Wesley writing to his brother, said, "I can scarcely yet believe it, that my brother, my old and intimate friend and companion, should have assumed the episcopal character, ordained elders, consecrated a Bishop, and sent him over to America. "Again, Charles observes, quoting from Lord Mansfield, ordination is separation," and charges John with having now taken steps in direct opposition to his own words written some years previously.

The words of Charles Wesley are these, "I can scarcely yet believe it, that, my brother, my old and intimate friend and companion, should have assumed the Episcopal character, ordained elders, consecrated a bishop and sent him over to ordan our lay preachers in America."

And these are the words of John Wesley in defence, "For these forty years I have been in doubt concerning that question, What obedience is due to heathenish priests and mitred infidels?" I have from time to time proposed my doubts to the most sensible clergymen I know. But they gave me no satisfaction. Rather, they seem to be puzzled as well as me.

Obedience I always paid to to the bishops in obedience to the laws of the land, but I cannot see that I am under any obligation to obey them farther than those laws require.

It is in obedience to those laws that I have never, in England excersised the power which I believe God has given me. I firmly believe that I am a scriptural bishop as much as any man in England or Europe; for the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove.

So fast and so far had Wesley receded from his former position, to which you would have the Methodist preachers and people of this day to go back, the fact is that John Wesley without recognising it, had for many years been the Bishop of a Church which he had founded, admitting and excluding members according to his own judgment. You have referred me to the 19th Article of the Church, and have stated that a Church is a society, &c. Now if you refer to Bishop Burnett on this Article, you will find that he expounds it so as to give the character of a church to a people and ministry which God might raise up, very much as he did raise up Methodism. The true construction of a Church of Christ comprises according to this article, gospel-preaching, the sacraments administered, and faithful men in christian communion. These things being absent, the building, the minister, the congregation, and the succession do not make up a true Church, these things being present beyond the Anglican pale there is a true church of God, and so we may conclude under cover of this Article, and with the sanction of the men who drew it up, and its standard expositors, that a particular Church may lose its character, the candlestick being removed out of its place, and God may raise up to himself a Church in his own way, according to his free and vast power to raise up of the stones, children unto Abraham. And so when we look around among the religious institutions of any country to find the Church of Christ, we must not enquire what is established by law, where is Apostolical succession, but where are faithful men, gospel preaching and the sacraments duly administered, there is the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

As to the dogma of A postolical succession, which is the very corner stone of your claims to the office of a Christian Ministry, there is no authority for such a claim in Scripture, and it cannot be traced through a single century, nor can you find me the requisite links to go over (he very first generation of the Christian Church. Such is the uncertainty of tradition and the baselessness of these popish assumptions, that it is not possible to determine the order of succession of the overseers of the Roman Church for the first century. Linus, Cletus, Anacletus, and Clement, precede or follow each other according to the varying judgment of various historians. Tertullian says that Clement was ordained by St. Peter. Jerome makes him the immediate successor of St. Peter. Others interpose Linus. Eusebius and Jerome, and Cletus, and Anacletus, to Linus, as succeeding the Apostle, and preceding Clement, while Irenæus altogether omits Cletus. Some suppose that Anacletus is a purely apocryphal personage, and that Linus and Cletus both exercised the pastorate at the same time,—the one having charge of the Gentile christians, and the other of the Jewish converts. So baseless is this vaunted doctrine of the Apostolical succession.

The time is surely now come when our Lord's disciples should seek to recognise with thankfulness the truth and grace of God in all places where goodness appears, and not labour to narrow up the operations of divine love to the merest corner of his redeemed world. As a heathen once remarked of the philosophy, "That is not philosophy which is peculiar to the differing sects, but that which is true in all sects," so that is surely not religion which is peculiar to this or that party of Christians, but that which is pure and godly in them all. The restrictions put upon Christianity in the exclusive teaching of the High Church, would dignify a portion of the

Lord's heritage as though it were the church catholic, and would wipe off the rest of Christendom from the map of our Redeemer's kingdom, not shrinking from doing to him the dishonour of minifying his gracious reign to so small a province, and this in order that themselves may have the vain distinction of being his heritage alone. "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are we."

If this pamphlet may, by the blessing of God, be allowed to do any good, may it be that of showing that the Lord's last covenant with mankind is large and free, having no restrictions but those that are moral and spiritual; not for Judea, but the world; not in this or that mountain, but wherever the true worshippers are; not of ancient, Israel, but "in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted-of him."

Let us all as Christian ministers' and people feel the pre-ciousness of souls redeemed by the Saviour's blood,—let us lay to heart the vastness of Satan's work, and the rapidity of his destructive march, and the innumerable Weapons of his warfare and then behold the love of the Redeemer, the grace of the Spirit, the freeness of salvation for every soul of man who can be induced to turn from sin and seek his grace; and, while any are turning sinners from the error of their ways, let us all join in a doxology to the God of all grace, still and ever praying that God may among all his people raise up and send forth labourers into his fields, so ripe unto the harvest. And if any should so mistake his duty as to forbid in the name of Jesus the gospel work of others, we would remind him that a similar case was very early decided by the Lord, for "John answering said, master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbid him because he followeth not us. But Jesus said forbid him not; for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part."—Mark ix., 38, 39.

As for the Wesleyan Methodists, while they are glad to encourage all that truly follow the Lord Jesus,—that teach his doctrine, and preach holiness through faith in his blood,—they claim only what they grant,—to be a true church of Christ,—of equal authority with their sister churches, and to their own ministers they look as men called of God to preach his gospel, and be overseers, pastors, or bishops in his church, equally with any other ministers in the great Protestant family, founded in the providence of God at the Reformation. The doctrines taught by the Methodists are substantially the same as those that the reformers gave to the Church of England, and by undoubted proofs can be shown to be identical with the doctrines taught in the primitive and apostolical times, and we are prepared to go into those times, and compare with any other church, our credentials as servants of our common Master, and although infinitely unworthy, yet as true and authentic successors of the apostles in all things in which they were designed by God to have successors, as are any other men in this sinful but redeemed world.

We are prepared to show that the Wesleyan Methodist Societies throughout the wide world are an integral portion of the great Catholic Church of God which the Saviour purchased with his own blood, and which the Holy Ghost hath begotten by the Word, and part of that glorious temple of God upon earth which supercedes and now more than occupies the place in his estimation which the temple and ancient Israel held in the former dispensation. We "hold the faith once delivered to the saints," and that not with the effeminate fantastic touch which marks out so many of your clergy, unhappily at this day, as apostates from that faith and allies of the infidel, and Popish enemies of genuine Christianity.

By the *faith once delivered to the saints*, we understand—not any fanciful notions about an imaginary Christ, as many of your writers and clergy teach,—but we mean the definite and sublime system of revealed religion, preached in its perfected form by the apostles, centred around the personal Christ, whom the four evangelists describe, incorporated in the societies set forth in the Acts of the Apostles, expanded and enforced in the epistles, and in its onward march through time, prophetically portrayed in its leading features of success and obstruction, of opposition and triumph in the Revelation of St. John. This is the faith which we teach and our people believe. The same faith, the one religion, that the ancient prophets predicted for a thousand years, which underlies and vitalises the ten commandments, and which breathes eternal life in the Psalms of David, glows in the poetry of Isaiah, swells in the mysteries of Ezekiel, which alone makes Paul superior to Plato, and gives us in Christianity no uncertain sound of doubtful doctrine, but the voice of God, speaking in his own proper Son,—God of God, light of light, and man with men, shining in clear divine light into the darkness of a fallen world, speaking with a power which raised up out of heathenism and Jewish corruption a band of faithful men who diffused the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, and fulfilled the vision of dry bones raised up into a living army by the power of grace.

This faith, full of mercy and good fruits, weeping over the miseries of a wicked world as Christ did over Jerusalem, "going about doing good" "round about the villages teaching," proclaiming pardon to the penitent, and a free, full, and present salvation to every one that believeth; this faith, once delivered to the saints, we hold, and have held it ever since God raised up John and Charles Wesley and George Whitfield to will the Church of England and the British nation back again to the saving truth of the Reformation, from which they had so widely departed.

And now yet again there is another apostacy from that divine "faith once delivered to the saints," and we

have lived in this nineteenth century to witness the ignominious phenomenon of "heathenish priests and mitred infidels, and not a few, stand up in christian pulpits to preach the doctrine of anti-christ wearing the livery of heaven the better to serve the courts of hell. You talk of John Wesley's scourge, pray what kind of scourge would Paul and Peter take to these clergy equipped from the school of Porphyry, duly ordained—duly ordained indeed—yet apes of the infidels of a bye-gone age. Gowned, dignified, and paid that Christ and his gospel may be preached to the souls for whom he was crucified, but prostituting their sacred office and all its powers to degrade our Redeemer to the level allotted him by Volny, Hume and Porphyry. This portion of your clergy, reverend sir, would be beaten with many stripes from the apostolic whip, and I rather think that you yourself would hardly escape.

Allow me, however, to invite you to look at the great first principles of the oracles of God and to forego the traditions of men. Look at our Lord's great command, the charter of our ministry, of yours and mine, as we are the Lord's servants—"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved and he that believeth not shall be damned." The souls attending your ministry are precious to me, as they are to every brother in Christ. Oh, sir, let them have the gospel of our common salvation. Hold up to them a perfect Saviour, a glorified High-priest, and a present salvation through his blood. Don't hide the Redeemer behind the drapery of your church or the dignity of your office. Come home, sir, to good old British Christianity for which the Reformers wrote and preached and died. Drink at their wells. Illuminate your mind with their lamps and put your extinguisher on the sickly flickering lights of Germany and of Home. Tell your people they are sinners and must be born again, guilty and must obtain pardon, under condemnation to the second death, but that life eternal is prepared for them that so believe as to flee for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before them in Christ Jesus.

Oh, let our souls be filled with gospel light, let us meditate upon it and let us feed by faith on the true bread of life, and then come out as strong men and giants ready to set our peoples' souls on fire with a Saviour's love, and lead them on to the purity of a christian life, the joys of the Saviour's love, and to a zeal for good works which shall shake popery to its base, change its brazen face into the paleness of death, send the false philosophers of Germany back sneaking into their own clouds, convince the Jews that Christ is really come, and impress the world that in this glorious church of the Lord there is a spirit and life which all her enemies can neither gainsay nor resist.

Let our churches live, and they will be respected. Let them put forth the Voice of a life-giving truth. Let them wake up the dead in sin and they shall be acknowledged of God and man. Let them reform the profligate, rescue the drunkard, elevate the worldling to higher thoughts than the everlasting monotony of bargain-making, only relieved by the horse-race, the ball, or the theatre.

Then will it be seen that we are ambassadors of Christ, and multitudes shall bow down at the feet of Jesus, saying "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles (which thou by thy servants art doing,) except God be with him." And "Now may the God of Peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep through the blood of the everlasting Covenant, make us perfect in every good work to do His will working in us that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

[LETTER II.] British Protestantism: The First Step;

Or, the Question, "What Shall We Do?" Answered.

By J. E. Gordon, Esq.

"Turn unto the LORD your God: for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil."—JOEL ii. 13.

London: Protestant Association Office, 11, Exeter Hall; Seeley, Burnside, & Seeley, Fleet-Street. 1817.

Price 1 ½d., or 10s. per 100.

No. LVI.

Alexander Macintosh, Printer, Great New-Street, London.

The Protestantism of Britain.

MY PROTESTANT BRETHREN,—

WHEN I took the liberty of addressing you through the columns of the "Record" newspaper, This letter has been published by the Protestant Association, under the title of "British Protestantism; its

present Position, Responsibility, and Duties."

I did not venture to hope that an effort, conceived and executed in so much weakness, would have prompted such a response as that effort has clone. But if it has authenticated, beyond doubt or question, the bursting pregnancy of a spiritual Protestantism in the land, it has also discovered the utter inability of the writer to meet the heart-cheering inquiries for information and advice which are daily reaching him, in any other way than through the medium of the public press. In this general answer, I shall restrict myself to such advice as is not merely preliminary to organized and systematic exertion, but indisputable in itself.

The duty of Protestants, in the circumstances which I have attempted to describe in my letter, may be considered under two heads—*prayer* and *action*. With respect to the last, there may be difference of opinion as it regards the *modus operandi*; and, therefore, I should hesitate to speak with confidence, until I have had better opportunities of consulting with those "who know what Israel ought to do." On the subject of the first, there can be no such doubt; as prayer must precede, rectify, and consecrate every Christian enterprise, whether personal or public. I propose, therefore, in the present communication, to restrict my observations to the duty and necessity of prayer, *as a first step*; leaving to a future occasion (should the Lord afford me ability) the development of a more deliberately considered plan of action.

In answer, then, to the general inquiry, "*How are we to act?*" I unhesitatingly reply, Retire to your closet. If the Protestantism of Britain can only be brought to its knees, the battle is won; for, either the Lord will restrain prayer, or He will answer it.

On this subject, I have no new doctrine to propound: but perhaps you will indulgently bear with me, if I presume to bring to your recollection a few practical illustrations of the truth of a very old one.

It is written, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you;" and further, "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them." And again, "All things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer believing, ye shall receive." No doubt or difficulty can, therefore, exist in the mind of the believer respecting the certainty of an answer to prayer,—unless it be upon the single question, "Whether or not the *object* which is sought be in accordance with the Divine will? The answer itself is just as certain as the promise of God can render it: but, as we read of those who "ask and have not, because they ask *amiss*," we may be thrown back upon the inquiry, Whether or not our asking has the sanction of the word and the will of God? With reference to all that lies within the scope of that will, it is absolutely and unconditionally written, "Ask, and ye shall have;" "Open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it."

Now, among the objects which lie within the scope of the Divine will, national deliverance from the consequences of national sin occupies, in Scripture, a very prominent place; and the duty of prayer, arising out of the discovery of Divine visitation for national guilt, is just as imperative upon Christians of the nineteenth century, as it was upon David when he beheld an Angel standing over Jerusalem with a drawn sword in his hand. In one of its forms, it is thus expressed by Solomon, at the dedication of the Temple,—"*When the heaven is shut up, and there is no rain, because they have sinned against thee; yet if they pray toward this place, and confess thy Name, and turn from their sin, when thou dost afflict them; Then hear thou from heaven, and forgive the sin of thy servants, and of thy people Israel, when thou hast taught them the good way, wherein they should walk; and send rain upon thy land, which thou hast given unto thy people for an inheritance. If there be dearth in the land, if there be pestilence, if there be blasting, or mildew, locusts, or caterpillars; if their enemies besiege them in the cities of their land; whatsoever sore or whatsoever sickness there be; Then hear thou from heaven,*" &c. (2 Chron. vi.26—31.) That this form of supplication was intended as a directory to believers in all ages will not, it is presumed, be disputed; and we are supplied with at least one interesting discovery of its application in the case of Jehoshaphat, King of Judah. I select the example of this monarch, because his case supplies, if not an intentional, at least a very remarkable parallel with that of our own country.

If the coming apostasy of Rome had its type or shadow in any part of Old Testament history, it was, assuredly, in that of the apostasy of the ten tribes from the worship of the temple to the idolatry of the "golden calves;" and if the union between the secular and spiritual power of the mystic Babylon is anywhere figured out in bold relief, on the dark ground of that defection, it is in the instance of Ahab and Jezebel.

Jehoshaphat was by far the most powerful monarch of the Judean dynasty; and his unrivalled prosperity stands connected with his official patronage and promulgation of Divine truth. He was, in fact, a patron of *itinerant*, as well as temple teaching; (Listen, ye sticklers for "Church order!") and he did not consider that he inflicted any degradation upon his princes by converting them into *Scripture-readers*. Yes, my brethren, it is written (and written, too, for *our* learning) that he employed five princes, in connexion with certain priests and Levites, to read and explain the word of God through the length and breadth of Judea. In brief, he effectually pervaded his kingdom with scriptural instruction, and it immediately follows, "The fear of the Lord fell upon all the kingdoms of the lands that were round about Judah, so that they made no war against Jehoshaphat." We are

also informed, that the Philistines and Arabians, the most warlike and turbulent of those nations, voluntarily and gratuitously poured their riches into his treasury; and the internal prosperity of his kingdom kept pace with the external display of his power; for he had, moreover, "*much business* in the cities of Judah," while his military establishment amounted to no fewer than one million one hundred and sixty thousand fighting men! But what next?

"Now Jehoshaphat had riches and honour in abundance, and *joined affinity with Ahab*." Jehoshaphat's prosperity, let it be observed, continued up to the date of his alliance with the representative of the great apostasy of his day. Mark the consequences.

First, there is mere *affinity*,—a cultivation of friendly relations, irrespective of religious discordance of sentiment,—a liberal disregard, in short, of those hampering restrictions which are imposed on little minds by the bigotry of religious caste. But affinity, "after certain years," ripens into friendship, and friendship naturally suggests a visit, and the visit results in political alliance. And why should it not? Where is the harm of entering into political relations with men whose religion may happen to differ from our own? What have politics to do with religion? Are *politicians*, forsooth, to take upon themselves the determination of "*what is truth*" in religion? But the bonds of union are drawn still closer, and the idolater is not merely admitted to the confidence and friendship of Jehoshaphat, the alliance results in actual identity of interest and feeling. "I am as thou art, and my people as thy people; and we will be with thee in the war."

The consequence of this, like that of every alliance of the kind, read to Jehoshaphat, when it was all but too late, a practical lesson of some importance. After an almost miraculous deliverance from the treachery of his idolatrous ally, and the swords of the Syrians, he is met by "Jehu the son of Hanani the seer" with the following message:—"Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord? *therefore is wrath upon thee from before the Lord*." Let us see what that rebuke involved.

"It came to pass *after this* also, that the children of Moab, and the children of Ammon, and with them other beside the Ammonites, came against Jehoshaphat to battle." Like the mighty Hebrew who was unconsciously shorn of his power while slumbering in the harlot's lap, Jehoshaphat no sooner awoke to a discovery of his actual position, than he found that "his strength had departed from him," and he now stands trembling in presence of the most impotent of the nations by whom he was surrounded. Where is that power whose very *prestige* so recently inspired terror into these nations? Where are the eleven hundred and sixty thousand "mighty men of valour," of whom we so lately heard? What revolution has produced this sudden eclipse of the national glory of Judah,—this threatened bankruptcy of her temporal prosperity? The answer is found in five words,—"*Jehoshaphat joined affinity with Ahab*."

We have seen what an *idolatrous alliance* can effect in the judicial prostration of a nation's strength: let us see what *prayer* can accomplish in lifting it again into an erect position.

Jehoshaphat had sinned: but Jehoshaphat had also repented of his sin; and, gathering up the spiritual might of the penitent saint amidst the threatened wreck of his temporal power, he gives utterance to one of the noblest appeals to be found in Scripture. In that appeal he falls back upon the part of Solomon's prayer which I have quoted, and concludes with these remarkable words:—"Neither know we what to do: but our eyes are upon Thee." In fear and perplexity and danger, he places his cause in the Lord's hand; and from that moment it is no longer his own. Mark the Divine response. "Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not yours, but God's. . . . Ye shall not need to fight in this battle: set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem."

The practical application of this glorious discovery of the power and faithfulness of a sin-hating, sin-chastising, but sin-forgiving God, is simple, intelligible, and encouraging. This first of nations, like that first of then living monarchs, has allied itself with idolatry, and stands trembling in dread of the threatened consequences. Like Jehoshaphat, "we have no might" against these consequences, "neither know we what to do." With Jehoshaphat let us add, "*Our eyes are upon Thee*."

I shall not detain you by even a bare reference to the numerous other instances of national deliverance, through the instrumentality of prayer, which are to be found in Scripture,—further than to remark, that such deliverances were not unfrequently vouchsafed to the prayers of *individuals*; as in the cases of Moses, and Samuel, and David, and Asa, and Hezekiah, and Daniel. The believer is just as welcome at the throne of grace with a large as with a small petition; and if his faith, and his patriotism, can grasp the extent of a nation's wants, God is proportionally honoured by the magnitude of the petition. In so far, then, as the testimony of Scripture is concerned, it is absolutely certain, that God will either restrain prayer for national deliverance, as He did in the case of Jeremiah; or He will hear it, as He did in the instance of Jehoshaphat. The very fact, therefore, of scripturally-warranted prayer, ascending to God for national mercies, is providential evidence that it will be accepted.

If we descend from Scripture to experience, we are shut up to the same conclusion: but the limit which I have assigned to this communication will only admit of the selection of one example.

From the best histories of Luther in our possession, and, more particularly, the noble work of Merle d'Aubigné on the Reformation, it would appear that he was eminently a man of prayer; that prayer, in fact, was the very element of his spiritual being,—as we may infer from the discovery, that he did not pass a day without devoting at least three of its best hours to communion with God. It was the spiritual power of this Reformer which elevated him so immeasurably above both his contemporaries and his successors: for, although the new principle in his character rested upon a constitutional basement of indomitable courage, great energy and self-possession, it is to the sustained ardency of his prayer, and the scriptural simplicity of his faith, that we are to attribute his unparalleled success. It was the constant conviction of Luther, that no secular weapon was of any avail in the contest in which he found himself engaged; and, even when pressed by adverse circumstances to the very verge of despair, he was as anxious to disclaim the assistance of such weapons as the other great leaders of the Reformation were to court it. "It is neither," said he, "by wisdom, nor by violence, that the renovation of the Church will be accomplished; *but by humble prayer, and bold faith which shall range Jesus Christ on our side*;" and, when threatened with an outbreak of civil war, from the excesses of the Anabaptists, his language, in a letter to Myconius, is characteristic of his habitual dependence;—"Satan is raging, ungodly priests take counsel together, and we are threatened with war. Exhort the people to contend earnestly before the throne of the Lord by faith and prayer. *The most urgent of our wants, the very first thing we have to do, is to pray*. Let the people know that they are at this moment exposed to the edge of the sword, and the rage of the devil. *Let them pray*." But it was during the sitting of the ever-memorable Diet of Augsburg, so pregnant with danger to the interests of the Reformation, that we witness the most remarkable illustration of the manner in which this ever ready, omnipotent, and never-failing weapon was wielded by Luther. Prevented by the arrest of friendship, the anathema of the Pope, and the edicts of the Empire, from appearing in the Diet, the intrepid Reformer occupied a fortified position on the neighbouring hill of Cobourg: and, while "the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers took counsel together against the Lord," and against his faithful servant, Luther brought the artillery of prayer to bear upon the deliberations of that most august but most godless assembly. Like a monster mortar plat formed on a rock, with its mouth elevated to the heavens in the line of its object, his spiritual projectiles fell thick and heavy in the council-hall of Augsburg; and neither the ramparted defence of imperial power, nor the casemated covering of Papal intrigue, could resist the descending destruction. They met, they reasoned, they resolved, they menaced, they entreated, they despaired, they separated: for a mighty wrestler with God had said, "*I shall weep, I shall pray, I shall never be silent until I know that my cry has been heard in heaven*." Well might Diedrich exclaim, "How could not those prayers but prevail in the desperate struggle at Augsburg!" It was the breath of the same prayer which neutralized the defection of the pusillanimous Melancthon, sustained the calm and inflexible decision of John of Saxony, returned the half-drawn sword of the fiery Philip of Hesse to its scabbard; and not only gave a retrograde movement to the imperial cloud of war, which had so long been gathering blackness over the Reformation and slowly moving in the direction of Saxony, but poured down its desolating contents upon the head of guilty Rome.

Such, my Protestant brethren, was the weapon with which the immortal Luther achieved a conquest that far exceeded those of all the Reformers, whether of his own time or subsequent periods. Let us grasp the same weapon. It has lost none of its power: and the God who heard the cry of a solitary monk, from the heights of Cobourg, and the silence of a cloister, is as ready to hear the prayer of every believing British Protestant. For, let it be remembered, that Luther, as well as Jehoshaphat, was a man of like passions with ourselves; and what *he* achieved by prayer, *we* may warrantably attempt. It can hardly be a question with any one who has carefully contemplated the spiritual aspect of that singular character, that his success as a Reformer stands intelligibly identified with his closet exercises as a Christian; and the question I would ask is, What would Luther have recommended in the circumstances in which *this country* has been placed? Can any one hesitate in admitting that it would have been such an exercise of "humble prayer and bold faith" as, to use his own language, should "*range Jesus Christ on our side*"? Would he not have counselled us, as he did Myconius, to "exhort the people to contend earnestly before the throne of the Lord by faith and prayer?" But, if such would have been Luther's advice if living, "he being dead yet speaketh."

There is a vagueness of thinking and feeling on the subject of prayer for the aversion of national judgments, which is as unscriptural as it is unprofitable. It is not by scattering—if I may so speak—the breath of prayer over the expanse of a darkened firmament that we shall pierce and dissipate the one well-defined and pregnant cloud, whose fiery bolts are pointed against the temple and the throne: there must be a specific reference to that particular sin, or course of sinning, which has separated between the nation and her God. To those who see and believe with the writer, that the sin, which has contributed, more than any other, to place this country under the ban of the Divine wrath, is her re-union with the Papal apostasy, the direction of prayer in our present circumstances will be clear and intelligible.

In that deeply interesting expression of Protestant feeling and sentiment which has reached me from different parts of the country, there is, in connexion with a *desire* to act, a very general feeling of despondency

respecting the *consequences* of action; and this feeling evidently rests upon a survey of the apparently insurmountable difficulties which any such movement as I have presumed to recommend would have to encounter. Again and again I must remind the *Christian* Protestant, (and it is only to such that I address myself,) that *his business lies with his God, and not with the difficulties of the question*. Difficulties there confessedly are: but "we have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what work thou didst in their days, in the times of old." And is "the hand of the Lord shortened that it cannot save, or is His ear heavy that it cannot hear?"

It is not difficulties that we have to fear; but inaction and God-dishonouring compromise. If the ignorant and heartless mass of the nominal Protestantism of Great Britain shall be repelled from any attempt at the discharge of obvious and positive duty, by the apprehension of impossibilities in its front, let it have a care that it do not risk a collision with very opposite impossibilities in its rear. Let it beware, lest, in resiling from the apprehended obstruction of a five-barred gate, (which, like that of Peter's prison-house, may "open of his own accord,") it do not back over a precipice. The impossibility in front—admitting its existence—refers to the impotency of human instrumentality, and may, by the interposition of an Almighty arm, be overcome: but the opposite impossibility resolves itself into the immutability of the Almighty himself. It is *the impossibility of saving a nation in a state of open rebellion against her God*. Either we must deny, that the nation has, politically and religiously, identified itself with the apostasy of Rome; or we must admit, that salvation, in such a condition, is impossible. My youngest child, (the reader will pardon the reference,) when considerably under four years of age, on hearing her mother remark, that God could do every thing, immediately replied, "There is one thing, mamma, that God cannot do: *He cannot do evil*." This was the child's own induction; and I would that it were stereotyped upon the understanding of every Protestant in the empire, who is dreaming of salvation for the country in its present position;—who would huddle up all that regards the past in unexamined uncertainty, provided we can only ward off the evils and the consequences of future concession. *God cannot do evil*: and therefore He cannot, contrary to His Word, and the established principles of His moral government, save either an individual, or a nation, in a state of open apostasy. If we cannot elevate the mind's eye of the national Protestantism to the apprehension of this solemn truth, we can have no clearer evidence that its back-bone is judicially broken.

I have assumed, from the outset, that the work to which the Word of God, the Church of God, the voice of our country, and the interests of posterity, are summoning us, is not man's but God's work. We are Conservatives to the heart's core: but not the sinister Conservatives of lucrative offices, green acres, party interests, and political shibboleths:—we are Conservatives of God's honour, God's Word, God's Church; Conservatives, in other words, of the authority, royalties, and prerogatives of the "Prince of the kings of the earth." Those rights and royalties, whether in the Church or in the State, it is at our peril either to compromise or surrender; and we, therefore, claim, in the Name of our Master, free course for His truth,—free course through the State, through the Church, through the palace, through the cottage. We advance this claim in God's Name, and on God's behalf,—leaving Him to realize it to whatever extent His wisdom and His mercy to Britain may see fit. But who shall attempt to circumscribe the answer to faithful persevering prayer? And let us have a care, my brethren, that, while we are piously and most properly limiting the influence of our own finite and fallible capacities, we be not, at the same time, impiously limiting "the Holy One of Israel." Resources we have none; and yet the available resources of *prayer* cannot be comprehended within a narrower scope than the exhaustless resources of Deity. We know something of what ascends to heaven by the vehicle of prayer, even when it is burdened by the "groanings which cannot be uttered:" but we know not what descends to earth from the censer of Him who, after having mingled and perfumed it with the incense of His own merit, presents it before the throne. That answer is destined to announce itself in "thunderings and lightnings, and a great earthquake."

When Jehoshaphat stood in presence of the confederated armies of the alien, his language was, "We have no might against this great company that cometh against us; neither know we what to do: but our eyes are upon Thee." But Jehoshaphat had made the battle the Lord's; and the Lord, in return, made his enemies his deliverers. "Ye shall not need to fight in this battle: set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem." And can He not as easily commission the events of His providence to act the part of deliverers for us, as He commissioned the hosts of Amnion and Moab and Edom to destroy each other? There is no union of armies or events, however intimate, however powerful, which believing prayer cannot dissolve. We have, it is true, to deal with "a great company," which have "consulted together with one consent," and are confederate against us. "The tabernacles of Edom, and the Ishmaelites; of Moab, and the Hagarenes; Gebal, and Amnion, and Amalek; the Philistines with the inhabitants of Tyre; Assur also," and "the children of Lot." But we may address to them the withering sarcasm, which Abijah addressed to the idolatrous hosts of Jeroboam, "Ye be a great multitude, and *there are with you golden calves*, which Jeroboam made you for gods. . . . But as for us, . . . behold, God Himself is with us for our captain." (2 Chron. xiii. 8,12.) Oh, that we could

transfer to our own experience the animating discovery, that God Himself is as certainly with us for our captain, as the golden calves are with our adversaries!

Such of my readers as have regaled their imagination by the poetical creations of Sir Walter Scott cannot have forgotten the fearfully-interesting position in which Fitzjames was placed, by the dismaying discovery, that he stood in presence of Roderick Dhu, and his "plaided warriors armed for strife." Placing his back against the rock on which he leant, the astonished but dauntless Saxon is represented as giving utterance to the heroic defiance:—

*"Come one, come all; this rock shall fly
From its firm base as soon as I."*

We, too, have our Rock; and what was pure fiction in the descriptions of Walter Scott, is solemn truth in the case of every believer. His hero was menaced by "odds," to which he could only oppose the few strokes of an arm that was soon to drop swordless by his side: but

*"Satan trembles when he sees
The weakest saint upon his knees."*

With his back against the Rock of Ages, the feeblest warrior that marches under the banner of the cross can oppose the might of Deity to his adversaries.

But a challenge to prayer, my Protestant brethren, has been flung down to us by the apostasy itself. It is a tact, that, amidst the incense of ten thousand altars, public, special prayer is ascending to the images and idol gods of Rome, for the conversion of England! And shall *we* continue silent? While an idolatrous priesthood are "calling on the name of Baal from morning even unto noon," shall not the servants of the true God adopt the language of Elisha,—*"Hear us, O Lord, hear us, that this people may know that THOU art the Lord God?"* Such a movement upon the part of the spiritual Protestantism of Britain would put the faithfulness of God once more to the test before the intelligent universe: and nothing could be more hopeful or more certain than the issue of such a contest.

But I have far exceeded the limits originally assigned to this communication, and must proceed to the practical application of what has been urged. What I venture to propose is—

- That our alliance with the apostasy of Rome, being, as we believe it to be, the chief ground of the Lord's controversy with us as a nation, we should individually, and in our families, recognise the hand of God in the judgments inflicted or threatened, acknowledge the justice of the visitation, or, in the language of Scripture, *"accept the punishment of our iniquity,"* and beseech the Lord to open, in His providence, a way of escape from both the sin and its consequences. I would most especially recommend, that the Lord may be entreated to render the sore judgment with which Ireland has been visited subservient to the spiritual emancipation of her people, and that He would inspire every minister of His true Church in that country with a spirit of fidelity and holy courage suited to the duties of the crisis.
- That there should be a special season for concerted national prayer on the same subject, say on one particular day of every month; when the united supplications of such of the people of God as entertain the views which have been stated should meet at the throne of grace. I would venture to suggest that this monthly concert should be of a *social* character, by the meeting together, in different localities, of at least "two or three" Christians, when more cannot be obtained.
- That every Protestant entering into this design, should hold himself prepared to harmonize his practice with his prayer, by the adoption of such means for furthering the severance of the nation from the apostasy of Rome, as the providence of God may Suggest;—ever keeping in mind, that the promise of deliverance, whether to nations or individuals, is only to such as *turn from the iniquity which has provoked the rod*. I would, moreover, recommend the diffusion of correct information respecting the nature of the sin of which the nation has been guilty, and the exertion of every species of legitimate influence that can be brought to act upon the understanding and conscience of the electoral constituency.

It will be seen, that the advice which I have thus presumed to offer, in answer to the numerous inquiries addressed to me, will only apply to those who entertain the views of Protestant principle and Protestant duty which have been expressed in my first letter. It is not necessary to the object we have in view, that these should be numerous;—only that they should be earnest. If those who are willing to unite in the plan recommended will forward their names and addresses to the writer, it may facilitate the ultimate object of national organization for both prayer and action.

I am,
MY PROTESTANT BRETHREN,
Your obedient

Humble Servant,

J. E. Gordon.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New-street, London.

Protestant Crisis-Prize Essay, No. I. Reasons Against the Endowment of the Romish Priesthood in Ireland. By Alexander Harper.

Being the Essay

Selected

By Rev. T. R. Birks and Rev. J. E. Cox, Referees,

For the

Premium of £40, Given by the Committee of the Protestant Association for the Best Essay on the Above Subject.

Second Edition.

London: PUBLISHED FOR THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION, By Hatchards, Rivingtons, Seeleys, Shaw, Dalton, and Jackson. 1849.

Price Sixpence.

Alexander Macintosh, Printer, Great New-Street, London.

Reasons Against the Endowment of the Romish Priesthood in Ireland.

IN that portion of the prophetic writings of the Bible which is most remarkable for minute detail and startling power of description,—that portion which contains the visions vouchsafed in Patmos to him, who, the best beloved by the Saviour while on earth, had given to him the farthest glance into the shadowy future—it is written, that the kings of the earth shall "give their power and strength unto the beast." That this term applies to the Papal dominion we shall not now attempt to question; but shall accept the interpretation given by the most eminent Protestant writers on this interesting subject, and consider that the phrase simply means, that the rulers in the Christian world, or at least the most powerful and influential of them, shall vie with each other in shewing respect and deference to the Papacy, obeying its commands, soliciting its protection, or espousing and defending its claims.

In exact accordance with the remarkable prediction has been the not less striking accomplishment. For the last twelve hundred years, the rulers of the civilized earth have made themselves the puppets and slaves of a monstrous spiritual usurpation, with an infatuation so great, that the only comparison the inspired writer thinks sufficiently striking, is, that of men intoxicated with the wine of sorcery. By a word, by a nod, from the spiritual ruler enthroned on the Seven Hills, empires have been overturned, thrones and sceptres tossed to and fro, kings robbed of the allegiance of their subjects and trampled under foot in a vain attempt at resistance,—the bonds of society loosened by an arbitrary mandate, while the wretched individual whose hard fate brought him under the ban of the "*Saviour's Vicegerent*" on earth was driven from the society of his fellows,—repulsed, loathed, as if covered with a foul leprosy,—and made, in his utter abandonment and wretchedness, to consider the wild beasts of the forest more merciful than his brother man. The days of excommunication and anathema are, to a certain degree, past; but not the less truth is there still in the expression, That the earth's rulers give their strength unto the Beast. The mode may differ, the disposition is still the same.

Since the temporary abasement of the Papacy in the beginning of this century, there has been a gradual *increase* of the power and influence of the Pope, so that, at the present moment—fallen as may be his temporal authority—probably his spiritual pretensions were never more widely or readily acknowledged. Without taking into account the actual increase in the number of his followers all over the world, the kings and rulers of the earth seem, at this moment, engaged in a competition to do him honour. A fugitive from the Eternal City—obliged to flee in a menial disguise from the fickle and brutal populace, whose debasement and ignorance are now recoiling on the heads of those who encouraged both—can this be the terrible potentate, at whose nod kingdoms were shaken, and whose fiat slavish millions adored and obeyed as the dictate of infallibility? It is even so. And yet two of the most powerful and enlightened empires on the earth are

conspiring to render him homage. Republican France would gladly bow the knee before this, the worst of tyrannies, and add another to the many proofs already given, that, while she worships a name—a cold abstraction—she knows not the meaning, understands not the language, of liberty. And England,—what is the attitude taken by her, the fairest child of the Reformation—the country in which the rays of Gospel truth are diffused with clearest and purest lustre—the home of peace and liberty, to which the captive in every land turns his eyes with longing and with hope? Alas! that it should be said of the land in which lived, and spoke, and worked, Wickliffe, and Cranmer, Knox, and Melville; and in which, from thousands of temples, the worship of pure hearts is daily ascending, like incense, to the throne of God;—in this land, for the last twenty years, one concession after another has been made to Popery, one sacrifice after another offered to the Beast. Beginning with the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, our rulers and statesmen, as if intoxicated, possessed with but one idea, have, year by year, sought to draw closer the bonds of union between Protestant England and idolatrous Rome. Instead of protesting against, and endeavouring to counteract, the destructive and debasing tendencies and results of the teaching of that religion, they lay hold of these results, melancholy as they are in themselves, as a desirable instrument for accomplishing their purposes. They find the people of Ireland sunk in ignorance, poverty, idleness, and semi-barbarism, all the effects of the pernicious teachings of Popery: how do they act? They do not attempt to dispel their ignorance, amend their morals, and improve their condition, mentally and physically; they do not attempt to reduce the influence and weaken the power of that which has been the fruitful source of the evil; but, taking, to aid them, that very principle—destructive and pernicious as it is—they seek, *by its means*, to keep within bounds the evil which itself alone has produced.

A wide-spread feeling of disaffection exists among the Irish population; it has been aided, or even produced, by the priests, who in the main are traitors; it breaks out into open rebellion—after a short struggle the rebellion is suppressed—the leaders apprehended and punished—at least the laity are; but though proofs abound, amply sufficient to shew the guilt of many of the priests, they are allowed to escape; nay, petted, courted, caressed, by the rulers of this realm! Why? Because our rulers will not do, what justice and common sense alike demand: govern Ireland *in spite* of the priests, giving to all, where due, their just punishment; they must, forsooth, govern that country through the priests, employing as the cure the very treatment which produces the disease! Instead of attempting to stay the progress of the conflagration, and arresting the incendiary, they leave him his liberty, and give him materials to feed the flame if he will! An attempt was made to establish colleges for general secular education—so far the object was good. But, true to their subservient and cowardly policy, our rulers approached the Papal throne, kneeling humbly, and requesting that a foreign potentate would be graciously pleased to approve what the Queen of England had done within her own dominions!

See Note A.

Well, indeed, might a Liberal politician exclaim, "Who rules in Ireland, the Queen of England or the Pope of Rome?" And our rulers, by their actions, answer, "The Pope!" What was the consequence? Could it be imagined for a moment that darkness would tolerate light, evil encourage good? The result might have been foreseen. The colleges were placed under ban, and the youth of Ireland forbidden to seek instruction there. This is the last insult received; but, true to the instinct which prompts them to kiss the hand that smites them, our Government and our leading statesmen are now notoriously contemplating a further concession to Popery—taking a step beyond which we can hardly go, and which may be considered the last and crowning abasement—the brimming over of the cup of shame and apostasy. This is the endowment, in one form or other, of the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland; their formal recognition by and identification with this Protestant State.

We have sadly miscalculated the spirit of our countrymen, if this infamous proposal should ever become the law of the land. We are sure that the heart of England is still sound, that the nation at large is as warmly attached as ever to the great and eternal principles of Bible truth. And again we say, we do not fear the result.

It is our intention now to state a few of the arguments which seem to us the most prominent and striking, in opposition to any plan for endowing or supporting the Church of Rome.

The darling argument with our statesmen is, Expediency—worldly policy. We shall therefore devote some time to the consideration of this part of the subject, and divide our train of argument into two portions; the *first*, to a consideration of the principle involved; the *second* will be occupied entirely by an examination of the expediency, and to the soundness of policy of any such measure.

Our leading Reformers, after throwing off the yoke of Popery, taking the Word of God for their guide, reformed the Church of England, and stated the Articles of faith which were to be the guide of that Church, in concise and simple language, so that none of the people could have any doubt what they were. In these Articles, they allude to the distinguishing features of the Church of Rome, terming many of her doctrines "blasphemous fables and dangerous conceits;" than which it is impossible to use more emphatic language. This Church, therefore,—the government and the principles of which are derived directly from the Word of God, and not

from vain traditions or inventions of man,—is pre-eminently founded on truth, having its origin direct from the fountain of all truth, the inspired Scripture itself.

By the English Constitution, a solemn national assent is given to the principles of Protestantism; the right to ascend the throne is limited to individuals holding those principles, and certain high offices in the State can be held by Protestants only. In addition, the higher dignitaries of the Church take their places in the Upper Legislative chamber by right of their office, and have a voice directly in the making of the laws. The State, therefore, is indissolubly united with the one Protestant Church of England; the whole structure is so cemented, that, were one portion to abdicate its functions, or to be forcibly pulled down, the rest would speedily follow; the Throne, the Church, the legislative authority, cannot exist separately, but will stand or fall together. And the vast and complicated machinery of this structure has been kept in harmonious and continuous operation from the Revolution of 1688 to this day.

We do not intend here to enter into a close examination of the *nature* of the agreement subsisting between the Church and State, as it concerns the privileges of the former and the powers of the latter; we simply take the fact as we find it.

A Church, therefore, teaching, and intended to teach, certain principles of faith and practice, exists in this country, and in Ireland, in most intimate alliance with the State. It will at once be seen, therefore, that to establish *another* Church, teaching diametrically *opposite* principles, is absurdly inconsistent, to say nothing of higher and holier views. It is absurd and inconsistent to establish a society or community with one object, and afterwards establish another association, avowedly to counteract the ends of the first. And here it seems necessary that we should very shortly glance at the leading characteristics of the two systems of religion, to shew that, in *principle*, they are opposed to each other in grand and essential points, and that they cannot approximate, unless one or other surrender the very essentials of their creed.

What is Protestantism? A distinguished Member of the House of Commons, and a member of the Church of England, but one who loudly disclaims the name of Protestant, said once in that House, that Protestantism was a *negative* thing, rather a negation of certain active principles of another Church, than an assertion of leading principles originated by itself. It might be sufficient, in reply to this, to shew the doctrines held and inculcated by the early Church till the third century; or to point to the pure faith so very wonderfully kept alive among the Vaudois during the thickest gloom of the middle ages. But we shall do more than this—we shall state what were the characteristic principles originated, or rather, revived, by the first Reformers, when the tyranny of Rome had been shaken off, and men searched the Scriptures, thought, and decided for themselves. To define in two words the leading ideas of Protestantism, we should say they were—*first*, the supremacy of the Bible, and its *sufficiency*, as a rule of faith; and, *secondly*, the right of every believer to exercise his judgment, and examine the Bible for himself. From these two grand and eternal principles proceed all the others. Protestantism selects the leading doctrines contained in the Bible, so clearly inculcated in that book that they would strike any illiterate savage on a first reading, and places them in all their purity and force before the people, along with the book whence they were taken. It adds nothing to these doctrines—takes nothing from them. It publishes them to the world, and endeavours to gain proselytes by argument, not by force, appealing to the heart and the intellect, not to the imagination, or the senses. It does not aim at the elevation of the priesthood to a rank above their fellow-men, making them occupy an intermediate place between man and God; but it devotes them to the work of preaching and conversion, making them still active, though sanctified, citizens of the world. It does not ask a blind unreasoning obedience from its followers, but a faith founded on the cheerful, assent of each man's private judgment. In all transactions of life, it inculcates the strictest and loftiest moral purity; makes each man put to himself this question,—What do the Word of God and my own sense of justice tell me to do? and, never looking to the consequences, but only to the act, he goes on in rectitude, loathing the execrable doctrine, that the end justifies the means. God alone is to be the object of worship; no inferior creature is to occupy his place. And, finally, man's inherent sinfulness and unworthiness, and his justification in the sight of God by faith, not by his own merits, always occupy the front rank among the doctrines inculcated by Protestants.

The effect of the revival of these great principles, and their diffusion over Europe, is matter of history. But for their operation on the monastic gloom of the middle ages, we would now have been dreaming in the depth of its midnight. From the Reformation dates the awakening of human intellect after its long slumber; and from that time the advance of mankind in literature, science, and morality was one of giant rapidity. The world arose from barbarism, and marched onwards towards civilization with invincible speed. With improvement of manners went purity of morals; and on every land, blessed with the light of the Reformation, a better day seemed to have dawned. And still, over all the earth, the position of a nation in comfort, prosperity, intelligence, may be seen by its adherence to, or denial of, the great principles of the Protestant religion; its freedom, or otherwise, from the yoke of Popery. In our own country, the truth of this statement is painfully evident to us daily; the condition of Popish Ireland is the one drawback on our otherwise unmatched

prosperity—our headship among nations.

Such is a hasty sketch of the principles of Protestantism. Let us now see what are those of the Church of Rome.

We might use Mr. Gladstone's language and say, it is an exact negation of all the principles we have attributed to Protestantism, But its principles of evil are fearfully active, as much so as ever, and Protestants should never forget what those principles really are. It appears to us, then, that the principles of the Church of Rome, from their nature, must necessarily produce, and always have produced, the four following evils, chiefly *superstition, spiritual tyranny, hypocrisy, immorality*. This we shall shortly endeavour to prove.

First; the tenets of the Church of Rome in a pre-eminent degree induce *superstition*. The worship is essentially that of idolatry. It is so in theory; so is it also in practice. The adoration of crucifixes, images, pictures, relics; the worship paid to the Virgin Mary, the apostles, and early Fathers; the raising to a rank worthy Divine honours, of celebrated saints, and devout men in all ages, and the worship ostentatiously rendered to the consecrated wafer—are the principal sources of superstitious feeling of the most slavish kind, and are, with their numberless ramifications, abundantly sufficient to perpetuate the most abject and credulous superstition among the adherents of that religion. The votaries of this system of idolatry have not, in the great majority of cases, a true idea of the Supreme Being; we maybe called fanatic and illiberal for making the assertion: but any one who has mingled freely, as we have, with the poorer and more ignorant Papists (the latter constituting an immense majority of the whole), can see at once, and in the plainest manner, that the conception they form of God, is that of a Being, mysterious and unknown, seldom concerning himself about the existence or well-being of this world and his creatures who inhabit it, but one who leaves to a crowd of angels, saints, &c., among whom the Virgin Mary holds a prominent place, the unchallenged superintendence of it and its inhabitants. The mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation have never been explained to them, and they class Jesus Christ among the saints, not much above the Virgin Mary,

See Note B.

while the one sacrifice made by him for the sins of all mankind is shewn to them by their priests, as a sacrifice made by themselves (the priests) by their own supernatural power, to be worshipped by the people as an emanation of divinity. A Papist is never told of the necessity of justification through an exercise of *belief* in the all-sufficient merits of Christ, and by that means alone; he is ignorant of such a thing as the absolute necessity of a change of *heart*—that change so entire and complete that, in the graphic language of inspired writ, it is called a *new birth*; he knows nothing of the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, because *that* would interfere with the sanctifying dispensations granted by the priest. With such corrupted and distorted notions of Christianity, can it be wondered that wherever Popery has long existed in a country, the people should, almost literally, be "wholly given to idolatry?" Is there anything surprising in the accounts that reach us of the success of Popish missionaries among savages and idolaters abroad? The heathen are not startled by any violent changes, they are not sternly ordered to throw away their idols, as hateful in the sight of God, and worship instead something which they do not see; the image of Christ on the cross, or the Virgin, takes the place of that of Marriataly or Vishnu, and the Hindoo mother consecrates her babe in another stream, though not the mighty Ganges. Does the votary of Juggernaut wish to silence the stings of conscience by the torture of his body, or by a violent death; he has only to lacerate his back with the lash, and deny himself food till nature sinks exhausted. Thus, while among the heathen, one form of idolatry is simply substituted for another, among nations professedly Christian, the most lamentable results are to be seen. The people are always in practice earnest idolaters. It may suit the purpose of well-educated men like Mr. Wyse,

Member for Waterford in the late Parliament, and an upright and honourable man.

to deny that Roman Catholics worship the image, the relic, or the crucifix; and unfortunately, in the British House of Commons, too ready an ear is lent to such disclaimers, but how notoriously is the reverse the case? Enter a Popish chapel, either in Ireland or England; look at those creatures grovelling in the dust about your feet, miserable specimens of the most abject and crouching superstition, in whom the squalidness of physical is not more evident than the depth of mental debasement; see with what intense and almost idiotic enthusiasm they gaze on the crucifix, or the image, or the uplifted host; mark them narrowly, nay, ask them afterwards, and you will find that what they worship is not a representation of something higher, of something Divine—it is the *thing* itself which they adore, a piece of wood, or stone, or bread! The poor devotee is told nothing of the God who inhabits eternity, who will have no other god beside him, who will suffer no representation of anything in heaven above, or the earth beneath, to be used in his honour; and so stunted is his intellect, so utter his mental darkness, that at first the full blaze of revelation almost blinds him; like the poor captive, he has become accustomed to the gloom of his cell, and prefers it to the free air and the bright sunshine. And the credulity, which is convinced that a fellow-man can give absolution,—can pardon a sin committed, or that another man can, by a decree, grant an indulgence

See the "Times" of 16th December, 1848. Letter of Correspondent from Madrid, relative to indulgences

granted by the Cardinal Legate.

for any sin for a certain time, or a relief to a particular extent, to the tortured soul, from the flames of purgatory, is equally degrading and demands our pity for the dupe, while it excites our indignation against the deceiver and his blasphemy.

We think, therefore, it will not be denied that the teachings of Popery produce superstition among all its votaries.

Secondly; in a greater degree than almost any other of the known systems of religion, has it produced *spiritual tyranny*.

The existence of this system depends on the degree of submission with which the people regard it. Everything, therefore, whether in doctrine or in worship, which tends to exalt the priesthood, and give them a sacred and distinctive character, increases that feeling among the people, and makes them regard their spiritual leaders with admiring awe and veneration. Here the difference between the Popish priest and the Protestant clergyman is at once manifest. The object of the former is to rule, of the latter to convince—of the former to enslave, of the latter to convert. Hence the solemn and mysterious grandeur which surrounds the one, glittering with strange garments before the altar, or shrouded in the dim confessional; and the comparatively familiar ease and gentleness with which the others perform their duties, mingling in life with its every-day concerns, cares, and relaxations, making their way by love, not by fear. By the stern law of celibacy the former are cut off from all human feelings and sympathies; they are unable, and often unwilling, to advise, even if they had the power, and too often, truth compels us to say, they use this power to trample ruthlessly on the tenderest ties. But while the Protestant clergyman does everything openly, and is exposed to the wholesome control of public opinion, the Popish priest, secure within his entrenchments of sanctity and privilege, does what he will almost with impunity, and rarely finds in his superior an impartial judge or a stern censor. Thus, in all those countries where Popery is paramount, Ireland not excepted, the priesthood are regarded with reverence and awe, and more frequently obeyed through the operation of fear than love. By the possession of the secrets of the confessional, the priest wields a terrible power, a power dangerous to society and to the commonwealth, a power which in a free country should not be allowed, and which every good citizen is directly interested in abolishing. How many crimes, which have stricken terror into a whole province, might be detected and punished, if the recesses of that priest's bosom were laid bare, and its secrets dragged forth into the daylight! And the guilty perpetrator of these deeds of blood ranges the earth as before with seared and untroubling conscience, feeling safe, because he knows well his secret will never be dislodged, but in his own person adding another to the list of those who, having confided all to that *holy* man, have become the passive and humble slaves to his will! The priest knows not only family, but individual secrets; the son confides to him what he will not to his parents; nay, more unnatural still, the wife, the mother, she who ought to have no feelings, thoughts, desires, unknown to the partner of her lot, whose mind ought to be a reflex of his own, the throbs of one heart agitating both alike,—*she* buries in the bosom of this *stranger*, thoughts which belong to her husband, and of which she robs him to bestow on another.

See Michelet, "Priests, Women, and Families," *passim*.

Take another instance; look at the operation of the curse of excommunication. We have glanced at this already, but it may be amplified to any extent. It is now only about ten years ago, since an honest, industrious miller, in the north of Ireland, in Protestant Antrim, incurred the displeasure of his priest, and he was solemnly excommunicated, cursed from the altar, the anathema being accompanied by the usual imposing mummeries. What was the cause of this—of what awful crime had the man been guilty? Hear it, ye slumbering Protestants, ye liberal politicians, who persist in assuring us, contrary to the evidence of all our senses, that Popery is not what it once was;—his crime was, that he read the Bible and allowed a prayer-meeting to be held in his house! For this did he receive the priest's curse; and the consequences were of the most serious kind. His neighbours, his own family, shrank from and avoided him, as if he had been a leper, or had committed some heinous crime, for which earth had no pardon, and heaven could hold out no hope; he was abused, hooted, pointed at, and loathed; no one would have any dealings with the excommunicated criminal. Fortunately, however, upright men and honest Protestants are to be found in Ulster; they espoused the cause of this proscribed and ruined Roman Catholic, and carried him to a court of law, demanding justice on his priestly tyrant. Justice is to be had yet, even though a Popish priest is the accused, and in this instance the result was gratifying in the highest degree, and the cause of the Bible triumphed. Heavy damages were awarded to the oppressed individual, and the priests received a lesson, the beneficial effects of which it is impossible to overrate.

See a small pamphlet, entitled "The Priest's Curse." M'Comb. Belfast.

The tyranny of the system is shown in a multitude of ways besides the above, but we can only allude to them. From this root sprung all the aids and engines of despotism—the Inquisition, the persecutions and crusades to exterminate heretics, which are matter of history, and the wielding the power and armies of kingdoms in support of the Popedom. All these and countless minor points are so many exemplifications of our

argument. The history of the whole of the Christian world for the last thousand years forms the evidence we adduce.

The above, we think, will be sufficient to explain our meaning when we state spiritual tyranny to be a result of Popery.

The *third* result named, is *hypocrisy*. A single glance at the system makes this evident.

Christianity, the religion of the Bible, proclaims in the strongest manner that repentance for sin must be of the most genuine and ardent character, proceeding from the *heart*, and influencing man's thoughts, language, and actions. The fount being pure, so are the waters which well forth; the tree will bear corresponding fruit. No truth can be clearer, in the moral, as in the physical, world. But how teaches Popery? Nothing, or next to nothing, is said of *heart-felt* repentance; nothing of the *motives* which actuate man; but the language and the *deeds*, not the *thoughts*—what is seen *outwardly*, not the *inner* man—the character *assumed*, not the *genuine* one, are to be looked at and judged. Jesus Christ, who is our model of purity, as well as faith and devotion, calls the crime conceived and *meditated*, as bad as the crime *accomplished*.

Matt. v. 28.

Profound and searching morality, which stands alone and unapproached among the systems of ancient philosophy or modern imposture! But Popery tells authoritatively, that even a crime committed is sometimes excusable, when the object to be gained is in itself good and desirable.

Delahogue, vol. i., p. 292.

And, no matter how hideous the crime, the stains must be washed away, and the criminal resume his wonted position, as an innocent, because absolved, man—by a course of penance or compulsory charity, ostentatiously undergone and pompously announced to the world. And thus the man, who, in his heart, if not in his actions, is daily conceiving, and therefore committing, awful and desperate crimes, walks before the eyes of the world, a good and upright man and a charitable Christian. He believes so himself, because he has never been taught anything else; and he dies in the delusion. Has he filled the land with wailing, with the tears of the widow, or the cries of the orphan—has he robbed the fatherless of their inheritance, or the virgin of her honour—a few more temples rear aloft their domes and fretted roofs and pointed spires; a few more altars smoke with the fragrant incense; a few more masses are chanted by the sacred band; and the absolution is granted, the sin is forgiven. The man who has destroyed the peace of perhaps thousands, scatters right and left his largesses and his bounty, and loudly extols the merits of charity! "When thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily, I say unto you, they have their reward."

The effect of this principle on the priests themselves, as well as the laity, brings us to the next particular.

Fourthly; the tenets of the Church of Rome have, in all ages, produced wide-spread *immorality*.

Among the laity, the operation of the doctrine of absolution and indulgences would account for the extent to which immorality has always prevailed in Roman Catholic countries, on exactly the same principle as other crimes to which we have already alluded. But, above all, is the conduct of the Popish clergy to be laid bare and reprehended on this head. In all ages, since this iniquitous system attained its full development, the licentiousness of the priesthood has disgraced their holy calling. It has passed into a proverb in those countries where Popery prevails, has formed the subject of romances, and been the burden of many a ballad. In truth, if the end proposed had been to make the priests as lewd and immoral as possible, a belter plan could not have been devised than this system, as it has always worked. Men, in most instances, young and healthy, brought up in strict seclusion, studying, as a part of their education, works, the contents of which reveal to them physical facts and moral crimes, of which otherwise they might have remained quite ignorant all their lives—thrown suddenly into spheres of labour, while their minds are curious and inquiring, and their bodies full of the hot blood and vigour of youth—and with those dispositions and desires, possessing at the same time the consciousness, that, by the stern laws of their religion they are debarred from gratifying innocently those desires—knowing, that, for them, love and beauty, and social enjoyment, are not; and that lover, husband, father, are empty names—then undergoing, day by day, such an ordeal as the confessional,—*obliged* to ask questions and to call up thoughts,

Bailly, vol. vii., p. 366. Paris Edit. No words can convoy an idea of the horrid and disgusting ideas and language with which this book is filled. When first published, it excited a shudder, wherever known.

which at any time would too readily come:—what is to be expected of such men in such circumstances—what invariably happens? In a multitude of instances—it is to be feared in many more than the world knows of, for the secrets are well kept within the prison-house—human nature, never strong, yields to a temptation, the strength of which those only can conceive who have undergone the trial. The priest falls—he has been placed in a position, and exposed to a danger, greater and more singular than the generality of mankind; and why should he, equally human, triumph where others fail? The God of nature, He who created man, the founder of Christianity, never intended that his creatures should, by the exercise of their own

invention, add to the trials, common to their lot as mortals, a refinement of torture such as this. Not to enlarge, it may be safely affirmed, that the institution of celibacy has been a main cause in producing that wide-spread immorality among the Popish priesthood, which is now a matter of history. And then comes the crowning iniquity, the damning doctrine of total absolution from a sin. No matter of how deep a dye, any man, be he priest or layman, *can* obtain a full pardon for that sin, from a fellow-man, with liberty to begin anew. A priest, who has possibly only himself obtained absolution for the crime of adultery, grants to another, for a sum of money, the same absolution in his turn. And so the waters of the unclean fountain, flowing on throughout the land, spread taint, and pestilence, and pollution, as they go.

See Note C., Immorality of the clergy at this day.

It is no answer to the objection we have made to the tenets of Popery, particularly the last, to say that Ireland forms a singular example to the contrary, and that the conduct of the priesthood there is, morally, above all blame. We, in the first place, deny the fact. But, had we taken it for granted, it would be easy to account for this singular exception to the rule on the simplest grounds. The Roman Catholic priests in Ireland are exposed to that, which, more than anything else, will always prove a most effectual check to their natural propensities, viz., the scrutinizing notice and supervision of hostile religionists. Were the clergy in Spain or Italy surrounded by Protestants in every town and village, and engaged with them in a continual warfare of creed and *practice*, they would doubtless exercise a most vigilant control over all their sayings and their deeds. Thus is it in Ireland; the priesthood know that they are in an enemy's country, that any flagrant act on the part of a member of their order would be eagerly taken hold of by their active and numerous foes. This applies to all the Popish clergy in Ulster and in those parts of Ireland where they are, on all sides, surrounded by Protestants; but in the west, where the control is less strict, the morals are less strict too. Again, in Ireland, the priesthood have been all along very much engaged in political strife; this has engrossed their minds, to the exclusion of other matters, and all their superfluous vigour and acrimony thus find vent. But, still more, we believe it is not so true as is alleged, that in Ireland there is that higher tone of morality, which is so much boasted of. This is not the place to enter into details; we would simply remind our readers, that, from their nature, such crimes can be easily concealed, with care on the part of the accomplices, and, of course, in Ireland, very unusual care is taken. Besides, it is matter of notoriety, how numerous marriages in early youth are in that country, and, if credible witnesses are to be believed, this is intimately connected with the morals of the priests. However, on this part of the subject we do not enlarge.

Again, it is equally certain that monasteries and convents during the middle ages were hot-beds of crime; and in the Inquisition lust and cruelty held divided sway. Many of the Popes were distinguished for their open and unblushing profligacy; and in a multitude of cases, the crime was justified by this argument: "That the transgressions committed by a person, blinded by the seduction of lust, agitated by the impulse of tumultuous passions, and destitute of all sense and impression of religion, however detestable they may be in themselves, are not imputable to the transgressors before the tribunal of God; and that such transgressions may often be as involuntary as the actions of a madman." To the Jesuits belong the *merit* of originating this exquisite morality.

Sufficient has now been said to illustrate our meaning, when we stated immorality to be a consequence of Popery.

We have now glanced at the leading characteristics of the Roman Catholic, as compared with the Protestant faith, and, as it is impossible to go into the subject within the short limits of this treatise, must be contented with this mere outline. We think, however, we have said quite enough to shew that there is a vast difference between the two religions, and that, while one may be called Christian truth, the other must be called Antichristian error. The history of all past time, and the world-wide experience of the present, tell us, that Popery, wherever prevalent, has engendered and perpetuated superstition, spiritual tyranny, hypocrisy, immorality—we may add, ignorance, and mental debasement; while the fruits of Protestantism, wherever professed in purity, have been, the strictest morality, intelligence, mental elevation, manly independence of character, widespread philanthropy, and civil as well as religious liberty. The latter religion has made England and Scotland what they now are—the envy and admiration of the world; the former has been the curse of Ireland, and has made her a by-word and reproach among the nations of Europe.

The point from which we started is now brought under our notice; viz., that it is impious, as well as absurdly inconsistent, to endow Popery as well as Protestantism.

We hold it to be impious. It is impious to form any alliance with that which has been so plainly condemned of God, and against which his most fearful judgments have been pronounced. We believe, as we think every impartial student of the Bible must believe, that Popery is that "mystery of iniquity" described by St. Paul; and "Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the earth," described in Apocalyptic vision; and we know that if we "partake in her sins," we shall "receive of her plagues." We believe it to be the "great Apostasy" described by another apostle; and we know that it "the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming." We *know* it is because of our pure and reformed faith,

that England has been so blessed among nations; and that if we partake of the unclean thing, if we enter into alliance with the Beast, we shall receive (have we not received a portion already?) of her plagues, "death, and mourning, and famine." It is also impious to ally ourselves with that tyrant superstition, whose history is written in the blood of the faithful followers of Jesus Christ for the last thousand years; which has so often crushed the professors of Bible truth; that truth so proudly inscribed by Great Britain on the portal of her Constitution—that truculent system, in fine, which is "drunk with the blood of the saints, with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." It is impious to sustain or propagate that which God has so manifestly condemned in the sufferings and degradation of those who receive it. Finally, it is impious to support or endow that against which our noble reforming ancestors protested even unto death, and in resisting which they gave their bodies to the flames.

But it is also inconsistent, grossly, absurdly inconsistent, to endow Popery in Great Britain. As was remarked before, a Church is established here, the object of which is to teach certain doctrines, as stated in her Articles, and to bring those doctrines under the notice of *all* the people. That the Church of England, though not perfect, has accomplished this object well, none, except her very bitter enemies, will deny. But the statesmen of the present day, largely penetrated with that latitudinarian Liberalism, so banefully extended over the Continent of Europe, have, in their wisdom, resolved to endow a Church teaching doctrines exactly the reverse;—so much the reverse, that they cannot be reconciled either by Infidel Liberalism, or semi-Popish Tractarianism, because they represent principles diametrically at variance with one another, and which will ever remain so; for the Word of God assures us of the fact: "What communion hath light with darkness? what concord hath Christ with Belial?" One Church is set up for a certain purpose, and then another is set up to counteract it. The nation pledges itself to the support of truth, and then to the support of error. How absurd is this! What would be thought of the same State founding a colony somewhere, and then soon after establishing an opposition colony, whose *necessary* and *sole* occupation would be, to be always at war with the first, till one were exterminated? How great would be the folly of that man, who, after sowing his wheat, proceeds with diligent impartiality to sow tares, with the end and object of destroying the wheat? It would be justly said, either that he was mad, or that he did not care whether he got a crop of tares or wheat, or neither; that he simply sowed them because he wished to get quit of his seed. Somewhat analogous would be our conduct in endowing Popery as well as Protestantism—it would seem that we cared for neither. Then our inconsistency is further manifest in this, if we carry out our principle, borrowed from Infidel France, of endowing all religions, we cannot stop at Popery. Unitarianism, in all its shades, to that one verging on Deism; the Greek Church; Mahommedanism; nay, more, all the systems of idolatry which abound in our colonies, from the brute worship of the Hottentot, to the abominable, cruel, and super-eminently absurd idolatry of the Hindoos;—all must be taken under the protection of Protestant Britain. Some of our legislators have hinted, or said, as much. Shall it ever be said that such legislation as this will be carried into practice? We cannot believe it. The principle being once conceded, of endowing *any* religion, simply because it has followers, the nation may be truly said to profess Infidelity, because through its rulers *it allows* this to be done. It sets on high this doctrine,—that nothing is certainly known to be true; that the Bible is not necessarily the source whence truth is to be drawn; but that any system of superstition *may* be right, while all that is necessary is to profess *something*. He who professes no faith, the Atheist, fares but ill in this scramble; *he* would get no endowment; if he worshipped a stone, he would. To such extreme absurdity and godlessness do these principles, if carried out, lead; yet they have been avowed, over and over again, and by statesmen too! Truly, if a higher power did not defend Protestantism, it could not long survive the friendship of such statesmen.

We have now concluded that part of the argument which is founded on religious principle; and we come to the question of *justice*, as the measure affects the numerous bodies of Dissenters in this country. Distinct altogether from the multitude of arguments drawn from other quarters, this one in itself we consider sufficient to decide the matter. When we say Dissenters, we mean all bodies of Protestants, whether Baptists, Wesleyan or other Methodists, Independents, and Presbyterians, here and in Scotland. We include those who object to all Church Establishments, as well as those who are in favour of Protestant Church Establishments. These Dissenters include a large proportion of the wealth, intelligence, piety, and benevolence to be found in the middle classes of this country. They are never backward in any good work, and to them the history of missions is indebted for some of its most brilliant pages. Generally speaking, they preach the truth in its purity and fulness, and, amidst discouragements, contempt, and reproach, pursue their labours with devoted zeal. They are not to be found among the disturbers of the public peace, the stirrers-up of sedition; disloyalty and treason have no encouragement from them. Yet these men get no reward for their meritorious conduct and self-denial; on the contrary, they see it proposed to make stipendiaries of the Roman Catholic priesthood, the most numerous body of Dissenters in the kingdom,—men, too, whose religion is Popery; who have retained their flocks in a state of deplorable ignorance and wretchedness; who have themselves been notoriously turbulent and disaffected—nay, whose evil conduct it is which has brought them this substantial reward! Can these Dissenters feel otherwise than justly indignant at such monstrous iniquity as this? Not only do they support their own ministers,

sometimes with considerable effort on their own part, but from their hard-earned incomes something more is to be taken to support the priesthood of another religion, which they are sworn to oppose; and that religion—Popery! Can injustice go further? They saw the wealth of this country—the taxes wrung from its peaceable and industrious inhabitants—poured out, like water, on the neighbouring country in the hour of her distress, and, in too many cases, insolence and abuse were all the thanks rendered for their noble generosity. And now, while themselves in anything but a state of prosperity, they are to be called on to maintain that very priesthood, whose behaviour was so thankless, so execrable, and to support a religion whose whole tendency they consider bad, and which they are bound to oppose! And just as they fondly hope their assaults on the entrenchments of the Man of Sin are beginning to be crowned with success, their rulers step in, and take from their pockets that which will give this Man of Sin fresh vitality.

Let not Dissenters forget, that, in whatever shape this measure shall be proposed, it will, directly or indirectly, fall on the people of England and Scotland. If a tax be levied on Ireland for the endowment, the people of that country will be relieved of a share of that taxation under which we in England groan. If, as is currently reported, the plan be, to divert the repayment of a loan made by England, to the endowment of the priesthood, it will be a robbery of our Exchequer, and of money that it can ill spare. The confiscation of part of the property of the Church in Ireland, even if attempted, will be insufficient; and we trust the great body of Dissenters will not be in favour even of that. However it may be the fashion to abuse that Church, we do not hesitate to assert, that, in a position of unexampled difficulty, it has lately done its duty nobly. Surrounded by vindictive foes in Ireland, who literally thirst for its destruction, it has not only kept its ground and upheld the cause of Protestantism, but has made, and is still making, effective assaults on the bulwarks of its foes. The last three years have made a vast change in the relative positions of the two religions, and the priests *know* that the change is not in their favour. Hence their desperate efforts—their insidious and wide-spread machinations. They would gladly see the Church in Ireland overthrown, whether the spoil be to them or not. But in this they will be disappointed. The people of England, Dissenters included, will not allow Popery to be supplemented and endowed, even though the money should come from the confiscation of the Protestant Church in Ireland.

We have thus concluded the arguments which properly belong to the first part of this subject; viz., those which are founded on religious principle, and on a sense of justice. They are addressed to those individuals who allow religious conviction to be their ruling motive, and to others, who may be insensible to religion, but who are generally actuated by a spirit of fairness and equity. There is still another and a very numerous class, to whom we must address ourselves, who, though not the most estimable body in the community, yet possess great influence; and who in this case, as in many others, will probably have it in their power to decide the question at issue. We mean those who look on the question as one of mere political expediency, and will not consent to look at it through the medium of religious, or any other, principle. These individuals include among their ranks the leading statesmen belonging to, at least, two of the parties now existing in the Legislature; they also include many people who are the mere hangers-on of factions,—many who may be called waverers, till it is seen which side will most likely win, men who always side with the strongest; and, in fine, some respectable men among the middle and upper classes, who are possessed with the idea, that the priests have vast influence in Ireland, and that that influence may be bought over to the side of loyalty and order. Now, it shall be our business to prove by a variety of arguments, that, even on the lowest grounds, the scheme will not stand examination, common sense, as well as religious principle, being totally at variance with it. We shall enumerate our arguments *seriatim*, keeping each distinct from its fellow.

I. The first argument we shall present, is, that no endowment from Government would attach the priesthood in Ireland to that Government, because, by their spiritual submission to Rome, they are still bound to seek the overthrow of a Protestant State.

The rashness and clumsiness of the scheme for endowing the Popish clergy in Ireland, is in nothing more manifest than in this,—that the whole affair is conceived on the supposition that *they* are in the same position as other ministers of religion in Great Britain or elsewhere, being at liberty to enter into engagements, or *bind* themselves to obligations, on their own responsibility. But the Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland are *not* in this situation, any more than they are in other states.

Take Prussia for instance. The late Archbishop of Cologne acted as if he were an independent potentate within the King's dominions, and for a long time kept the kingdom in a state of turbulence and disorder. The Pope had a prior claim on his allegiance.

Indeed they are even more implicit and unhesitating in their obedience to Papal authority there than almost anywhere else. We hear of German and even Italian clergy calling for the abolition of the inhuman practice of celibacy, but not the faintest murmur of disobedience ever escapes from the priests in Ireland. Their slavish and crouching subserviency is indeed evident to any one who notices events, and they themselves would be the last to deny it. Indeed, they boast of it. It would be out of place here, and we have not room, to enlarge on the abundant evidence existing to shew the complete subjection in which the priesthood are held by the Pope, as

their only and infallible head and ruler. This evidence is within the reach of any one desirous to obtain information on the subject.

See Note D.

The *fact* is notorious, and no Roman Catholic will deny, that the Pope, as head of the Church, has a claim on every Catholic, and wields an authority paramount to any *on earth*, because, by the very nature of his office, he assumes power over not only things of time, but those of eternity. And no honest Romanist will deny, that in his eyes the fiat of the Pope has an importance and authority far superior to any of the powers of earth. This being so, how can payments from the coffers of the English Government, and that an heretical one too, have any influence over men who owe allegiance, primarily and chiefly, to a foreign potentate, the sacred head of their Church.

See Note E.

Will 150*l.* per annum to parish priests, and 100*l.* per annum to curates, tempt them from the side of Christ's Vicegerent on earth to that of an heretical and usurping power? Nay more—whatever might be promised by some of their wily and Jesuit leaders, the vast majority would hold themselves at perfect liberty to serve the cause of the Popedom *in preference* to any other, either openly or secretly, fortified by the encouragement of his Holiness himself, who would, as a matter of course, smile approbation on those who preferred the interests of the Holy See to those of an heretic power. And it is not too much to say, that, on the principles of Jesuitry, avowed and professed by a multitude, if not the majority, of the Irish priesthood, they would, even while solemnly engaging to obey the authority of the Sovereign of these realms, hold themselves quite at liberty to break that engagement when the interests of the Church demanded it should be done.

See Note F.

With a body of priests, therefore, who on their own showing (for they proudly avow it) owe a submission to the Pope and the authority of the Church, which is to come before everything else,

See Note G.

how absurd to suppose, for a moment, that payments of a greater or less amount will induce that priesthood to *disobey* their spiritual head on any occasion, and obey, in preference, him, who may be Prime Minister for the time in Great Britain! All experience tells us the contrary. We have already alluded to Prussia. Let us take a thoroughly Popish country—Spain. In 1841, the Pope pronounced an allocution, or address, on the affairs of that country: Espartero, then at the head of affairs there, had alienated from the Church a small portion of its enormous revenues for the use of the State; this allocution was to the effect, that the acts of the *Government* were *null* and *void*;

See Note H.

that the authors of those acts had, by incurring the displeasure of the Holy See, rendered themselves liable to everlasting punishment, unless they retraced their steps. It was openly published by the Romanist bishops in Ireland: the faithful were commanded to pray for Spain,—and a release of their souls from purgatory was held out as the reward. This actually occurred in 1842. Now mark the result in Spain. Espartero lost that hold over the people he formerly possessed; and the priests were the most active in fomenting the various plots and insurrections which ultimately drove him from the country. For some time the Pope refused to recognise the Queen of Spain; and it was only on the restitution of the whole, or greater part, of the alienated Church property, that he relented so far. This is an affair of yesterday; so is the conduct of the Archbishop of Paris, in reference to the University; all shewing, that, even where Popery is in close alliance with the State, the authority of the Pope is considered by the priesthood supreme.

Not only, however, do the priesthood in Ireland, as elsewhere, owe a more implicit submission to the See of Rome than to any other Government or authority—but they are, besides, by the nature of their office, and from the education they receive, *bound* to aim at the *overthrow* of heretical powers everywhere, Great Britain among the rest. This assertion, Roman Catholics will not be so ready to admit as the fact of their *submission* to the Pope, but it is capable of equally clear proof. That bulls and edicts have been, and still are, published or revived, the purport of which is to anathematize all Protestants and Protestant States, to assert the Pope's spiritual power over all the subjects of these States, and to declare the right of the Church of Rome to *resume* the possession of all alienated Church property, by whomsoever held, whether layman or ecclesiastic, is, we think, admitted by almost every one. That they have been published *in Ireland* under the sanction and with the approval of the Roman Catholic bishops there, can be proved.

See Note I.

And that, *wherever* published, they are to be held solemnly binding on the faithful, under pain of eternal punishment, was admitted by those bishops themselves in the evidence they gave before the Committees of Parliament, previous to the passing of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act.

See Note K.

This admission is of great importance.

If, then, coupled with the well-known deference and obedience paid to the Pope by Roman Catholics, lay and clerical, we find that edicts claiming that obedience are published in Ireland, the actual meaning of which is to counteract the proceedings of the Government of the day, and to establish an authority, nominally under, but really superior to, the reigning Monarch and the Houses of Parliament, we are amply warranted in saying that no bribe of such a moderate amount as anything we *can* offer, will, in this country, more than elsewhere, attach the Roman Catholic priesthood in subservience to the Government of this or any Protestant country.

II. Only part of the clergy would take the pay offered them, and the necessary consequence would be that *these* would lose all influence over their flocks, while the influence of the recusant and independent portion would increase.

If the above premise is granted, the conclusion will follow inevitably. What is the cause of that influence over their flocks, wielded by the priests, which the Government are so anxious to buy from the latter? The foundation of that envied and coveted influence exists in the real or supposed independence of the priests, their uncorrupted integrity, their love for their people, their identity of feeling and sympathy with them in all their wrongs, sufferings, and struggles, and hence the preference they always show for their wishes and objects, to those of any other class or power in the country. The people feel a pride in supporting them, though in distress themselves, because they know that they are rewarded by the devoted attention and advocacy of these clergy in their turn. But get these priests to take pay, *in any shape*, from the English rulers, and how is it possible that the people can continue to repose in them the same devoted, unshrinking confidence? The Irish are peculiarly sensitive, it is well known, and no declarations of attachment on the part of the priests themselves would persuade them to look on the endowment as anything else than a betrayal of their trust by the priests for a sum of money. And from whom do they see their spiritual guides accepting this bribe? who are their seducers from the side of their trusting and deluded flocks? The English Government—that Government which political agitators, openly assisted or connived at by the immense majority of these very priests, have, with most indefatigable diligence, laboured to exhibit to the Irish, as a foreign, usurping, and tyrannical power. The priests in Ireland have sapped the foundations of loyalty and allegiance in the hearts of the people, sometimes by open and violent political harangues, sometimes by denunciations from the altar, sometimes by siding with the criminal, as if he were an injured man, and also very frequently by paying homage, and offering congratulations, to those of their prelates who distinguish themselves by their violent hostility to the Imperial Government.

See all the London papers of the 28th December, 1848, for an account of the rejoicings at Tuam, on the return of Dr. M'Hale from Rome, after his triumph over the Government here.

Thus turbulence and disloyalty on the part of the priests went hand in hand with disaffection among the people. Well, you buy the priests—grant, in the literal sense of the word, that you get from them for *gold* that duty to their Sovereign and her government which neither honesty, religion, nor a sense of *decency*, would induce them to perform—bribe them, and proclaim it to all the world—have you bribed the people? Are they of *no* account in the question? Is it not with a view to gain them, you have bribed their clergy? And does it follow, as a matter of course, that they will *now* do what their clergy bid them, with as much readiness as they showed before that clergy enlisted themselves among the paid servants of the Government? Certainly not—you have done *them* no good; you leave *them*, the common people, the Irish peasantry, still sunk in wretchedness—still pining under disease, nakedness, and famine—still trodden down, or fancying themselves so, at least, by their overbearing landlords—but still, amidst it all, nourishing in their bosoms that hatred to English rule, to their landlords, to their Protestant fellow-countrymen, which they have been led to think it their duty to cherish, and with this additional ingredient to give it bitterness, intensity, and stability, that they have been deserted by those in whom they placed unbounded confidence, who made them what they were, and then abandoned them to their fate.

And this brings us to the assertion, that some of the clergy would refuse the endowment, if only to increase their own influence over the minds of the people, who, if betrayed by *some* of their spiritual leaders, would place more confidence in, and cling more strongly to, such of them as refused the pay and livery of the State, and preferred to cast in their lot amidst the people as of old. We do not feel inclined to place overmuch reliance on the loud protestations of many of the priesthood, that they will not accept an endowment; but still there is no doubt that some would follow out their declarations. The more indolent, peaceable, and well-affected of them would probably accept State pay, if only to obtain a settled and comfortable income. But there are two classes of priests in Ireland, each represented by prelates of distinctive character,—one, though devoted to their religious system, yet inclined to advance its interests by the quiet performance of their duties, and men who look more to comfort in life than anything else—these include the oldest of the clergy, all over Ireland, and are represented by Dr. Croly, the Romanist Archbishop of Armagh, and one or two other prelates. But there is another, and a very numerous body, whose zeal for the interests of Popery is glowing, whose bigotry is intense, and whose darling object is, not comfort in this life, but unbounded spiritual domination. To these men, the

pleasure of wielding a priestly sceptre, moulding the desires, and influencing the actions of thousands, is so great as to cast every other into the shade. These priests are represented by the notorious Dr. M'Hale, Archbishop of Tuam, Dr. Higgins, Bishop of Ardagh, and Dr. Maginn, Bishop of Derry,

Since defeated.

the latter the champion of the confessional. Now, the *former* class would, almost to a man, accept the endowment, but even in their case, still subject to the objection named under our last head, of obedience to the Pope, as head over all on earth. The latter class, however, would, at least most of them, refuse it, simply because it would be better for *their own* interests, and the interests of their *Church*, that they should *not* take it. Deserted by the others, the attachment of the people would be centred entirely in themselves, the incorruptible few—in purse even, the latter would be gainers, but how immensely in influence! A people not half so sensitive, grateful, and romantic as the Irish, would be struck by the moral grandeur of the contrast, and act as we have supposed. Still would his priest be to the Irish Papist his comfort and support, his advocate where wronged, and the only one who stood in the breach between him and the banded tyranny of the Saxon statesman, landlord, and soldier. And it will not do for the advocates of the endowment to take it for granted that the *whole* of the priesthood will accept the pay offered them. We say, irrespective altogether of their own repeated assertions, they will *not* take it unanimously, because, if susceptible to mercenary considerations *at all*, they will find refusal *more advantageous* to them than acceptance. Knowing the Irish well, they would know that their *emoluments* would be better, if they retained their turbulent independence, and that their *influence* would be very much greater, so that their *interest* would dispose them to refuse it. And if, of the three thousand

"Freeman's Journal."

curates, and two thousand parish priests in Ireland, a tenth only were to refuse the endowment, *their* object would be gained, and the design of the measure most effectually frustrated.

Besides, there is a large, active, and influential order of clergy, or rather of individuals under vow, as monks, friars, &c., whom it is not even proposed to endow. All these, to the number of some thousands spread over Ireland, go under the name of Regulars. They are the irregular soldiers of the Holy See, but most devoted, zealous, and efficient auxiliaries. No one talks of buying them over, and if pay and obedience are to go together, then, not being paid, they are at perfect liberty, even in the view of a Protestant, to do what *they* choose. And if there is a desire among the Romanist clergy to retain an influence over the people, (without which of course they are not *worth* purchasing,) can they find better assistants than the various bodies of regulars? and how will these regulars obtain this influence, unless by a full sympathy for, and co-operation with, the people, in these *same objects*, which, thanks to pernicious teachings, the people have been induced to believe essential to their comfort and prosperity? By doing that, they at once attach them to their side, but not otherwise, for the Irish cannot be expected to come all at once to the conclusion, that because their priests have taken pay from the British Government, they, the people, are *now* happy and not miserable—elevated, and not oppressed. They have been too long tutored in one direction to change their feelings and opinions all at once because their priests happen to have changed theirs. Bribe them, and the case might be different. They are also quick-witted enough to perceive without difficulty, that the priests must be expected to give something on their part, as their share of the contract, and *that something* being evidently their supposed influence over the people, it would naturally follow, in the opinion of the latter, that their demands were just, because the Government acknowledged them to be so, and at the same time feared their power, by buying from their side those whose co-operation rendered them formidable.

Thus the very course pursued would neutralize the result aimed at; the *fact* of the endowment being offered and taken would at once diminish that influence, for the purchase of which the endowment is to be given. It would be so, too, even if it were accepted by *all* the priesthood, which we have shown *would* not be the case, for the most obvious reasons, and moreover *could* not be the case, as there would still remain a large, number of ecclesiastics and others connected with the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, whom it is not even proposed to endow. Thus, if the priesthood retain a hold over the minds of the Irish, it can only be through the regulars; *but these men are not to be endowed*, and by making an exception in their case, we in fact say, that we do not *expect* allegiance from them, because they do not get that, which is the *price* of loyalty and allegiance. And if a shoal of expatriated priests from Italy or elsewhere were to enter Ireland, for the *purpose* of securing a hold on the affections of the people, they, not being bound to allegiance or good behaviour, would, as a matter of course, gain their end, by adopting the course named above, and pandering to the turbulent and disaffected feelings of the degraded peasantry.

Again, there is another view of this part of the subject yet to be named—they throng on us as we advance. Granting that every priest, curate, friar, and monk in Ireland, was offered and accepted payment, we are literally as far from our object as ever. Why? Simply for this reason. These ecclesiastics all know well that they are indebted for this endowment, as for every other concession, not to love, but to fear, and that what we now consent to bestow on them, we cannot, and indeed *dare not*, afterwards withdraw, whatever be their conduct!

To take it away after giving it, is, in point of fact, equivalent to our giving an open assent to their *withdrawal* from allegiance to the State, for, after announcing our *reasons* for paying them, the transaction assumes the character of a bargain, in which an infraction on one side releases the other party from all obligation, and nullifies the contract. If, therefore, the priests, in order to retain their influence over their flocks, agitated with them as before, and pandered again to their vicious and turbulent propensities, we could not, and would not withdraw their stipends, being *afraid* that they would *then* become more formidable than ever! It comes to this, then, that the priest might, even with the pay in his pocket, still feel it his interest to make himself dangerous as an agitator, to secure his continuance as a stipendiary of the State! How hollow, therefore, will an alliance be—how insecure a system—by which a State depends for its support on the purchased neutrality of its inveterate foes!

III. Our third argument is, that this endowment, even if unanimously accepted by the priesthood, would not satisfy them, any more than previous concessions have done, inasmuch as they aim at complete ascendancy in Ireland.

The whole course of our legislation in that country for the last twenty years has been a series of concessions to Popery, and not of remedial measures affecting the mass of the people. Hence *they* have year by year become worse and more wretched, while the priesthood have become more arrogant and audacious. Within the period named how few have been the measures proposed at all affecting the comfort, the happiness, and the social condition of the great mass of the population; while how numerous have been the Acts passed connected with religious questions, with political rights, with education of one particular kind, as if even the latter at all touched the seat of the disease! Beginning with the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, we pass on to the establishment of the National Schools, which would have done well enough if they had not become mere engines in the hands of the priests; then the proposed Appropriation Clause; the studied coolness shown towards all the Protestant part of the population; the Municipal Corporation Act; the tacit understanding, if not the distinct agreement, subsisting between the late Mr. O'Connell, the avowed ally and advocate of the priesthood, and Lord Melbourne's Government, the result of which agreement was the monopoly of patronage in Ireland by the former; the playing fast and loose with the Repeal agitation, which was powerfully supported and encouraged by the priests; the increased grant to Maynooth; the further attempts in the last as well as in the present Parliament, to repeal the few remaining restrictions on Popery and its practices; the Bill for establishing Diplomatic Relations with the Court of Rome; the cringing servility expressed in the letter of Lord Clarendon, Her Majesty's representative in Ireland, when addressing the Popish Archbishop of Dublin, begging that "his Grace" will be "pleased to submit the statutes of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland to the consideration of *his Holiness*;"

For extracts from the letter, see Note A.

and, above all, the fact, too evident from the strong and general suspicion entertained, that the Government are screening from justice many priests who were notoriously implicated in the late attempt at rebellion—all these circumstances, and many others of less public importance, have been so many acts of concession intended to propitiate the priesthood. Have they done so? Are not the priests at this moment more insolent and implacable than ever? They have found out the source of their own power and of the weakness of the Government—they know by experience that they have only to agitate widely and clamour noisily, and fill the whole land with tumult and complaint, to induce the British Government to come eagerly forward and offer them something as a bribe to hold their peace. Just on the principle that an injudicious parent adopts, of giving a child sweetmeats as an inducement to be quiet, instead of the wholesome discipline of the rod. And so, on the plainest principles of human nature, the Romanist priesthood in Ireland adopt the plan of incessantly clamouring for further favours from the State, and accepting every concession as an instalment only of what is due.

Some objector will say, "What do the priesthood consider their due—what will really satisfy them?" We will tell this innocent Protestant, if such there be, what will really please the Irish priesthood—what undoubtedly will pacify them. Restore to them the whole of the Church property, whether now held by the Protestant Establishment, or by individuals; remove all such restrictions on their worship or practice in any particular as prevents their being on a level with their brethren in Italy or Spain; let them not be amenable in any way to the civil law, but subject solely to their ecclesiastical superiors; allow them, in fact, to revive in Ireland the spiritual despotism and the priestly glory of the middle ages; and we will take it upon us to say, they will ask no more. But, do what you will, with nothing less will they be *contented*. A paltry endowment, such as you propose, will not satisfy them, because it is not one-half, nay, not *one-tenth* of what they really desire. Your very proposal is a confession of weakness, and tells them what is their real power; they will, therefore, inevitably continue to demand more. That they look on the restitution of *all* Church property as only common justice, is evident from their own oft-repeated assertions, and that this opinion of theirs is actively disseminated throughout Ireland, is evident from the authoritative publication there of bulls and rescripts, which assert the

necessary restitution of all forfeited Church property, and the possession of it by Protestants to be *rapine*.

See Note H and I.

In connexion with this part of the subject let us remind the reader of the prayers which the late Archbishop of Paris, and we think also the Archbishop of Malines, directed the faithful to offer up for the conversion of heretical England to the true faith. And truly it forms a splendid prospect—the restoration of the ancient Church's unchallenged pre-eminence in Ireland, and the consequent influence thereby exercised on England, whose apostate children might yet return to that holy Church, from whose pale they have wandered. That is the bright day-dream which Romanists love to contemplate, the golden sunset which is to follow on the troubled and cloudy day. More than any other of the empires of earth—more than the Republic throned in the west—more than the mighty Potentate of eastern Europe, much more than any of the idolatrous climes of the gorgeous south—would Great Britain be a jewel of richest lustre in the tiara of the Pontiff.

But that, with which we have to do, is neither the wishes nor the hopes of Popery. The results of our legislation in Ireland ought to convince our statesmen that anything like a conciliation of Popery is hopeless. Popery is naturally antagonistic to all civil Governments, and cannot work in harmony with them; it has always been so,

See Note L.

and will be so, unless some of the principal tenets of the system are annulled. A system which commands its followers to obey no civil law, without its sanction to that law, is evidently hostile to the fundamental principle of all government, which is, that a law, when passed, is to be obeyed by all classes of the people, and enforced by the civil magistrate on all.

See Note M.

Hence in Ireland there is no medium course between the entire subjection of Papists to the law of the land, and their complete and acknowledged pre-eminence. And to produce this subjection, to make it as easy for the civil law to enforce its sanctions on them as on others, certain regulations and restrictions *must* be put in force, applying to their case. For instance, altar denunciation should be prohibited as dangerous to the social welfare, and when any crime committed against an individual has had its origin in an anathema from the altar, the instigator should be visited with a severer punishment than his wretched instrument. The confessional should not be allowed to remain what it is at present, a mere shelter to the criminal. And, above all, the administration of the law should be sternly and without hesitation enforced, no priest being allowed to escape, who has done things at least as bad as those for the commission of which laymen have been imprisoned, banished, or executed. Mere concessions will not do; subjection or superiority must be the treatment of the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland.

IV. The measure would embitter religious feeling in Ireland, and divide the country into two hostile camps, thus protracting the period of improvement among the great mass of the population.

This assertion follows naturally on our last argument. The Roman Catholic priesthood would be as hostile and discontented as before, because, though the most numerous body, they receive only a small part of that wealth, *all* of which they consider their own; the Protestant clergy would, as a matter of course, be hostile and indignant, that what they justly consider error and idolatry should be endowed by the State, which thus supports one body of clergy to counteract, by their teaching, the efforts of the other. And the various adherents of both Establishments would share in the same feelings. The one body considers, that by the British Government offering payments to their priests, the *right* of that priesthood to ecclesiastical revenue is conceded, while at the same time they perceive by far the greater part of this ecclesiastical property is still held by a Protestant Establishment as firmly as ever. And, instead of being pleased, they will very naturally become indignant at the unfairness of the division. For it must not be lost sight of, that, by a proposal to pay the Roman Catholic clergy, you at once introduce a new element into public opinion in Ireland among Papists, viz., this, that they see a *right* acknowledged to claim provision for their clergy. And if you once allow that right, we do not see how it is possible to refuse the further demand of the restoration of all ecclesiastical property which the Roman Catholics would then undoubtedly make. Yet this demand *would* be refused by English statesmen, and by the English people, who would not allow a Protestant Church to be levelled; and the whole revenues of that Church conferred on Papists. But *till* this were done, the latter would be more discontented than ever, their appetites being whetted by the share of booty they had already tasted. Again, the Protestants of Ireland, already keenly opposed to the errors of Popery, would not be at all likely to regard it with more favour, if they and their Protestant brethren in Great Britain were to be compelled to *pay for its support*, which they would certainly have to do, in some shape or other, if the priests were to be endowed at all. Now there is no possibility of anything like great improvement taking place in Ireland so long as estrangements of this character subsist between the great masses of the population.

The primary curse of Ireland—the main cause of its present low and degraded position, and of the general demoralization of its people, has undoubtedly been Popery. To prove this, we have only to look at the results of

Popery, wherever extensively *prevalent*, in contradistinction to Protestantism. Compare Connaught with Ulster, Lucerne with Zurich, Bavaria with Prussia, Spain with Holland, Italy with our own beloved land, Cuba with Jamaica, the Brazils or Peru with the United States of America. Take any Popish country over the world, we care not which, and, without exception, it will be found that the inhabitants of that country are ignorant, immoral, indolent, superstitious, and utterly void of that freedom of tone and energy of thought and action which makes able and independent citizens, and prosperous and happy states.

Belgium is no exception to this rule; the commercial activity and independence of that kingdom being almost wholly owing to its long connexion with Holland and its intimate relations with England in various ways.

Now the Protestants of Ireland know very well, by bitter experience, that so long as Popery exists there, so long will their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects be sunk in misery and vice, a heavy drag-weight on their own progress, and a very mill-stone round the neck of the whole nation. This, therefore, is a most powerful inducement with them to oppose any measure which tends to support, or in any way *perpetuate*, Popery in Ireland.

Another of the curses of that unhappy island has been agitation—avowedly for political reforms. It is the agitation, fanned and encouraged by the priesthood in many cases, which has filled the minds of the peasantry with the wildest notions of their own rights, and has led them to visit the slightest infraction of these fancied rights with sanguinary and fierce retaliation. This has been unfortunately too much facilitated by the accommodating principles and practices of their religion. And the consequence has just been to prevent the growth of that sound and intelligent public opinion which is in England and Scotland the grand bulwark of the social edifice. And men of enterprise and capital will not engage either in a country where civilization appears only nominally to exist, whilst the practice so often approaches that of the most turbulent periods of the middle ages. Now there is a positive certainty that this agitation and turbulence will increase and not diminish, if the priesthood are endowed—*first*, because the *people* will be in all respects as miserable as ever, and not be improved, though some of their priests happen to be so; *secondly*, because, the priests themselves will not be contented, as they will yet want something more; *thirdly*, because the Protestants, clergy and people, will dislike Popery more than ever, when they find that its baneful sway is likely to be rendered perpetual, and by the help of their money; and we may add, *finally*, because the possession of large additional funds by the Popish priesthood will give them facilities they are the least likely to neglect for an aggressive war on Protestantism.

Thus, then, one of the curses of Ireland will be kept in full activity by the aid of funds from the State: the other will also retain all its pernicious vigour by the results which follow on the operation and continuance of the first; and both thriving in rank luxuriance, and overspreading the whole land, will, as hitherto, effectually prevent the germination of any useful plant or lovely flower in the encumbered and tainted soil.

V. The endowment of Popery would also produce agitation of a very serious kind among all classes of Dissenters, and amongst the people generally in Great Britain, who would not cease to agitate till they brought about the downfall of all Church Establishments.

The discontent would not be confined to Ireland. The people in England and Scotland are not so lightly taxed as to bear without a murmur the imposition of another burden, in the shape of an endowment to Popery. It is a trite but expressive saying, "it is the last straw which breaks the camel's back." Taxation in this country has now reached such an *intensity*, so to speak, of oppressiveness, that it would be unsafe to go any further in the same direction. The last attempt to increase the burden of direct taxation was met with such a hurricane of popular indignation that it was at once abandoned. And now the effect of the grinding taxation imposed on the middle classes is being seen in the almost universal outcry for retrenchment and reform in the whole system. It is difficult to believe that any Ministry will have the hardihood, in the face of these facts, to propose such a measure as the payment of the Irish priests. We must recollect, however, that there are many other modes of doing this than by the direct conveyance of money from the Consolidated Fund. Our present rulers are quite the men to seek to reach their goal by very sinuous paths, and great care will be taken to make it appear that the burden will *not* fall heavily on the people of England. But let not the people be deceived. They must recollect, that though the tax *may* fall primarily on Ireland, it will fall on England indirectly. It is well known that the Irish are, at present, altogether relieved from both the income and assessed taxes, two of those imposts under which Englishmen literally groan. The excuse for not imposing them upon Ireland has been the poverty and distress of that country. How much more powerful will this argument become, if, by a rate or contribution of any kind from land, the burden of the support of the priesthood is thrown on Ireland! Then indeed the excuse will have some weight. And the consequence would be, that all the wealthy in Ireland, thriving Ulster included, would be relieved from a contribution to the amount of two millions or so *per annum* to the exchequer, an amount which would enable us to dispense with the window-tax. Thus the question comes home directly to the pockets of the English people. As it is, our expenditure in Ireland is two or three millions more than our receipts from that country;

See Mr. M'Gregor's Letter to the Electors of Glasgow. "Times," of Dec. 30, 1848.

and yet, as if we had more money than we knew what to do with, we would spend another million or so on the Popish priests! Folly and recklessness could scarcely go further. And so, on the pounds, shillings, and pence view of the question—the lowest of all—the proposal is dangerously rash, foolish, and impolitic.

But among the people of England there is a very numerous body, who, besides the money view of the matter, would take another, which more seriously concerns the members of the Established Churches. We allude to the Dissenters. Now, of this numerous and active body there is already a considerable proportion hostile to the Churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland, and bent on accomplishing their over-throw. They are not the most numerous and influential portion, and as yet all their efforts have fallen pointless and harmless. By far the most influential and pious body—the Wesleyan Methodists—are avowedly favourable to the Established Church, and would not raise a hand to harm her. But the instant we endow Popery, matters change. The first-named body will be of course more loud in their opposition than ever, and now they will find themselves joined by all who have hitherto held aloof; because, though the latter are favourable to endowment, when only Christian truth and purity are so treated, they will oppose it, when idolatry and positive error are taken into connexion with the State. To endow a Church for the teaching of Protestant principles they may consider good and necessary, but when you endow *another* Church for the spread of Popery, you do what is impious, wicked, and dangerous, sufficiently so to bring down the judgments of Heaven on the country, as one given to idolatry; and therefore you are to be resisted to the very uttermost. And if the one cannot be overthrown without the other, then down let them come, one and all! This will be the language of these sincere Protestant Dissenters. How can it be otherwise? If they *really* believe what they profess, they *must* consider the downfall of all Church Establishments a much less serious evil than the endowment of a faith so antagonistic to the Bible as Popery. And hence this will most assuredly be their language, if the measure is carried. So well is this known, that a leading Voluntary, one of the most stern and uncompromising of the opponents of Establishments, the Editor of the principal organ on that side, has avowed, that he would be in favour of the endowment of the Popish priesthood, because it is the sure way to bring down *all* Establishments; the monstrous nature of the project would, in his opinion, raise a tempest before which every Church Establishment would be rooted up. And those who are of this opinion would hail, with fierce delight, the acquisition of the vast bodies of Dissenters of all classes and grades, who would then join an Anti-State-Church crusade. A movement such as this would be really formidable; and how languid would be the opposition made by many members of the Church of England, how listless and desultory would be their efforts, when they reflected that every blow struck in defence of their own beloved Church, was just as much in defence of the Popish Church of Ireland! What pride could her members take in defending these venerable and hitherto impregnable battlements, when they saw their time-honoured fortress was only serving as a buttress to support—an outwork to cover, the gloomy and bloodstained citadel of the Man of Sin!

We need scarcely ask any sincere member of the Church of England if he can look with indifference on the prospect of her destruction. Yet, in all probability, the passing of an Act to endow Popery would sound her death-knell, and with her fall would vanish from our land the chief bulwark against the tide of Infidelity, licentiousness, and crime, which would then advance with unchecked impetuosity.

VI. The endowment of Popery would produce a most pernicious influence on the minds of the working and lower classes all over the country, who see men paid simply for having done mischief.

Dispassionately examined, the scheme is absurd to a most ludicrous degree. State policy is in favour of the payment of the priests, because it will prevent their doing evil.

See "Quarterly Review," for September, 1848.

If this is to be a principle of legislation, we do not see how the Government can refuse to pension pickpockets, housebreakers, and thieves of all grades. In both cases they commit crimes, and endanger the peace, property, and comfort of the community; in both cases they are foes to social order, for, from confusion and turbulence are derived their chief gains; in both cases the object is to place them beyond the reach of temptation, and in both cases money would be the means employed. The numerous fraternity of thieves may with some reason complain, that, while their offences are punished with the gaol or the hulks, those of the priests are *rewarded* by smooth and courteous language, and substantial and lasting emolument. And there is this to be said in favour of the thieves, that they would most thankfully accept the boon and be contented with it, while, judging from all past experience, the priests would take it with grumbling and abuse, and employ it as a means of getting more. Some one may say, "You cannot believe the word of a professed thief;" in reply to this, we say, that the most sagacious observers of passing events have exactly that opinion of an Irish priest.

"No rational man in this island believes a statement on the unsupported authority of an Irish Roman Catholic priest. . . . It is only the language of passion."—"Times," leading article, 8th Jan., 1849.

In the case of rewards to thieves, the orderly, and well-behaved, and virtuous members of the community would say, that not only was it a wicked thing to do, and opposed to the usual ideas of right and wrong,

entertained from time immemorial, but that it was rather unjust that those who had done them mischief should be rewarded for it, and to crown all, that they should have to *pay* for these rewards. They would truly say, that, not only was it quite opposed to everything inculcated in that old-fashioned book the Bible, but that it offered a premium to the naturally vicious to go on in vice, and would tempt those to indulge in vice that never thought of it before. Now very much in this strain, and with perfect truth, would the working-classes talk of the endowment of the Roman Catholic clergy. The money is given to keep them quiet; they have been disloyal, seditious, quarrelsome, and abusive, *therefore*, they are to be *bought over* to the side of loyalty, allegiance, peace, and good-will. Had they originally been well behaved and peaceable they would not have been offered this pay; but *because* they have worked mischief, and to prevent them working any more, they are purchased, as it were, by the Government, for a *consideration*. This is the plain English and common-sense view of the matter, and so will the people take it. Now, if the working-classes were endowed to superfluity with comforts and happiness, and did not know how to throw away the surplus, they would not perhaps say much, though even in this case they would complain of the selection of objects for their charity. But how stands the case? Thousands of the labouring classes are out of employment, and in a state of severest destitution; and the vast majority of the remainder are in the receipt of but scanty wages, and reduced to a hard struggle to keep the wolf from the door. Private benevolence is largely called forth for their relief, but the Legislature does little, and the poor owe it little thanks. But at a time when they are ground down by taxation to replenish an exhausted Treasury, and an absolute want of means is pleaded as an excuse for not remitting any impost whatever, the people,—the hardworking, peaceable, intelligent, industrious, and *religious* sons of toil, who ask no favour, but simply the opportunity of earning their bread by the labour of their hands,—see the money in the national Treasury lavishly thrown away on the payment of priests, and these, the Irish Roman Catholic priests, who, they well know, have mainly contributed to make and to keep Ireland what it is—a continual source of alarm, trouble, and expense to them—the people of England. They did not grumble when the wealth of the country was poured in millions into Ireland, to feed her in the hour of famine, although they suffered for it and suffer for it still. But if, in spite of their indignant remonstrances, one or two millions annually are thrown away on the payment of the priests, they will more than grumble—the act will not soon be either forgotten or forgiven. They will naturally ask themselves why they continue to slave day by day, always on the verge of want, for a Government or a country which does not reward them by one mark of approval, but reserves all its rewards for the discontented and the seditious? They will see that there are different modes of treatment for sedition according to the class of the offender; the poor man is imprisoned or banished, while the criminal in a priestly garb, with means and influence, gets a pension for life from the State. If this do not breed sullen discontent among them, all history has been written in vain. It will be all the more dangerous that it may be concealed; the smoothness of the current is a sign of its depth. All who are interested in the preservation of our institutions may depend on this, that it is a dangerous thing, in the present state of this country, and of the world, to furnish our working-men with another and a glaring instance of what they call *class legislation*.

VII. To *govern Ireland* through her priesthood is an acknowledgment that the ordinary laws of the land are insufficient for that purpose.

This is truly a humiliating confession for a British statesman to make. Our code of laws, increased or modified year by year—the fruit of the most profound and experienced intellects, under which our country has prospered, and attained such a grand pre-eminence among nations—is yet found insufficient to rule Ireland, and priestcraft must be called in to our aid. This is bringing back some of the worst characteristics of the middle ages. It is not pretended that the influence of the priests would do more, even if generally exerted, than deter the people from crime, and contribute to social order. Now, the question is, is the civil law, if properly enforced, really insufficient to effect this object? Has it been repeatedly tried and found wanting? No; when vigorously enforced, it has *always* succeeded in its objects; it is only because it is not *kept* in vigorous operation, not enforced with *continuous* energy, that the progress of crime has not been checked. We must not suppose that the same *kind* of machinery for prosecuting the ends of justice, will do in Ireland, which is found effective enough in England. This is a grand mistake, which for the last twenty years has pervaded the whole course of our legislation towards that country. In dealing with hundreds of criminals, with confederated bands, in Ireland, we have done just what we would do in England, where cases of murder and robbery are few and isolated. Hence we have failed, for what was sufficiently stringent in the one case, was not so in the other. But whenever we attempted to suit the remedy to the disease, and the means to the occasion, we have been entirely successful. Earl Grey's celebrated Coercion Bill of 1834 crushed and almost annihilated the bandits and assassins of that period. But it was only a temporary measure, the State physicians believing that to be merely an attack of madness, which was chronic disease, and by-and-by the patient was relieved from restraint. The councils of conciliation being in the ascendant for many years afterwards, no such measure was again tried. At length, in 1847, crime had attained such an unexampled vigour and audacity, that it was found absolutely necessary to pass another Coercion Bill. This was done. The law was vigorously enforced, and by one or two stringent

measures, the people were made to respect it. Had this been *continued*—had the cowardly assassins, who established a reign of terror among the peasantry, been convinced that there would be no breathing-time for them, but that this severe measure was part of the regular law of the land, robbery and murder would have quitted the scene. But they knew it was only temporary, only partial in its operation, and they took courage and waited their time. And now, while we write, at the commencement of the year 1849, we are again horrified by the almost daily repetition of such crimes, as have made Ireland a very Aceldama. Again must we say, no half-measures will do, no measures intended for a time only. Ireland must be ruled, and ruled in such a way, that her whole population shall respect the law, and fear to infringe it; call it a rod of iron, if you will,—all the peaceable and industrious members of society there will call it a rod of mercy. The frightful peculiarity about Ireland is, that the peasantry are more afraid to obey the law than to break it, and they almost universally connive at the escape of the criminal. Now this is altogether owing to the tenour of our legislation, by which they are not led to *fear* the law, inasmuch as they so often see the criminal escape unpunished; and when we are incited to a violent effort to enforce that law, it assumes in their eyes too much the appearance of the mere prompting of revenge and passion. Were very severe measures, such as martial law, *the law* all over Ireland, they would fear it for its vengeance, and respect it for its power. This applies to the *whole population*,—the priesthood included.

It does certainly seem supremely absurd that we should treat Ireland, which is in a state of turbulence and demoralization, in the same way as we deal with England and Scotland,—countries that have attained the highest pitch of intelligence and refinement. The results of this grand mistake meet us everywhere in Ireland, in the appearance of an ignorant and unbridled population, favored with privileges that they do not know how to use, and institutions that they cannot appreciate.

We repeat it, the law of the land, when properly enforced in Ireland, is sufficient to preserve order, without the purchase of the priesthood. And this is one, and a most effectual, mean for regenerating that unhappy country. Are there no others, altogether independent of the claims made by the friends of the priesthood, to gain this desirable object?

VIII. The real evils of Ireland are of quite a different nature, and would not be affected by such a measure as the endowment of the priesthood.

That Ireland is very miserable, is of course universally allowed. Nor is there much difference of opinion among sensible and intelligent Englishmen as to the causes of her misery. In the first place, there are defects among the people themselves, who, though they have many excellent and amiable qualities, are deficient in well-directed and well-sustained enterprise and intelligence,—two qualities which, combined, produce a habit of steady industry. Of course there are exceptions, but we speak of the nation generally. Again, they are credulous to a lamentable degree, the result of their ignorance and their superstition; and are ready to run after any fluent demagogue or mendacious agitator, who propounds some political reform as the cure for all their misery. It is this, apparently invincible, habit of indolence,—never working till they are driven to it by want, and deserting the sober and steady paths of industry on the slightest pretext, to follow any babbling impostor, who for his own ends attempts to delude them,—it is this worst of all habits which has hitherto prevented the native Irish from rising much above the level of poverty. And this habit has been only strengthened by a system, which we have to name as one of the most fruitful sources of crime in Ireland. This is the tenure of land. Three classes of people altogether unknown in England, are, by the operation of this mischievous system, produced, viz., extravagant and absentee landlords, extortionate middlemen, and indolent and wretched cottiers, or peasantry. The first are generally in debt, because they live up to a nominal income which they do not receive; the second, having to look for their profits to the difference between the rent they pay the landowner, and what they are able to squeeze from those who cultivate the land, so minutely subdivided, grind down those beneath them by a rapacious system of extortion, profiting by the competition for land; the third, having no claim on the owner of the soil, but being at the mercy of the middlemen, and therefore liable at any moment to be turned adrift, care only for raising enough to pay their rent and maintain themselves in food—here again their natural improvidence shews itself, and they cultivate only potatoes, and just enough to keep them existing from year to year. Hence the terrible distress among them when a failure occurs—hence the hostility of the people towards the landowner, in whom they so rarely find a present protector or liberal friend; hence the evictions that so often take place; hence, too, the quarrels and heartburnings which so generally prevail, and which are so often ended by a bloody revenge. And from this grand evil—the tenure of land, minor evils branch off in all directions. Capitalists will not invest money in a country which is continually agitated; a man of enterprise will not go to live in a country where all his actions will be misconstrued, himself called an alien and enemy, and at last assassinated. They both see that the ordinary course of law is insufficient to protect them. The Irishman, again, listening to popular agitators, has been told, that the land should belong to the Irish only, that these men are only intruders, who will help to crush their independence. Now, without capital, managed and directed by *Englishmen*, Ireland never can flourish. Irishmen themselves have not the capital, and few of

them, have experience to manage it if it were given them; but if it were managed by English colonists, it would produce prosperity there as elsewhere. The example of Ulster is before us; let us make Ireland a country fit for Englishmen to inhabit and labour in, and her regeneration will soon begin.

Thus, it may be said that the national character is one cause of the misery of Ireland; the tenure of land another, and the supremacy of lawless crime over peace and order the result of both. The *first*, it must be recollected, is partly or chiefly owing to that religion which we are called on to establish; the influx of capital and industry which would follow on the enforcement of law, would serve to neutralize the evils of the *second*. Let us try both these measures—that is, *no* encouragement to Popery, and a vigorous administration of the laws, before we talk of rearing in Ireland such a monster abuse as an Established Popish Church, and the handing over the government of that country to an army of priestly stipendiaries.

There are other evils in Ireland demanding removal, but all connected, more or less, with those named above. Absenteeism, over-population, want of employment, with large tracts of land waste and unreclaimed, vast natural resources undeveloped, and natural advantages left unheeded—pauperism, destitution, discontent, want and nakedness, the fruitful progeny of a monstrous alliance between original defect and created deformity! Let us take them in turn—a landlord will not live where his life is not safe, and we cannot blame him; youthful marriages would not be so abundant, if there were not such disastrous facilities for obtaining a temporary subsistence, on a deceitful basis, an *apparent* settlement in life; there would be no want of employment, if those were encouraged to come, who were able and willing to employ; land would not be out of cultivation, if those who had means were invited to reclaim it, and cheered instead of being discouraged in their work; and natural resources would not be undeveloped, if those, who had it in their power to ransack the secrets of the earth, and gather in the treasures of the sea, were convinced that the usual gratitude would follow the benefit conferred, and the usual reward attend their efforts. And all the ills that are engendered by poverty, indolence, and crime, would vanish with the authors of their being, leaving a country happy, contented, and prosperous, as (the boasting of her enemies notwithstanding) rich and smiling England.

We have thus gone over most of the arguments that present themselves against *any* plan for the endowment of the Irish Romanist clergy, but very imperfectly, as our space is limited. The arguments in favour of the measure have only to be named, as all we have written already has anticipated and, we trust, answered them. All the advocates of the measure rest their support of it on the three grounds of policy, charity, justice. As to the policy of the measure, we have, we think, shewn conclusively, that it would fail in attaching the priesthood to the Government; as to the charity, we answer, that all the Roman Catholic priesthood are in comfortable circumstances compared with many of the clergy of the Churches of England and Ireland, and with most Protestant Dissenters, and if the contributions levied on the people fall off, from their unwillingness to submit to the extortionate demands of the priests, *that* must be considered a sign of the times bright with promise for Ireland; as to justice, on the ground that the Church property was *all* once the heritage of the Popish Church, what Protestant is there silly enough to require to be told that the Romanists only require *that* admission to make their claim to the *whole* of the property of the Church of Ireland, clear, just, and irresistible?

On glancing over what we have written, we find two distinct lines of argument addressed to two classes of individuals, comprising all who will think and decide for themselves on the matter. To Protestants we addressed ourselves, to prove that there are vast and irreconcilable differences between their religion and Popery, and that they are not, as latitudinarian statesmen, or semi-Popish ecclesiastics would have us to believe, branches of one system, divided for a time, but ere long to be united. We showed that Protestantism was derived from the pure Word of God, and that, like its inspired original, it is distinguished for simplicity, purity, and earnestness; the means it employed being conviction and persuasion; its end—the purest morality and sanctity in this life, associated with a complete change of *heart*, to prepare the believer for the next. On the other hand, we showed that Popery was a gigantic apostasy from the doctrines of the Bible, and derived principally from traditions of men, distinguished by the grossest superstitions and by blasphemous and dangerous doctrines, using force or fraud to gain converts, and only maintaining its ground by holding the minds and wills of those converts in the most abject slavery, producing also in every country where it prevails grovelling superstition, a yoke of spiritual bondage, glaring hypocrisy, and wide-spread immorality. Hence we averred that it was impious to endow such a system of error, and moreover inconsistent to support a religion directly the opposite of that which has been so long established in this land, and with which the security of the Throne is inseparably connected. We then referred to the question of justice, as affecting all the Protestants of the empire, Dissenters chiefly—indeed all of every persuasion who dissented from the doctrines of Rome—maintaining that it was grossly unjust that any should be made to pay for the support of a Church whose principles they believed, on such strong evidence, to be pernicious and destructive. And we then proceeded to enumerate some of the arguments that seemed conclusive even as to the impolicy of the measure, taking the very lowest ground—asserting that no pay of any amount would bind the Popish priesthood in this or any country to the Government, as they owed a prior allegiance to their spiritual head, the Pope; that only a portion of the clergy

would accept an endowment, and that those who refused it would obtain all the popular sympathy, and consequently be more hostile and more dangerous to the Government than ever; that even if accepted unanimously, it would not satisfy the priests, as they would not be contented with less than ascendancy and the restitution of *all* Church property; that it would embitter religious feeling in Ireland, and still further protract the period of her improvement; that it would also lead to great agitation and dissatisfaction all over the empire, leading inevitably to the downfall of all Establishments; that it would have a most pernicious effect on the minds of the working-classes, who would see priests rewarded for the same conduct that, in their case, is punished with imprisonment or transportation; that the attempt to govern Ireland through her priesthood is an acknowledgment that the laws of the land are insufficient, which facts prove to be an untrue assertion; and finally, that the real evils of Ireland would not be in the least affected by this measure, and demand a far different remedy.

And now we entreat all classes of our countrymen to ponder over what we have said, hasty and imperfect as many of our arguments have been. All are interested in a measure of such importance as the endowment of the Popish clergy of Ireland. To Protestants, we say, are you prepared to see taken into alliance with the State, a system of baleful superstition and dark ungodliness, opposed to the Word of God, and productive of degradation and iniquity, wherever prevalent? Will you submit to see our constitution sullied, and placed in jeopardy by such an unnatural union? Will you consent to pay for the support of a religion which the Bible tells you is hateful to God, and which all experience proves to be degrading to man?

To Dissenters, we say, will you, opposed as you are to all Establishments, allow a third to be reared—and that the Establishment of Popery? Are you more likely to succeed in your warfare against the system, when you find the whole might of the Poppedom leagued against you? If you cannot overthrow any existing Establishments, surely the next best thing is, to prevent the erection of more! And will you allow part of the money, wrung from you by taxation to be devoted to the support of Popish priests, merely because certain *Liberal* statesmen, in pursuance of their mischievous policy of concession, are in favour of that measure? Have you forgotten what Popery is—and do you not see, that, wherever it is able, it is carrying out its boast of *immutability*, by the profession and practice of those principles which have disgraced humanity, and brought scandal on the religion of Christ? Is not Protestantism a living, blessed reality, that to which you owe your civil liberty, your power of speech and action—is not *it* more precious, something more worth defending than Voluntaryism, which is a mere abstraction, a thing that may not be realized for ages, if indeed at all? And will you not resist the *compulsory* infliction on Ireland of that priesthood, who have, as you know well, been the principal cause of her continued degradation and abasement?

To all our countrymen, we would say—do not hastily, without the most careful consideration, give your consent to such a measure as the endowment of Popery. Events of much greater moment than you perhaps suppose, are staked on the issue of this question. It is big with the fate, not only of this country, but of others, many of which are throwing off the yoke of priestcraft, and assuming the attitude and the garb of freedom. That Popery, which is actually now losing its hold upon many of its hitherto subject realms, should be adopted, fostered, enriched by that kingdom which has all along been the champion of Protestantism, the guardian of civil and religious liberty, and the defender of the oppressed in every clime, would be an event of such momentous importance as to nerve the energies of the Papacy for more widely destructive efforts, and to quench the aspirations after freedom of many a struggling but ardent heart. The wealth lavished on the priests in Ireland would not affect them, would not attach them to us, but would be simply so much money poured annually into the coffers of a Church, whose already vigorous efforts for the spread of *their* idolatry, our missionaries all over the world dread more than the wavering resistance of the crumbling entrenchments of Heathenism. Our money, therefore, in so far as the object aimed at is concerned, would be thrown away, and thrown away on those whom it would not satisfy, but only incite to such further measures as would change their equality into complete and despotic ascendancy. *This* is what Rome aims at; no observer of passing events can doubt it, and if we would prevent her success, we must not surrender without a struggle our few remaining defences.

Endow Popery?—monstrous and unnatural project! Is it not enough to startle from their slumber the scattered remains of the sainted martyrs? Can the thousand victims of the savage tyranny of the Papacy—the victims of the Alpine valleys, of "Seine's empurpled flood," of Prague, of Smithfield—can the Christian patriots, who languished in the dungeons of the Inquisition, who were stretched on the rack, and gave their bodies to the flames with serene and lofty composure—can *they* have seen, without the most joyful hope, the result of their devoted heroism, and the blessings attending it in this, the land of Protestant freedom? And if still permitted to look on that earth, on whose soil they once trod, and which was the scene of their agony and death, what must be their feelings *now*, when they behold the inhabitants of that island, which has chiefly prospered because she has adhered to those principles which they died in maintaining—wilfully submitting to the yoke of the Poppedom, and so far forgetting their peculiar privileges and their lofty destiny, as to ally themselves with

that tyrant superstition, whose footsteps are traced in blood, and over whose head, as over Pagan Rome, the avenging thunderbolt is poised? Tears may not enter into the blessed abodes of the sainted dead, but those abodes will re-echo the cry, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?"

But neither allusions to the past, nor boding reference to the future will have any influence on statesmen, who are blinded by prejudice, and possessed with but one idea,—*concession* to Popery. To the nation we appeal, whether with or without their spiritual leaders; we appeal to them as Christians, as citizens, as men, to declare with a voice of thunder, that the thing *shall not be*. If a certain faction desire to bring about an unholy alliance between our country and Popery, then, in the name of pure religion, of liberty, of morality, of justice, and of *common sense*, forbid the banns! What can result from such a consummation, but evils without number for generations yet unborn? You can, if you will, prevent it. If you should *not*—if you allow this iniquity to be perpetrated—if, despising the solemn warnings of the past, shutting your eyes on the experience of the present, you rush headlong on the shadowy future, without one ray of light to guide your footsteps through the gloom, heavy will be the punishment on you and your children, and those who shall come after them—and keen will be the anguish, poignant the grief, bitter the remorse when *too late*, to avert the inevitable and dark catastrophe!

Notes.

NOTE A.

The following passages occur, in a letter from Lord Clarendon to Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, dated "March, 1848," marked *private*, but since fortunately made public:—

"My dear *Lord*,—*Your Grace* had the goodness to promise me that you would convey to Rome, for the consideration of the Pope, the amended statutes of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, as the British Government has no official organ of communication with the Holy See.

"I was happy of having the opportunity to consult your Grace before any alteration was made, because, as a *Catholic* prelate, you well know what guarantees and provisions were requisite for ensuring *religious instruction* to the *Catholic* youths who might frequent those Colleges, and I was anxious that such securities should be given with the most entire good faith, and in a manner perfectly satisfactory to the Irish prelates, who, *like yourself*, desire to see the true interests of morality and the *Catholic religion* promoted by these institutions. . .

"As entertain a profound veneration for the character of the Pope, and implicitly rely upon his upright judgment it is with pleasure that I now ask your Grace to submit these statutes to the consideration of *His Holiness*, believing as I do that they may be advantageously compared with those of any other similar institution in Europe."

Is it not humiliating that a Minister of State in this Protestant empire should write such a letter, asking the approval of a foreign potentate to an Act which had received the signmanual of our Gracious Sovereign? One can almost rejoice to see a Government which had been guilty of such crouching before the Pope spurned from his foot! The bold and outspoken bigotry of Dr. M'Hale is quite refreshing when compared with such servility.

NOTE B.

Besides the usual blasphemous interjections of "Holy Mary! Mother of God! intercede for us," &c. &c., the following are some of the epithets applied to the Virgin:—"Gate of Heaven, Morning Star, Ivory Tower, Golden Temple, Ark of the Covenant," &c. (See Challoner's "Garden of the Soul," a devotional work very extensively used by the Roman Catholics.)

NOTE C.

Extract of a letter from a Paris Correspondent of the "Morning Post," dated "Paris, Sunday, 7th January, 1849

"Now that Pio Nono has escaped from Rome, and is partially released from the troubles of his Pontifical duties, he really should turn his attention to the high crimes and misdemeanours in which the Romish priesthood are wont to indulge. The French papers are constantly compelled to chronicle the condemnation by the law courts of some member of the sacerdotal order, for infringements of that which the social order has ever held sacred. To-day their columns are polluted with the accounts of a priest, who employed his leisure hours in the commission of crimes which are too hideous to enumerate. Well may Dryden ask,—

*"How can incest suit with holiness,
Or priestly orders with a princely state?"*

"The frightful mass of pollution which was placed before the public during the trial of the Freri Leotade, at Toulouse, has again been stirred up. In another part of the French papers is to be found the sentence passed on a priest for embezzlement of the parish funds; so that you see the office of *sacerdos* in this country is too frequently coupled with that of either, *bos*, *fur*, or *sus*.

NOTE D.

Instances of the submission of the Irish clergy to the Pope abound. We need only refer to a case of late occurrence,—the condemnation of the New Colleges by the present Pope, through the influence of Dr. M'Hale, Archbishop of Tuam, and the general belief in Ireland that, owing to that censure, the Colleges would be rendered almost inoperative, as the priests would unanimously condemn them.

NOTE E.

In an edition of Dens' works, in eight volumes, published by Coyne, Dublin, under the sanction of Dr. Murray, the Romish Archbishop, there (vol.ii. p. 155) the following question occurs:—"What power has the Roman Pontiff?" "The Pope hath plenitude of power in the Church, so that his power extends to all those who are in the Church, and to all things which belong to the government of the Church."

NOTE F.

The obligation of oaths. The opinions of the Jesuits as to oaths, and the power of mental reservation, are well known. They have been avowed in England within the last few years!

The "Secunda Secundæ," of Thomas Aquinas, has been stated by a Maynooth Professor, Dr. M'Nally, before the Committee of the House of Commons, to be a standard book there. (See Appendix to Report, p. 450.) In this work occurs the following question:—"Whether a prince, on account of apostasy from the faith, loses his dominion over his subjects, so that they are not bound to obey him?" Answer, "We have the authority of Gregory VII., who says, 'We holding the statutes of our holy predecessors, absolve by our apostolical authority those *who are bound to excommunicated persons by fealty* or the sacrament of an oath; we absolve them from the sacrament of their oath, and prohibit them to observe faith towards them, by all means, till they make satisfaction. But apostates from the faith are excommunicated, as also heretics, as the *Decretal* says, *Extra de Hæreticis*, cap. *ad Abolendam*.' Therefore men must not obey apostate princes."

The above is *taught* at Maynooth, which is endowed liberally by us Protestants. Can we wonder that Ireland is disaffected, when such a pest-house of sedition is allowed to exist? We might multiply quotations such as the above.

NOTE G.

To show the opinions of Romanists themselves as to the obedience due to the Pope, read the following extract from the "Tablet," the English Roman Catholic Journal of Oct. 28, 1848, relative to the Irish Colleges:—

"The Holy See has now spoken. Its word has gone forth to the ends of the earth, and will never be recalled. All Catholics must bow to it, and render it obedience. If any sons of the Church, nominal or real, wished to gainsay what has now been written, it would be impossible for them to do so; and we hope and are most anxious to be persuaded that few—none, even—entertain a thought that would dishonour them for ever. No cleric can henceforth take a part in these Colleges; so that there can be no ecclesiastical president or vice-president in Gal way. No layman of high character can meddle with them, so that Cork is equally safe. Even the shadow of Catholic authority and protection, therefore, is wanting; and they must now stand on their true basis—that of un-Catholic or anti-Catholic establishments—'sinks of indifference and error,' but man-traps or soul-traps no longer. If Catholic students attend their halls, supposing halls ever to have a bodily existence, they must attend avowedly, because either their parents or themselves are careless of eternal ruin. Against such danger, no bishop and no pope can effectually provide. But at all events, a yellow flag has been hoisted over these receptacles and propagators of contagion. The mark of the Beast is upon them, and the brand of infamy has burnt down to their very bones."

NOTE H.

The following is an extract from an allocution delivered by the late Pope Gregory XVI. on the affairs of Spain, in 1841:—

"We complain that the property of the Church has been invaded, as if this property were subject to national authority, and as if the immaculate spouse of Christ had not the right of receiving and possessing earthly property, and as if our predecessors were to be treated as usurpers for having held this property under Pagan princes themselves; and so legitimate was their right considered, that when one or other of the Pagan emperors took possession of it, their successors hastened to sell it as property illegally detained. We complain of the decrees and other acts of the Government violating the immunities of the Church, and of ecclesiastical persons established by the command of God and of the holy canons; of the decrees which, with unheard of boldness, attack the power the Church has received from her Divine Founder, and which she has preserved in all its force and integrity, in spite of the opposition of secular rulers." "We therefore condemn, by our apostolical authority, and in virtue of the protection which we owe to all the churches, all the aforesaid acts, all that the Government of Madrid has done or attempted to do, by itself or its subalterns, against the Church: declaring by our authority all these acts to be null and void, either in the past or the future, and of no effect in the consequence which may result from them. We implore and conjure, in the name of our Lord, those among the authors of these resolutions who still glory in the names of sons of the Church, at length to open their eyes to behold the wounds they have inflicted on their tender mother, and to reflect on the censures and spiritual punishments they incur, ipso facto, and which the apostolical constitution and the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils pronounce against those who attack the rights of the Church: let them take pity on their own souls, bound in invisible chains."

NOTE I.

The preceding note shows what are the pretensions put forward, and the authority claimed, by the Papacy in the present day. In the year after the allocution was issued, the Pope commanded a jubilee throughout, all Ireland, offering various indulgences and privileges to such Roman Catholics as prayed for Spain. On receipt of this edict the Papal bishops in Ireland addressed pastoral letters to their dioceses. One of these bishops was Dr. Kinsella, Bishop of Ossory, one of the four who, in 1831, set up *Dens* as the conference book for the province of Leinster. The address of the Pope was published in 1843, in the Popish "Almanac, Registry, and Directory for Ireland."

NOTE K.

The Papal bishops who were examined before the Committees of both Houses of Parliament, and before the Commissioners of Education in 1825-6, gave evidence, that if a bull were published in any country, and not reclaimed against by the bishops, it would then be put in force.

NOTE L.

So notorious is it that the nature of Papal authority inevitably interferes with the working of the civil power in a country even thoroughly Popish in its tendencies, that proofs abound, when we merely look to the past history of the most priest-ridden countries in Europe. A Committee of the House of Commons in 1816 published a Report, shewing the regulations made by some Continental states, as to the publication of certain bulls affecting the very stability of the civil power. In this Report it is stated that three of the most Popish states of Europe, France, Spain, and Portugal, forbade the publication of the bull *Cœna Domini* within their dominions. The French Parliament in 1768 thus pronounced: "The Court, all the Chambers being assembled, has ordered, and does order, the said publication to be suppressed forever; *it forbids all persons, of whatever condition, dignity, and quality they may be, whether laymen or ecclesiastics, secular or regular, printers, booksellers, hawkers, or others, to cause the said publication to be printed, distributed, sold, or otherwise issued, on pain of proceedings extraordinary being instituted against them, as rebels against the king, and as guilty of high treason.*"

NOTE M.

We give the following extract from a journal already named, the "Tablet," to shew what are the opinions of even English Papists as to the degree of submission due to an Act of Parliament, till it has been endorsed by the

Pope. The subject is, the New Colleges, which Pius IX. has condemned, and the writer, in his tone of insulting and triumphant derision, probably says more than he at first intended, or than he afterwards approved of:—

"Calm your perturbations, ye excellent individuals, and submit with decent dignity to the inevitable. It is even so. It must be so. It will be so yet more and more. You are only at the beginning of your perplexity. The Pope will speak more loudly than ever, and, what is more, he will be listened to. He will turn over your musty Acts of Parliament with finger and thumb, scrutinizing them with a most irreverent audacity; examining those which concern him, and when he has found these, rejecting some and *tolerating* others, with as much freedom as you use when you handle oranges in a shop, selecting the soft and sweet, and contemptuously rejecting the sour and rotten. And then, oh, dreadful thought! he will insist upon being obeyed. The very slates at Exeter Hall must erect themselves in horror at the bare thought of such a thing. What! the Bill was read three times in each House of Parliament—it was twice passed—engrossed on parchment—garnished with a waxen appendage by way of seal, and had over it pronounced, by Royal lips, the mysterious and creative fiat, *La Reine le vent*. The Queen wills it: her Lords will it: the Commons will it. What does it want to complete the perfect fashion of a law? Nothing of solemnity—nothing of force—which the Imperial sceptre of this kingdom could give is wanting to it. Bur, truly, it may want the sanction of religion. The Pope disdainfully snuffs at it: an Italian priest will have none of it: it trenches upon his rights, or rather upon his duties; it violates the integrity of those interests which he is set to guard: and therefore, Commons, Lords, Queen, wax, parchment and all, avail it very little. You may call it law, if you please; you may enter it on your roll; you may print it in the yearly volume of your statutes. But before long you will have to *repeal or alter it*, in order to procure the sanction of a foreign potentate, without which it has not in the end the value of a tenpenny nail."

After this a liberal Dissenter may well say, "Such language would really lead one to question whether any Roman Catholic deserves to be called a subject of Queen Victoria, or can be a loyal citizen of any nation upon earth. The man who refuses to obey a law of his country, till a foreign potentate has had leisure to look over it, and is pleased to accord it his sanction, is manifestly an alien in the land where he resides."

With such evidence before their eyes, politicians still wonder that conciliation fails, and that the Roman Catholic Irish are turbulent and rebellious. If Oliver Cromwell were now alive, how would he treat such a missive as the above?

Macintosh, Printer, Great New-street, London.

Popery at Madeira: Or, an Account of the Persecution and Oppression
Of

Dr. Kalley,

And Other Protestants,

By the Portuguese Authorities at Madeira.

By James Lord,

Of the Inner Temple, Esq., Barrister-At-Law.

"The Portuguese seem set upon giving full satisfaction to the *Pope*; and his *Nuncio* is bitterly opposed to the work which has been going on in Madeira.

"But there is one who is Lord of lords and King of kings. He has all power in heaven and on earth, and often makes foolish things to confound the wise."—Extract from Dr. Kalley's Letter, 13th July, 1843.

London: Published for the Protestant Association', By Hatchards, Rivingtons, Seeleys, Nisbet, Dalton, Baisler, and Jackson.

No. XLIII. 1844. [*Price 3d or 20s. per 100.*]

Alexander Macintosh, Printer, Great New-Street, London.

Popery at Madeira.

To those who assert that the *nature* of Popery is changed; that her cruel practices will not return, with a return of power; that her principles are not what they were—we would present the following narrative, supported, as it is, by facts of a most painful character, with which many of our personal friends are themselves well acquainted.

Gladly, indeed, would we draw the veil of charity over the imperfections and frailty of human nature, if concealment of the disease would tend to promote its cure, or ignorance of the existence of evil principles was the surest way either to counteract their operation, or avoid suffering from their baneful consequences.

But things are not so. And, though poets may paint to the imagination the folly of being wise—where bliss even of a temporary nature, is attendant upon ignorance, yet the philosophy of history and the testimony of experience, furnish us with a different and more useful, though sterner lesson. Thence we learn to think it wiser and more humane to caution the mariner against the hidden rock before his frail bark is shattered to pieces upon

it, and to awake the sleeper, while there is yet time to escape, ere the flames, bursting upon him with all their fury, arouse him from his balmy slumbers only to light him to his tomb.

It has ever been our conviction that *the cause of Protestantism is the cause of truth*. The word Protestantism may be modern; that which it signifies is as old as Christianity. The essential opposition of truth and error, like that of light and darkness, or fire and water, must eternally exist; and in proportion as systems partake of these principles of truth and error, they will be either united or opposed to one another throughout their various ramifications.

We mean not here by the word Protestantism any political machinery devised for mere party objects, with the view of exalting one, or depressing another class of society, but that system of religious and civil policy which, based upon truth and well-tryed principles, tends to the continued defence and further promotion of that truth and those principles upon which it *depends*.

This Protestantism, in our own country, is considered to have been more prominently brought to public notice and more firmly established at the epochs of the glorious Reformation and subsequent Revolution of 1688;

See a form of prayer, with thanksgiving, to be used yearly upon the fifth day of November, for the happy deliverance of King James the First and the three Estates of England from the most traitorous and bloody-intended massacre by gunpowder, and also for the happy arrival of his Majesty King William on this day.

by the first of which our ancestors were delivered from Popish superstition, and by the second from arbitrary power.

The twofold object of true religion is to prepare man for the discharge of all his duties as they relate to the interests of time or eternity. Any system which overlooks either of these objects, or which in its nature imperfectly provides for them, must be defective. In the soul rightly regulated, there is a harmony in all its operations, whether in great or in small things, in public, or in private, in office, or retirement, to know, to do, or to suffer God's holy will is its chief passion or desire.

If on examination we are compelled to say of any system that the more fully it is carried into effect, so much the more does it tend to thwart each of these purposes and ends, we may fairly conclude that it is a false, corrupted, and depraved system, one that comes not in its nature and design, up to the standard of Divine truth and excellency.

Such a system is Popery. Gradual in its growth, it overspread truth with darkness, and then flourished in the darkness it had made. How wide is the difference between the genius and the results of the two systems: Popery—persecution, cruelty, and ignorance, on the one hand; and on the other, Protestantism—toleration, charity, and intelligence. We appeal to history,—we appeal to facts,—we appeal to the present position of the different countries of Europe, their different colonial and tributary dependencies, in corroboration of this. Nor need we be at a loss to account for it. The multitude in Popish countries are slaves. Popery, while she makes gods of the priests, makes slaves of the people. But where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. "He is the freeman whom the truth makes free, and all are slaves besides." Truth, intelligence, and love, moving from the centre to the circumference, produce the happiest effects in Churches and nations; the greater their influence, the more widely their circle is extended, the greater is the good produced. Such is, or ought to be, Protestantism. Error, ignorance, and cruelty, evolving continually the products of their own essential evil, create moral, intellectual, and spiritual darkness; benumb the faculties of the soul, or arm them against herself. And such again is Popery: she substitutes what is *human*, for what is *Divine*, she puts the *creature* in the place of the *Creator*, the *redeemed* in the place of the *Redeemer*, the *sinner* in the place of the *Saviour*, the *tradition of men* in place of the *Word of God*.

It has been observed, by some Pagan philosopher of antiquity, that every deity ought to be worshipped in that mode, and with those rites, which he had himself appointed. What he might deem right with respect to fancied deities—which were no gods—is strictly true with regard to the infinite, eternal, Triune Jehovah. He has revealed his will; none may add to it—none may take from it. But Popery adds traditions to suit her purposes. He himself is the object of our worship. None may apply to departed men and women, and senseless images and relics. Christ is the only Mediator between God and man. Neither the Virgin Mary, nor prophets, nor apostles, departed men and women, may be approached by us, and worshipped as though they could make atonement for sin, or were exalted into the rank of mediators and intercessors between God and sinners. Yet Popery, as a system, does this; and the petitions offered up to those who either cannot hear when invoked, or have no power to answer and to save, form a great part of the devotional exercises of her members. Thus the creature is worshipped and Christ is dishonoured.

"Thus in Madeira," Dr. Kalley says, "another Delegado do Procurador Regio . . . declares 'me guilty for having said that the Virgin was a woman, and should not be worshipped!!'" And, again,

"A few days ago, an old man told me that the Virgin is everywhere present, and did not know whether she

or God had prior existence!" (And see Appendix, p. 21.)

In another letter he observes, "Popery is truly a soul-destroying monster, more horrible than any other on earth, devouring its victims in thousands every day; and English Christians proving indifferent to God's glory and the welfare of immortal beings in Popish lands, God may justly allow Popery to return and invade England.

"I wonder that after God has held out such glorious results—that Babylon shall be utterly destroyed, that he is against her, and will make her like Sodom and Gomorrah—there are so few willing to engage as soldiers of the Lord's hosts, and to go and fight for him in Popish lands. Heathen lands have strong claims on Christians, but if they leave neighbouring nations in a state of ignorance, superstition, idolatry, and moral depravity, the moral effluvia will be carried over to our own land and poison its atmosphere."

The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, and must not be diluted by any mixture of man's device or brought under the power of tradition. Scripture is the test of tradition, not tradition of Scripture. That which we make the test must be purer than the thing tested; that which we make the standard must be presumed more true and of more authority than what is to be tried by it. It is therefore a misplacing of Scripture to make it subservient to tradition, as it is misplacing tradition to make it equal or superior to Scripture. Whatever therefore rests merely on tradition may be received only in so far as it agrees, or does not contradict the Scriptures.

In receiving the latter we have safety; in resorting to the former we have no sufficient proof or sure foundation, no clear light, but must wander on in conjectural uncertainty.

Popery is false towards God: it robs Deity of his attributes to cast a halo around the head of some created object. It brings in tradition in the place of Scripture, form instead of life, shadow instead of substance. In all these points it is false towards God; and any system which is false towards God can never be true to man.

The case of Dr. Kalley presents, in a striking light, POPERY UNCHANGED, as well in the corrupt nature of her doctrines as the cruel and tyrannic manner in which she would seek to fetter and enslave the bodies, no less than the souls, and consciences of men.

The following excommunication communicated direct from Madeira, and fulminated against two individuals there on the 27th of April last, for no other crime than that of leaving the communion of the Church of Rome, will prepare us for the treatment subsequently experienced by Dr. Kalley:—

"Sebastiao Cazemire Medinna Vasconcellas, Leader of the Choir in the Cathedral, Synodick Examiner, Vicar-General of the Bishopric of Funchal in the island of Madeira, for the Most Excellent and Reverend Don Januario Vicente Camacho of her Majesty's Council, Dean of the Cathedral of Funchal, Commander of the Order of Christ, Bishop Elect of Castle Branco, Temporal Governor and Vicar-General of the Bishopric of Funchal, Porto Santo, and Arguinot,—

"To all the reverend vicars and curates, assistants and chaplains, as well as to all judges and justices of peace, to the delegate of the attorney-general, to the administrators of councils, and all officers of justice, and to all ecclesiastical and secular persons of every degree and condition in all this bishopric and out of it, whom this my letter may reach, who may hear it, or get notice of it in any way,—health and peace for ever in Jesus Christ our Lord, who is the true remedy and salvation of all. I make known to you that, having proceeded to an examination of witnesses, as competent to my office, it was proved by them, and confirmed by my sentence, that Francisco Pires Soares, married, and Nicolau Tolentino Vieyra, bachelor, both of this bishopric, residing in the parish of Santa Luzia, near the parish church, apostatized from the union and bosom of the Holy Mother Roman Catholic Church, and became sectaries of the Presbyterian communion, incurring by this, ecclesiastical censure and the canonical punishment of the greater excommunication. The censures requiring to be aggravated, I ordered this present letter to be written, by which I require and command, under pain of the greater excommunication, all ecclesiastics, ministers, and officers of justice, and others above-mentioned, as soon as they shall have notice of it, not to touch or hold communication with those who are excommunicated by the curse of Almighty God, and of the blessed St. Peter and St. Paul, with those of Gomorrah and of Sodom, Dathan and Abiram, whom the earth swallowed alive for their great sins and disobedience. Let none give them fire, water, bread, or any other thing that may be necessary to them for their support. Let none pay them their debts. Let none support them in any case which they may bring judicially. Let all put them aside as rotten and excommunicated members, separated from, the bosom and union of the Holy Mother Catholic Church, and as rebels and contumacious: for if any do the contrary,—which God forbid,—I lay, and consider as laid, upon their persons the penalty of the greater excommunication. Therefore were their names and surnames expressly declared; and that all may know this, I order the reverend parish priests to publish this at the meeting on the first Sabbath or holyday, and to affix it on the door of the church, from which let no man take or tear it under pain of excommunication, until, by making satisfaction for all, they merit the benefit of absolution.

"Given in Funchal, under the seal of the Vicar-General and my signature, on the 27th April, 1843. Jacinto Monteiro Cabrae, Writer to the Ecclesiastical Council, wrote this.

(Signed) "SEBASTIAO CAZEMIRE MEDINNA E VAS."

The results of this and of the Bishop's pastoral

See Appendix, p. 21,

we may almost anticipate. Dr. Kalley says—

"The poor people have been exceedingly alarmed, but the effect of the opposition seems to be the contrary of what the Popish party intended. Books seem to be more greedily sought and more eagerly read. Many Bibles are buried in tin boxes for safety. . . .

"One poor woman has been in gaol since January on some pretended charge of disrespect to images; nothing is being done to bring her to trial. The lawyer advised an appeal to be made to Lisbon about three months ago. It was agreed to, and there it lies, and she remains in gaol. She is quite contented and happy, but though rejoicing to suffer for the truth, it is hard to be separated from her large family; one child was weaned on her going to gaol. . . .

"A nephew of the same poor woman has been excommunicated, and in the excommunication all who shall pay him what they owe, or who shall give him bread, water, or any necessary, are held as excommunicated. He is in hidings. The proceedings of the Church are declared by one who is a clergyman and lawyer, to be altogether illegal, but we have none in whom to place confidence, and know not what steps should be taken. . . .

"Many Infidels have gone to confession in consequence of the Bishop's orders to publish the names of all who have not confessed. In the parish in which I live sixty-two names were read from the pulpit as non-confessionalists; the first was that of the first female who joined the Protestant communion, and the last was the last that applied for admission to it. The name, Kallistas, is used as a term of reproach for those who read the Scriptures.

"I believe that all this opposition and persecution has advanced the cause of truth; and though at first alarmed by the Bishop's letter, I hope that no harm will result from it.

"You will see from the letter to Lord Aberdeen, that I have had an attack of fever. I am a good deal better, but very weak, and feel much the want of exercise in the fresh air."

The substance of this tract was, some time since, prepared from original letters and documents before us, and condensed into a statement for the purpose of being laid before the Earl of Aberdeen.

It is now published as a tract, with some notes and additional extracts from the correspondence of Dr. Kalley with various friends, and a short appendix, consisting of a letter too important and interesting to be omitted, or condensed.

Statement of Facts Relative to Dr. Kalley's Imprisonment.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Aberdeen, Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

THE following statement of facts, connected with the case of Robert R. Kalley, M.D., a British subject, now imprisoned in the common gaol of Funchal, by the Portuguese authorities at Madeira, on the charge of having committed the crime of blasphemy, and being an accomplice in those of heresy and apostasy, is respectfully submitted by the present Deputation from the Protestant Association, accompanied by friends of Dr. Kalley:—

Dr. Kalley had for some time resided at Madeira, practising as a physician, where he established and maintained at his own expense, an hospital for the sick poor, and was much beloved and respected by the people, not only for his medical skill, but on account of his unwearied kindness and attention in administering to their various wants; and about two years ago, he received the public thanks of the Municipal Chamber of Funchal, for his disinterested benevolence and kindness to the poor.

Dr. Kalley had also manifested great interest in the spiritual welfare of the inhabitants, and had distributed various publications amongst them of a religious and moral character.

This course he pursued for some time, not only without molestation, but receiving actual encouragement;—for the predecessor of the present Bishop applied to the Government to grant free admission to eighty Bibles for distribution amongst the Roman Catholic Clergy, of the same Romish version and edition as those since circulated by Dr. Kalley.

But at length opposition arose; an opposition the less to have been expected, because Dr. Gomez had been warmly supported by the local authorities and Government at Lisbon, in the adoption of a similar course.

Some of those who, by reading the Holy Scriptures, became less devoted to the doctrines and ceremonies of the Romish Church, were imprisoned for not conforming to the requirements of ecclesiastical discipline.

Dr. Kalley himself was threatened; legal proceedings were resorted to; but it did not appear that he had

placed himself in the power of his persecutors, by the infringement of any law, or any treaty regulating the intercourse between the subjects of Great Britain, and those of the Crown of Portugal. Notwithstanding this, however, the civil authorities of Funchal proceeded to annoy Dr. Kalley by every means in their power, forbidding his friends and patients to enter his house, surrounding it by police,

See Appendix, pp. 18, 20.

who made use of intimidating and insulting language to Dr. Kalley, his family, and friends.

So long ago as the 31st of March, 1843, Senhor Dr. Coelho, Substitute British Judge, after the examination of thirty-nine witnesses, decided that Dr. Kalley could not be indicted; and from his decision the following extract is made:—

"There being amongst us, no law which punishes this species of crime, as one of our most respectable writers on jurisprudence, Mello Frere, recognises in his 'Institution of Criminal Rights,' (Tit. ii., s. 12,) I cannot as a judge, bound merely to apply the law, consider the accusation against Dr. Kalley relevant, especially taking into consideration what is provided by the first article of the Treaty of 1842, according to which no subject of the two nations is in any manner to be incommoded on account of his religious opinions; other means must be adopted, which are beyond the limits of judicial power.

(Signed)

"COELHO E SOUSA.

"Western Funchal, 31st March, 1843."

On the 5th of July, 1843, this was annulled by Senhor Machado, Juiz Ordinario, who on the 11th of the same month made the decision, upon the authority of which Dr. Kalley was imprisoned, and from which the following extract is made:—

"I declare Dr. Robert R. Kalley, a British subject, indicted and suspected of having committed the crime of blasphemy, and of being an accomplice in those of heresy and apostasy, prohibited and characterized as crimes, by the Ordonnance, on Book v., Tit. 1 and 2, Decree of the 25th of March, 1646, and Law of 12th June, 1769. Let the notary place his name on the Criminal Roll, and pass mandates for his imprisonment, with denial of bail, declaring in them that the house of the indicted may be entered according to law, in the presence of his counsel, and with the secrecy 'or Secretary' of justice.

(Signed)

"BERNARDO FRANCISCO LOBADO MACHADO.

"Eastern Funchal, 11th July, 1843."

Thus the provisions of 1646, and 1769, appear to be set up in direct opposition to the provisions of the treaty, between Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain, and the Queen of Portugal, signed at Lisbon, the 3d of July, 1842. The first article of which contains the following important provisions:—

"The subjects of each of the high contracting parties shall also, within the dominions of the other, be allowed the free use and exercise of their religion without being in any manner disturbed on account of their religious opinions. They shall be allowed to assemble together for the purposes of PUBLIC worship, and to celebrate the rites of their own religion in their own dwelling-houses, or in the chapels or places of worship appointed for that purpose, without the smallest hindrance or interruption whatever either now or hereafter; and her Most Faithful Majesty does now and for ever graciously grant to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, permission to build and maintain such chapels and places of worship within her dominions. It being always understood, that the said chapels and places of worship are not to have steeples and bells."

Indeed the Constitutional Charter of Portugal itself declares, Art. 145, "That no one shall be persecuted for motives of religion, provided he respect that of the State."

But there being no law to define what is meant by respecting the State religion, and not thinking it sufficient to trust to the present Liberal Government, Great Britain has secured to her subjects by *treaty*, the free use and exercise of their religion in their own houses.

On the 12th August, 1843, Dr. Negr#o, Judge of Rights, and British Conservator, declared the above Juiz Ordinario incompetent to act in criminal cases, reformed the decision which gave sentence against two Portuguese subjects, held them discharged, and condemned the Juiz Ordinario to pay the costs for having occasioned the nullity.

Thus, though the Juiz Ordinario has been legally declared incompetent in the case of Portuguese subjects, yet his sentence is made to operate in the case of a British subject; for it was on the decision of that legally declared incompetent authority, countersigned by Dr. Coelho, that Dr. Kalley was apprehended, and has been confined for more than four months in the common prison, at Funchal; and in a letter addressed to the Earl of Aberdeen, on the 26th of October, Dr. Kalley states, that the other appeals against the acts of the Juiz Ordinario in the absence of the Judge of Rights, were allowed, as in the case above referred to, and that his appeal alone

was sent to Lisbon, evidently on purpose, as it seemed to him, to prolong his vexatious imprisonment.

But Dr. Kalley still remained in prison. And on the 30th of October, therefore, he petitioned Dr. Coelho, Judge of Rights, and Substitute British Judge Conservator, to be liberated on bail, who on the same day pronounced his judgment, from which the following is extracted:—

"As the penalties pronounced against heretics and blasphemers by our laws, cannot be applied to the petitioner, because he is not of the same religious communion; and as even in the case of his being guilty no other than an arbitrary punishment can be imposed on him, which can never exceed five years' banishment, there is room for bail, which I fix at the sum of one hundred dollars, and I order that his bail be received, making the proper bond.

(Signed)

"COELHO E SOUSA.

"Funchal Occidental, 30th October, 1843."

The Notary being required to prepare the bail bond, refused in the following terms:—

"Most Illustrious Judge of Rights, it appears to me that there is no room for the bail required, seeing that the petitioner appealed from the sentence which denied him bail, but you will order what you think right

(Signed)

"PAULO EMILIO D'ORNELLAS.

"Funchal Oriental, 30th October, 1843."

Dr. Negr#o, the British Judge Conservator, having resumed his duties, Dr. Coelho ceased to act:—no second order has been made, and Dr. Kalley still remains in prison.

On the 3d of October, Dr. Kalley thus writes:—

"I have now been ten weeks in gaol, absolutely without any legal sentence against me: for the sentence of a Juiz Ordinario, in the case of a British subject, has no more legal authority than the sentence of the session-clerk of a parish would have in Scotland. It has none even in the case of Portuguese subjects; and I am confident that throughout the Portuguese dominions there is not at present any individual in prison on the sentence of a Juiz Ordinario, except one, and he is a British subject! whose only crime, nay, whose only accusation is, that he has exercised his religion in his own house! and while by treaty, it is conceded that British subjects may be Protestants in their own houses and chapels."

In the course of his correspondence with friends in England upon this subject, Dr. Kalley has stated (letter, 3d of July), that "there seems to prevail amongst the Portuguese authorities here," i.e., in Madeira, "an idea, that the British Government is not only indifferent to religion, but opposed to it, and that it would rather wish its subjects to have no religion in foreign parts; and this seems to be what emboldens them to adopt such unconstitutional and illegal measures as they have done against me."

And again—

"What we would earnestly desire is, that any prejudicial influence might be averted from Lord Aberdeen; and that the truth might be so recommended to him as that he would not in any way sanction, or appear to sanction, the illegal intentions of the Romish party against me: and if on the other hand he would state firmly with reference to this business that the British Government would never suffer any infraction of the treaty, which forbids any of her unoffending citizens to be persecuted on account of the exercise of his religion, within the precincts of his own house, there is reason to hope that the whole of the present opposition and disturbance would at once be quashed."

Dr. Kalley further, thus proceeds, "If our friends in England would use their influence with his Lordship to ensure such a reply to the representations sent to him, we feel that it would in a most important way, serve the cause of truth.

"In a civil point of view, the case is a strong one. I have taken a long lease of a house, and made arrangements for a permanent residence,—have entered on a deeply interesting field of practice as a physician, and been engaged in it for three years. There can be no doubt that the greater part of the opposition raised to me, has been the work of medical men, who, under the cloak of religion, have tried to drive away one of their profession, on whom they look with jealousy. If England consent to have her sons made victims of such feelings under that cloak, it will soon become available against any who may become the objects of jealousy in any profession."

Thus it appears by documents, from which the above are extracts; the originals, or copies of most of them, having been already forwarded to the Foreign Office—

- That the charge against Dr. Kalley failed. The Judge himself declaring, there was no law amongst them which punished the species of crime imputed to him.
- That his imprisonment in the common gaol was in its origin illegal, because he was convicted of no

crime, nor accused of an offence, for which in his case any punishment could be inflicted.

- That his incarceration was, moreover, in gross and flagrant violation of the provisions of the late treaty made between Her Majesty and the Queen of Portugal.
- That his continued detention, notwithstanding the remonstrance sent out from the Foreign Office, is a yet greater stretch of arbitrary power—an insult to the British Government and people, a flagrant violation of the treaty, contrary to the law of nations, and the friendly intercourse which ought to exist between Powers at peace with one another.
- That such detention is not only illegal, but a yet greater hardship and cruelty than his imprisonment, injuring him in his practice, impairing his health, damaging his reputation, and inflicting continued punishment where no crime has been committed.
- That the opposition and hostility recently evinced to Dr. Kalley, may be in great part referred to the intrigues of those who are professionally opposed to him.
- That the Portuguese authorities at Madeira seem to think themselves justified and encouraged in such maltreatment of a British subject; and such notorious violation of the treaty, by an erroneous opinion prevailing amongst them, that the British Government is comparatively indifferent about the matter.

The Deputation have therefore respectfully to request information as to what remonstrances may already have been made to the Portuguese authorities by Her Majesty's Government, and what answers may have been returned to such remonstrances.

The Deputation are also further desirous of knowing what more can, and will be done:—

- To procure the liberation of Dr. Kalley, and to remove from the minds of the Portuguese authorities the erroneous impression, that the British Government is indifferent to religion, and the rights of its subjects abroad.
- To indemnify Dr. Kalley for his severe losses, privations, and sufferings.
- To assure the Portuguese authorities and other Powers, within whose dominions British subjects may be visiting or residing, whether for purposes of traffic or pleasure, or for the benefit of their health,—that they are not to be illegally oppressed or persecuted by them, for professing and exercising the Protestant religion, and yet remain destitute of the protection of their native Government; but that the same full liberty which foreigners of every persuasion and country enjoy in Great Britain, without regard of sect, or creed, or politics, is the sacred and undoubted right of British subjects conforming to the laws of those countries in which they may reside. And that whilst Great Britain provides that the rights of foreigners, and the treaties with other nations are respected by her,—she will also provide that the liberties,—the religion,—and reputation of her own subjects shall be protected, and held sacred throughout the globe.

The deputation was received by the Earl of Aberdeen with the greatest courtesy, and the substance of his Lordship's reply to the Deputation was, that there existed no indifference at the Foreign Office upon the subject. That he had some time since forwarded to Lisbon directions requiring the liberation of Dr. Kalley on bail, as in any case he was entitled to a fair trial; and that on finding there had been some very improper delay somewhere, in consequence of which the directions from the Foreign Office had not been complied with, he had sent out by the last mail, demanding the dismissal of any official who had interfered to deprive his directions of their full operation and effect in procuring the liberation of Dr. Kalley.

On the 27th December, another communication was received from the Foreign Office, stating "that the Court of Relaç#s at Lisbon has pronounced a decision in favour of Dr. Kalley, by virtue of which that gentleman will have been liberated on bail." This is, in some degree, satisfactory; but the experience of the past leads us to anticipate protracted delay on the part of the Portuguese authorities at Madeira, if the Foreign Office, and the friends of Dr. Kalley, rest satisfied with the mere decision, and are not energetic in seeing that it is not rendered almost nugatory *by delay*, which is often a *denial* of justice. Since writing the above, the following letter has been received from Dr. Kalley, dated Funchal Gaol, 26th December, 1843, in which he thus writes—

"You will be glad to hear that I received a despatch from the Foreign Office, under date the 1st current, in which Mr. Addington, by Lord Aberdeen's direction, says, that 'if it shall turn out that the authorities of Madeira, in refusing to admit you to bail, and in keeping you in prison for so long a time without trial, have violated the forms of Portuguese law, or the privileges secured to British subjects by ancient treaties, Her Majesty's Government must use all the means at their disposal in order to obtain for you complete redress and compensation for any injuries which may have been illegally inflicted upon you.'"

"Lord Howard already long ago stated, that he considered that the proceedings against me had been constituted and followed up in an irregular and unjustifiable manner; and Lord Aberdeen directed Lord Howard to renew in a peremptory manner his demand, that steps should be taken for my immediate release on bail. His Lordship could use such language towards a foreign Power only from a clear conviction that the denial of bail was a breach of privilege. We have now, however, sufficient proof that the authorities here did act unjustly towards me. You are aware that I appealed to the Relaç#s against the denial of bail; that appeal

was decided on the 12th, and Mr. A. writes to me on the 14th that it was in my favour. There are, however, certain days during which the Attorney-General can appeal to the Tribunal of Justice, and were he to do so, my liberation would still be delayed until another decision be given. As he has, however, already expressed his opinion that bail should have been received at first, he probably will not interpose an appeal, and if so, I may expect to be at liberty in the course of eight or ten days, so soon as the sentence shall be officially communicated to the authorities here."

This justifies us in indulging apprehensions, till we hear that Dr. Kalley is at liberty. Some are of opinion that the Relaç#s has conceded this appeal, in order that Dr. Kalley may be released on bail, and let them cast aside the other appeal, supposing that in this manner their Government may not be implicated in expenses, and that when consequent to the Doctor's liberation on bail, the attention of his countrymen shall have been withdrawn, they will be able to arrange the whole affair in accordance with *Portuguese jurisdiction*. If the question be soon determined, it must be acknowledged that the Juiz Ordinario had *no right or power to commit Dr. Kalley to prison*; and on such a decision much heavier damages ought to be demanded, than if the denial of bail alone were declared unjust. For then the whole disgrace of imprisonment *as a felon* and its consequences must be redressed. It is said, that in anticipation of public disapproval, for the satisfaction of the English Government, the authorities in Lisbon have already intimated to those at Madeira, *privately*, that they approve of what has been done, so that the public disapprobation may not incommode them much.

We trust, however, that Dr. Kalley is by this time liberated on bail, but his trial may be yet some time pending; and whatever be the result, as to an acquittal or conviction, the proceedings already had, supply a lesson which the Protestants of the British Empire *ought well to know, and never to forget*.

That great energy and prompt attention to the rights and interests of British subjects has been displayed by the Foreign Office, and that in consequence, the vulture has been obliged to leave her prey undevoured, this is a matter in some respect of just congratulation. Still we must remember, that nothing but the intervention of British power has rescued a fellow-Christian and a fellow-subject from the cruel imprisonment of a Portuguese dungeon,

Dr Kalley says—

"I was brought to prison, being taken from the midst of patients in my hospital.

"The hope was then held out to me that I should not remain more than an hour or two, while papers were being prepared for my being a prisoner in my own house. I was put into a filthy little room into which all were admitted, till a friend begged from the Judge of the Camera, a large room and bed-room which were locked up and unemployed, and they were granted to me through his kindness."

and, perhaps, from an ignominious death.

Dr. Kalley applied to get out on bail, "but the Delegado do Procurador Regie declared, that the crimes with which I am charged (blasphemy and being complice in heresy and apostasy), are punishable with death by the Portuguese laws, and, therefore, not bailable." (And see Appendix, p. 19.)

Rome's object is the assimilation of all to her own corrupt and erroneous system; or the imprisonment and annihilation of those who differ from her. We have recently had instances almost on a national scale, of what she is preparing to do and may yet accomplish, if Protestants augment her influence and power, or even connive at her proceedings.

Addenda to Popery at Madeira.

WE subjoin the following extract from a letter, received from Dr. Kalley since the publication of the foregoing, and dated the 10th of February, 1844:—

"Though it be now within a few minutes of the hour when the mail is to close, I must find time to inform you of my liberation. The order for it arrived on the first day of this year, and on the evening of the same day it was put into execution. The bail required was fifty dollars, which is rather less than ten guineas; and the surety is a person who is not even a householder, and was merely employed to carry the petition to the Judge. They seemed to feel as if they had caught a hot poker, and were glad to get rid of it as fast as possible, without standing upon ceremony; and now, the enemy is very quiet, for there is a general expectation among all classes that the British Government will demand the dismissal of those who have been foremost in attacking or denying British rights. I have no doubt that the British Government will fulfil its promise, that if it were proved that the denial of bail was unjust, or any long imprisonment without trial inconsistent with British privileges, it will use all the means at its disposal to obtain for me ample redress and compensation for all losses and injuries. I trust that such steps will be adopted as shall secure British subjects from being maltreated in a similar way for the future."

We subjoin also the following from a communication just received from a friend at Lisbon, and dated Feb.

12, 1844:—

"You are of course aware of the persecution of Dr. Kalley, who at last is out of prison. He has fought his way nobly in the cause; but had he not been a British subject, whose Government gave him protection, he must still have groaned under despotic oppression; it would have been difficult to have found a lawyer who would defend his case. When his appeal came to Lisbon, it was put in the hands of a lawyer who was considered of very liberal principles, and consequently the most likely person to undertake it; he first examined the documents carefully, and then said, he would undertake the defence only, as it would be all documentary, and another person would be got to sign instead of him, for though the cause was just, he would not have defended it if it had been necessary to do it in public; and the same feeling would prevail with the judges, who would, as far as possible, throw the decision from themselves upon others. No one would like the odium of favouring a cause against the religion of the State, the Church, and the Government, nor would they like to give a decision so contrary to the liberal opinions so generally expressed throughout Europe at the present day. If an Englishman, strongly backed by his Government, should be confined so many months in prison, and with sufficient pecuniary means, what would have been the fate of a Portuguese without such protection, and perhaps in low circumstances? This is a difficulty which, at the present day, cannot be easily overcome."

With reference to the decision of the Court of Appeal at Lisbon, by virtue of which Dr. Kalley has been liberated on bail,—a hostile writer, signing himself W. A. H., says, in a letter from Madeira, January 8, 1844, and published as a tract:—

"This decision makes not the slightest difference as to the final issue. For blasphemy, heresy, and the promotion of apostasy, Dr. Kalley was arrested,—for blasphemy, heresy, and the promotion of apostasy, he is still to be tried."

Thus, from this display of bigotry, we very well see that, if the British Government and the friends of Dr. Kalley withdraw their vigilance and protection, he may yet be a victim to the fury of his persecutors.

Indeed, Popery, unchecked by the presence of superior light, or overawed by superior power, will be found pretty much the same all the world over. Equally cruel, equally superstitious, equally erroneous in her principles, and dangerous in her practices. Dr. Bonavia, a convert from Popery, and a catechist of the Colonial Church Society, with others, are at this moment bitterly persecuted by the Roman Catholics at Malta. As soon as sufficient information on this case can be gained, it is, we believe, intended to publish it as a tract, by the title of "Popery at Malta,"

Temple, Feb. 26, 1844.

Appendix.

Letter From Dr. Kalley.

MY DEAR Sin,—On the 25th ult. I received your favour of the 12th, containing a copy of the Resolutions passed at a public Meeting on the previous evening; and I desire to express the gratitude which I feel towards the Right Honourable Gentleman who presided, and towards all those friends who have so kindly interested themselves in the case of an humble individual—a stranger and a prisoner in a foreign land. May He who promised that a cup of cold water given to a disciple in the name of a disciple should not lose its reward, grant to each an abundant blessing out of the infinite stores of His own goodness!

Above all, I desire to thank Him who put it into your hearts to show me this kindness. Your letter and assurances of sympathy and friendly effort on my behalf, coming so unexpectedly and opportunely, were like a refreshing draught of water to the weary, thirsty, and fainting traveller. Nor was my satisfaction merely selfish. While I rejoiced in your letter because of the kindness expressed in it towards me individually, I still more rejoiced in it because of the indication it afforded that Scotchmen still appreciate the inestimable privileges of civil and religious liberty which they enjoy, and gave a hope that, forgetting minor differences, they will unite heart and hand to oppose those destructive errors which seem to be spreading like a mighty flood over our beloved fatherland.

From the expression, "free preaching of the Gospel," in the third Resolution, I am afraid that the idea entertained as to the extent of liberty enjoyed by Protestants in Portugal is not quite correct, and that the actual cause of my imprisonment and reasons of my appeal to our own Government have not been clearly laid before you.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CHARTER of Portugal declares, that "the Romanist is the religion of the state;" but that "all others are permitted to strangers with their family or private worship," and adds (Art. 145), that "no one shall be persecuted for motives of religion provided he respect that of the State but there is no existing law to define what is meant by respecting the State religion. Not trusting to the continuance of such a Liberal form

of Government, Britain has secured to her subjects by *treaty* the free use and exercise of their religion in their OWN HOUSES and CHAPELS, without any condition, except that their chapels are not to have steeples and bells; and it is *expressly declared that we shall not be in any manner inconvenienced for our religious opinions*. In Lisbon, Madeira, and various other places, the British have chapels where Portuguese subjects attend unmolested, and there is no British clergyman proceeded against or imprisoned for preaching in their presence.

Notwithstanding the liberty thus doubly secured, I received a command from the civil governor of this island, dated Kith Murchy to abstain from having any meetings of Portuguese subjects in my house, and from speaking to them on religious subjects either in my said house or out of it. I respectfully asked on what law he founded his order. He sent no answer, but published a proclamation, denouncing me as a disturber of the peace, and threatening all who might come to my house. Not regarding such an arbitrary and illegal proceeding, I continued my customary worship. Police officers were then posted at the door of my dwelling-house to insult my friends as they went out, which was done most grossly; and having gone to the door with them, I also was, on the public street, in open day, before scores of witnesses, insulted and threatened to be stoned off the island. I complained of this to the Governor through the Consult but the same officers were allowed to return and repeat their insults, and, as many came, notwithstanding the insults, the police were sent earlier, to prevent them from entering. Several were taken to prison merely for seeking to enter my house; and the Rev. Reginald Smith, Rector of Stafford, Dorset; James Abernethy, Esq., Ferryhill, Aberdeen; and others of our countrymen (whose depositions were forwarded to our Government), were present, and heard the officers forbid to enter many patients and persons who came for medicines.

In January, February, and March, about forty witnesses were examined many of them twice, some three times, in order to criminate me. In the whole evidence there is not a single date affixed to anything testified regarding me. Nor do two witnesses agree in any fact and date, except that, on the 22d January, two Portuguese subjects communicated at the Scotch Church, and both of the said communicants declared in the said evidence that I did not invite them to go there. *In the whole evidence, there is no scene, mentioned as the place where I performed the religious acts for which I am imprisoned, except my own house.* On the 31st March, the whole proceedings being laid before Coelho, the Judge of the district (not as Conservator, though he was then British Judge Conservator), and he declared that the two Portuguese who had communicated should be imprisoned, denying them bail; but that, although my conduct, abusing the liberty granted to strangers, degenerated into crime (delicto), yet there is no law to punish such a crime, and that, especially, on examining the terms of the treaty with Great Britain, it appeared that it was not within the limits of judicial power to take cognisance of the matter.

The Deputy and Public Prosecutor appealed against the Judge's opinion in my favour. An appeal against the sentence of a Portuguese Judge should, when ready, be laid before the Judge, and he has then an opportunity of changing or even reversing his sentence, if he see fit. Before, however, the said appeal was ready, the Judge Coelho went to Lisbon. In his absence, there being no Judge of the district, the appeal was laid before the *Juiz Ordinario*—who has no power to give any sentence in any criminal case, and whose duties refer chiefly to the interests of Portuguese orphans—and he, though *destitute of authority*, and though for months he had *most grossly abused me* in the newspaper of which he is editor, took upon himself to reverse the sentence of his superior Judge, and then gave a sentence against me, requiring me to be imprisoned, and denied bail. Before this illegal sentence was executed, the Judge Coelho had returned from Lisbon, and an order had also come to the Deputy of the Public Prosecutor directing what should be done with respect to the acts incompetently performed by the *Juiz Ordinario*. In consequence of this order, all the proceedings carried on by the *Juiz Ordinario*, in criminal cases affecting Portuguese subjects, were annulled, and he was found liable to pay the costs, because he had exceeded his powers, and was incompetent to act in criminal cases. *Notwithstanding of this order, Coelho, in virtue of the sentence of the Juiz Ordinario, issued a warrant for my imprisonment, and resigned it as Conservator, Though paid by the British Government for the protection of British interests, he, in virtue of what he knew to be altogether an incompetent and illegal sentence, issued a warrant against a British subject.* Consequently, on the 26th of July, I was seized in my hospital amidst the tears of the poor and sick, and removed from the bosom of my family to the public prison, though my dear wife was so ill that I had required to bleed and blister her two days before. And I have now been upwards of ten weeks in jail, absolutely without any legal sentence against me; for the sentence of a *Juiz Ordinario*, in the case of a British subject, has no more legal authority than the sentence of the session-cleric of a parish would have in Scotland. It has none even in the case of Portuguese subjects; and I am confident that throughout the Portuguese dominions there is not at present any individual in prison on the sentence of a *Juiz Ordinario*, except one, and he is a British subject! whose only crime, nay, whose only accusation is, that he has exercised his religion in his own house! and while by treaty it is conceded that British subjects may be Protestants in their own houses and chapels; and what would a Protestant be without his protest against the abominations of Romish idolatry? Even if I had, within my own house, preached in direct strong condemnation of all the errors of Popery, there could be no

ground for imprisoning me, because the treaty expressly conveys liberty to follow our own religion in our own houses. There is, however, hardly a sentence testified against me which is not defended by their own Church, because my rule has always been rather to preach truth than to attack error; for the people are most grossly ignorant of the first principles of Divine truth.

It might have been supposed that the Judges, knowing me to be imprisoned in a manner so grossly irregular, and in opposition to existing treaties, would at least have accepted bail, but instead of that, the individual who had in his hands the aforesaid order from Lisbon respecting the incompetent acts of the Juiz Ordinario, and who, as Deputy of the Public Prosecutor, had petitioned to have a copy of it added to my process, as applicable to it, did actually urge the Judge to deny me bail, upon the ground (as declared in a paper written by his own hand and stamped, now in my desk) that the crimes of which I am accused are punishable with death. I have consequently been denied bail, although I offered the best on the island, and have been confined in the heart of the town during such weather as drives all our countrymen to seek a cooler climate. My practice has been, as far as my persecutors could effect it, destroyed. My family has been distressed and harassed; and I have been involved in the expenses and horrors of a Portuguese criminal process. I say horrors, for the laws quoted against me are those of the Inquisition; the newspaper of the Juiz Ordinario advocates having recourse to the gallows and the stake; and the Judges seem utterly void of all idea of truth, justice, humanity, and even common sense.

Being imprisoned unjustly, illegally, against the faith of treaties, and by the sentence of an individual without authority, I appealed to our Consul, and received for answer, "*that the law must take its course.*" I appealed to the Conservator? for him to order me to be set at liberty, as incompetently imprisoned, but he answered that he could not order any one to be set at liberty who was imprisoned by another jurisdiction. I appealed also to the Relacas, or Supreme Tribunal, in Lisbon. When my appeal was ready, it had (as already mentioned) to go before the Judge here for the sentence to be confirmed or reversed. But it was neither. Coelho had formerly acted as substitute for Negr###. The latter being now, however, returned from Portugal, the appeal was to him. Knowing that he dared not maintain that the Juiz Ordinario had authority to imprison me—for this might occasion the loss of his Conservatorship, worth 400 dollars per annum—while he was afraid to offend his own Government by annulling the Ordinario's sentence—he was very awkwardly situated. Besides the Delegado do Procurador Regis (Deputy Attorney-General) and Judge, there is another person with whom, in such cases, there is much to do; it is the Escriv###, or writer, When the parts of a process required for an appeal or agravo, are copied, it is the duty of the Escriv### to lay it before the appellant for twenty-four hours—then twenty-four before the Deputy-Attorney-General, to answer the remarks of appellant—and, lastly, twenty-four hours before the Judge, for him to give his decision. On the 1st September my agravo was laid before the Deputy-Attorney-General; on the 2d (Saturday) it was duly returned to the Escriv###; but the latter, being a creature of the Judges, and nominated by him, kept my agravo up till Tuesday morning, having himself been with the Judge almost all Monday. On Tuesday morning, Negr###, the Judge, declared himself ill, and sent his rod of office to Coelho, his colleague, Judge of the next district, who acts as substitute for this on occasion. Although the law, that the sentence of the Judge be given at the expiration of his twenty-four hours, is for the protection of the appellant against unnecessary delay; although it was the fault of the Escriv### who had not presented the agravo in time; and although all that was required was, to say that a Juiz Ordinario cannot reverse the sentence of his superior judge, and order the imprisonment of a British subject; although an order had come from Lisbon, in consequence of which the acts of the said Ordinario were annulled in another case, and he obliged to pay costs; yet the Judge Coelho sent the matter to Lisbon to be decided; thus leaving me in prison for an uncertain period, probably months, before an answer returns.

I appealed, also, against the denial of bail. Mascarenhas, the deputy of the Attorney-General, who had said that the crimes I am accused of are punishable with death, marked almost the whole of the process to be copied for the appeal, in order to cause as much delay and expense as possible; for in everything they strive to annoy. It is now, however, before the Judge, and to-morrow he must give an answer either confirming his denial of bail or reversing it. It is most probable that he will still deny it (see P.S.), and that it will be necessary to send *this* also to Lisbon, in order to decide whether a British subject, imprisoned for the exercise of his religion within his own house, can be liberated on bail!

The aforesaid Mascarenhas, knowing the illegality of the whole proceedings, and that they must be annulled in Lisbon, has already commenced another process, repeating the same accusations, and adding the charge of sedition, founded on the fact that I admitted Portuguese subjects into my house, and spoke about religion while they were present, after the Governor had ordered me to desist. With reference to this, a solitary fact will suffice to show the absurdity of the charge. A gentleman of property, and possessed of a clear judgment, knowing the unconstitutional nature of the Governor's order, came to my house in despite of it, and told the police-officers at my door that "he, denying that the Governor had any right to prohibit him from going to any house, would enter." The police took down his name, and a process was commenced against him; but the

delegate of the Attorney-General, on 22d March, gave the following opinion:—"If the intimations had been made (by the police) in virtue of the law, there would be a misdemeanour. *There is however, no law which can prohibit one citizen from going to the house of another.* On the contrary, this is a power which springs from civil liberty, which cannot be taken away or restrained by the mere fear of authority; therefore I do not proceed." And the Judge gave the following decision:—"In view of the opinion of the public prosecutor, there is no room for a criminal process." Notwithstanding this, and another of similar import (of which documents are forwarded to our Government), *the police continued to be posted at my door, and to forbid all and every Portuguese to enter. And my allowing them to enter is the ground of a grave charge of sedition! They actually forbade a person who had been invited to dine with us!*

Some papers, calling the friends of Dr. Kalley to rise and rescue him from the fangs of his enemies, &c., *universally believed to be made and affixed to the walls by my persecutors, are added to the process against me. I was in jail when they appeared.* It was proposed by the said Mascarenhas to add also that part of the *Tract Society's Report for 1842, which refers to Portugal and Portuguese islands.* And I am informed, that yesterday the Judge Negr## found something else to add to the same process. It is as follows—The Bishop published a pastoral letter last Sabbath, declaring Portuguese Bibles published in England anathematized, and that he regarded as excommunicated all who should read or hear them read, and calling on the authorities to assist him in picking them up, and excluding them and our tracts from all schools. Accordingly, Negr##, *our worthy Judge Conservator of British rights, came to the jail yesterday to search for Portuguese Bibles and Testaments, printed in England. He found two—and took them or stole them—for he took them without any law or right, and called witnesses to prove that they were found in jail; that, therefore, these excommunicated books must have come from me, and it is said that this is to be added to the process against me!* One of the prisoners who had a Testament was an old soldier, who came to learn to read in my school, and having spoken somewhat freely about images, he was picked up, and being accused of desertion, he produced a proof that he was no deserter. The document was taken from him and kept, and he is in jail. It seems that our Bibles are so vile that they would corrupt Portuguese thieves, &c., *though the last Vicar-General sent a copy of the same edition to each priest in order to be read by them in their churches.*

The two communicants have been in hiding since the 1st of April. The aunt of one of them has been in jail since the middle of January, for having said that the Virgin Mary was a woman like others, and that her images should not be adored! These were imprisoned a fortnight each for not going to the Vicar when called by him to swear against me. And the Judge who condemned them confessed in my house that there was no law for this, but the priest urged it much.

When I commenced this letter I was labouring under a severe cold. It got so bad that I was confined to bed yesterday; and my head is still so stuffed and confused by it that this must serve for my excuse, if you find things stated in a confused or unintelligible manner. You will, perhaps, be surprised that, under such circumstances, I should have written at such length. I thought it my duty, however, to state the facts, and have endeavoured to condense them, though my endeavours seem not to have had very good success.

No doubt our God has in wisdom permitted all that has occurred. *He, and not his enemies, rule: and all He does He does wisely.* Man would murmur at what he cannot understand, but Jehovah bids be still, and know that He is God; and it becomes us to be still, and only reply, Thy will be done. Father, glorify Thy name. That He may enable His servants in Scotland, England, and throughout the world, to know His will, and be faithful in doing it, and that His blessing may rest upon us all, is the sincere prayer of yours most truly,

Robert R. Kalley.

P.S.—The Judge has acted as I supposed, and now, unless England act energetically, I must lie in jail for months—it may be, years. It cannot be that she will let one of her sons rot in a foreign jail for acts sanctioned by treaty, and without any legal sentence—without even the form of justice.

I have further to add, that the administrator of the Camara went to-day to a school, supported chiefly by English charity, *and took away thirty Bibles!!* He was accompanied by five officials of the Town Council. The administrator is he in whose house the Rev. A. Moody Stuart lived last year, i.e., as tenant. When I called on him he had a large Bible on his own drawing-room table.

I should have mentioned that I have the signatures of upwards of six hundred Mudeirenses, declaring that, though they heard me read and explain the Scriptures, they never heard anything against the religion of the State, and upwards of sixty of the most wealthy and respectable in Madeira declare that they regard the proceedings against me as either the result of ignorance from not understanding, or of malice for certain ends. Their declaration is written, signed by themselves, and stamped as a formal document.

Funchal, Madeira, October 3, 1843.

Publications of the Protestant Association.

Statement of Views and Objects of the protestant Association. 3s. per 100.

Advice on the Formation of Protestant Assotions. 3s. per 100.

- Claims of the Protestant Association on Public Support. By G. H. Woodward, A.B. Second Edition. 2d., or 12s. per 100.
- Speech of J. C. Colquhoun, Esq., M.P., upon the Maynooth College Grant. 1d., or 7s. per 100.
- The Uses of the Established Church to the Protestantism and Civilization of Ireland. By J. C. Colquhoun, Esq., M.P. Second Edition. 3d., or 20s. per 100.
- Circumstances attending the Publication of the Bible with Rhemish Notes. By the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee. Second Edition. 6d., or 40s. per 100.
- The Doctrines Promulgated by the Romish Bishops In Ireland, A.D. 1832. By the Rev. Robert J. M'Ghee. Second Edition. 6d., or 40s. per 100.
- Address of the Committee of the Protestant Association to the People of England. Third Edition. 2d., or 12s. per 100.
- On the Object and Uses of Protestant Associations. By J. C. Colquhoun, Esq., M.P. Third Edition. 1 ½d., or 10s. per 100.
- England the Fortress of Christianity. By the Rev. G. Croly, LL.D. 30th! 1000. 1d., or 7s. per 100.
- The Admission of Papists to Parliament, and their Violation of their Oath. By J. E. Gordon, Esq. Fourth Edition. 1 ½d., or 10s. per 100.
- Speech of the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, in defence of the Established Church. Third Edition. 1d., or 7s. per 100.
- A Sketch of Popery. Tenth Thousand. 3s. per 100.
- A Few Facts to Awaken Protestants. Sixteenth Thousand. 3s. per 100.
- The Roman Catholic Oath.—Speech of the Bishop of Exeter, 1838, in the House of Lords. Second Edition. 4d., or 28s. per 100.
- Letter to the Duke of Wellington. By the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee. Third Edition. 1d., or 7s. per 100.
- The Jesuits Exposed. Third Edition. 3d., or 20s. per 100.
- The Progress of Popery. Fifteenth Thousand. 3d., or 20s. per 100.
- The Achill Mission, and the Present State of Ireland. By the Rev. Edward Nangle. Second Edition. 2d., or 12s. per 100.
- Protestantism and Popery. By the Rev. Henry Melvill. Tenth Thousand. 1 ½d., or 10s. per 100.
- The Popish College of Maynooth. Tenth Thousand, 1 ½d., or 10s. per 100.
- Roman Catholic Question.—Speech of M. T. Sadler, Esq., M.P. for Newark. 3d., or 20s. per 100.
- Speeches of Rev. Dr. Croly, &c., against the Appointment of Roman Catholic Chaplains, &c. 1d., or 7s. per 100.
- The Reformation, a direct Gift of Divine Providence. By the Rev. George Croly, LL.D. Fifth Edition, revised. 3d., or 20s. per 100.
- Repeal of the Popish Emancipation Act. 2d., or 12s. per 100,
- The Danger of Attending Popish Chapels. Nineteenth Thousand. 3s. per 100.
- Cruelties of Popery. 1 ½d., or 10s. per 100.
- 20. Address to Protestant Operatives. 3s. per 100.
- Jezebel. By the Rev. H. M'Neile. 4d., or 28s. per 100.
- Settlement of the Constitution in 1688. 3s. per 100.
- Popery Weighed in the Balances and found Wanting. 3s. per 100,
- Address to the Protestants of the United Kingdom, 1 ½d., or 10s. per 100.
- Come out of Rome. By the Rev. E. Biekersteth. 3d., or 20s. per 100.
- National Religion. By Dr. Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury. 1d., or 7s. per 100.
- A National Standard of Civil and Religious Liberty. 1 ½d., or 10s. per 100.
- Address on Popish Outrages in Ireland. 3s. per 100.
- Beware of Popery. By the Rev. Hugh Stowell. 3s. per 100.
- A Warning to Protestant Parents against sending their children to schools kept by Roman Catholics. By the Rev. B. Richings. Fourth Thousand. 3s. per 100.
- A Solemn Appeal to the Protestants of the British Empire. 3s. per 100.
- The Church of Rome proved to have the marks of Antichrist. By the Rev. Hugh M'Neile. 3d., or 20s. per 100.
- Speech of Sir Robert Peel on Church Extension; to which is appended a Speech of John Pemberton

- Plumptre, Esq., M.P., on the same subject. 1 ½*d.*, or 10*s.* per 100.
 - The Pope and Popery Exposed. A Speech by Rev. R. J. M'Ghee, May 10, 1843. 4*d.*, or 28*s.* per 100.
 - Speech of Viscount Bernard, M.P., on Mr. Ward's Motion in the House of Commons. With Notes illustrative of the Early History of the Church in Ireland. 3*d.*, or 20*s.* per 100.
 - England's Cæsar. A Speech by the Rev. H. M'Neile, Liverpool, Dec., 1843. 1 ½*d.*, or 10*s.* per 100.
- First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth
Annual Reports. The Protestant Magazine. Published Monthly, in 8vo. 4*d.*
The Penny Protestant Operative. With woodcuts. Published Monthly. 1*d.*, or 7*s.* per 100.

Handbills.

- Popery the Enemy of God and Man. 5th Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- Popery like Paganism. 2d Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- Popery Unchanged. 4th Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- Startling Facts. 3d Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- Popish Bigotry. 1*s.* per 100.
- Fifth of November, 1605. 1*s.* per 100.
- No Popery. 3d Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- Sinfulness of being Present at Popish Ceremonies. 3d Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- Is there not a Cause? 1*s.* per 100.
- 10. Awful Perjury. 1*s.* per 100.
- Popery in Ireland. 2d Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- The Popish Creed. 2d Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- Protestantism Confuted by Popery. 3d Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- Guilt of Assisting Popery. 3d Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- Awful Guilt of the Roman Bishops. 1*s.* per 100.
- Murderous Effects of the Confessional. 3d Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- Questions to Lukewarm Protestants. 5th Edit. 1*s.* per 100.
- The Gunpowder Plot. 1*s.* per 100.
- Idolatry of the Reigning Pope Gregory XVI. 1*s.* per 100.
- Loyalty and Patriotism. 1*s.* per 100.

Narrative Tracts.

- Eleanor, the Irish Convert. 2*d.*, or 12*s.* per 100.
- Anecdotes of our Protestant Martyrs. 1*d.*, or 6*s.* per 100
- Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. 1*d.*, or 6*s.* per 100,
- The Persecution of the Church of England by Queen Mary. 2*d.*, or 12*s.* per 100.
- Examinations and Martyrdom of Dr. Taylor. 1 ½*d.*, or 9*s.* per 100.
- Murder of the Rev. Irvine Whitty. ¼*d.* or 1*s.* 8*d.* per 100.
- The Fifth of November. 1*d.*, or 6*s.* per 100.
- Andrew Dunn. 2*d.*, or 12*s.* per 100.

Popular Series.

- Dialogue on Maynooth College between John Search and Peter Surface. 1*d.*
- The Lyonesse Martyrs. 1*d.*
- The Child's Book of Martyrs. Illustrated with many wood-cuts. Parts I. to X. 1*d.* each. To be completed in fourteen monthly parts.

Special Fund for Printing Standard Protestant Works,

By Popular Writers,

In a Cheap and Attractive Form.

THE COMMITTEE OF THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION have resolved upon extending their operations by issuing in an attractive form

A Series of popular Works,

calculated to extend Protestant principles, and to counteract the rapid spread of error in the land, and propose to create a separate Fund, to enable them to prosecute with vigour this fresh work in the cause of TRUTH; and they now affectionately invite the kind pecuniary support, and the co-operation of their Christian

friends throughout the country.

Already Published.

I. History of the Great Reformation.

By the Rev. J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE. Abridged by Rev. EDWARD DALTON, Secretary to the Protestant Association. 18mo., cloth lettered, with Frontispiece, 4s.

II. The Divine Warning to the Church at this Time.

By the Rev. EDWARD BICKERSTETH. Third Edition, considerably enlarged. 18mo., cloth lettered, price 3s., or £3 for twenty-five to give away.

III. The Jesuits; their Principles and Acts.

By the Rev. EDWARD DALTON. One vol. 18mo., 3s.

IV. Thoughts on Popery.

By the Rev. DR. NEVINS. Revised by ISAAC TAYLOR, Esq., Author of "Ancient Christianity," "Natural History of Enthusiasm," &c. One volume, 18mo., 2s.

V. Life of Edward VI.

By the Rev. R. W. DIBDIN, M.A. One volume, 18mo., 1s. 6d.

VI. Serious Dissuasives from Popery.

By Archbishop TILLOTSON, and Bishops HALL and JEREMY TAYLOR.

With Introductory Essay by the Rev. EDWARD NANGLE, M.A. One volume, 18mo., 3s.

IN THE PRESS.

On the Idolatry of the Church of Rome.

By Rev. A. S. THELWALL, M.A. One vol. 18mo.

PREPARING FOR THE PRESS.

I. History of the Inquisition.

By the Rev. R. MACKLIN, M.A. One volume. 18mo.

II. No Peace with Rome.

By BISHOP HALL. With Introductory Essay by the Rev. EDWARD BICKERSTETH, M.A. One volume, 18mo.

III. Select Protestant Biography.

One volume, 18mo.

IV. The Pope's Looking-glass.

Revised by the Rev. Dr. MARSH.

V. The Papal Antichrist.

By BISHOP HURD. With Appendix from Bishop NEWTON, and Introductory Remarks by the Rev. R. W. DIBDIN, M.A. One volume, 18mo.

VI. The Life of Luther.

One volume, 18mo.

VII. The Gospel Lever applied to Romanism.

By the Rev. EDWARD NANGLE, of Achill. One volume, 18mo.

VIII. Memoirs of the British Reformers.

One volume, 18mo.

IX. Accusations of History against the Church of Rome.

By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, Prebendary of Durham. Revised by the Rev. J. E. Cox, Perpetual Curate of Aldeby, Norfolk, Editor of a recent Edition of "James' Bellum Papale," &c.

X. The Nullity of the Romish Faith; or, a Blow at the Root of the Romish Church.

By MATTHEW POOLE. With an Introductory Essay by the Rev. PETER HALL. Rector of Milston, Wilts, and Minister of Long Acre Chapel, London. 8vo.

Other Works are under the consideration of the Committee, who are in communication with some of the most distinguished and learned advocates of Protestant truth, who will preface and revise the Works to be published.

Macintosh, Printer, Great New Street, London.

The Wesleyan Conference, Its Duties and Responsibilities: With a Vindication of its Recent Acts of Discipline. By Thomas Jackson, President of the Conference, MDCCCXLIX.

PURGE out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.—1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

London: Published by John Mason, 14, City-Road; Sold At 66, Paternoster-Row. MDCCCXLIX,
London: Printed by James Nichols, Hoxton-Square.

Advertisement.

THE author of this pamphlet, having had the honour to be elected President of the late Wesleyan Conference, held in Manchester, by the suffrages of his brethren, feels himself called upon to explain and vindicate some of its proceedings, concerning which much misapprehension prevails, and no small amount of misrepresentation and censure has been advanced; but which he conceives to be in full accordance with the rules and usages of the Wesleyan body, and defensible upon principles that are generally recognised and acted upon in social life, as well as upon Scripture grounds.

Richmond, September 12th, 1849.

The Wesleyan Conference, &c.

"LET not then your good be evil spoken of." This apostolic precept is of general application, and is therefore binding upon the professors of Christianity throughout all time. When misapprehensions prevail respecting their conduct, or respecting their principles of action, so as to be made matter of serious blame, it is the duty of the parties accused to give such explanations as may be requisite in order to a just understanding of the case, so that evil surmising and evil speaking may, as much as possible, be prevented. The Wesleyan Conference, during its late sittings in Manchester, performed certain acts of discipline upon some of its members; and that as matter of painful, but of imperative, duty. Concerning these acts a large amount of clamour has been raised. The men upon whom they were passed have visited various towns, where they have convened mixed assemblies, before which they have stated their alleged wrongs; the public press, to some extent, has not only echoed their complaints, but espoused their cause; several persons belonging to the Wesleyan societies have declared themselves to be grievously offended; and Christians of other denominations have expressed a desire to understand the true nature of the affair, that they may be able to ascertain whether or not an ecclesiastical censure has been righteously administered, or the commands of Christ have been violated by a body of men who are pledged to act in accordance with them.

It is for the purpose of conveying what the writer conceives to be a correct view of the subject, that the following statement has been drawn up, and is now submitted to the consideration of all who feel an interest in the matter.

The Wesleyan Conference.

THE Wesleyan-Methodist Conference, as it at present exists, is constituted by Mr. Wesley's "Deed of Declaration," which bears the date of Feb. 28th, 1784, and which he enrolled in the High Court of Chancery, in which Court it has been repeatedly recognised, as binding upon the entire Connexion. It consists of one hundred Ministers, and of an indefinite number of others who are voluntarily associated with them; and was intended by its venerable Founder to carry out and perpetuate those plans which he had previously formed for the spiritual benefit of mankind, and upon which the divine blessing had manifestly rested. He invested this body with various rights; but those rights involve some of the most solemn and momentous trusts that were ever committed to human beings. To the Conference is confided the task of admitting men to the evangelical ministry in the Wesleyan section of the Christian church, after the people have, in their Quarterly-Meetings, expressed a persuasion that the parties are duly qualified for that sacred calling; of guarding the orthodoxy, the spirituality, and the purity of that ministry; and of securing the efficient discharge of its sacred duties; of appointing Ministers to the occupancy of the Wesleyan pulpits throughout the United Kingdom, and to the pastoral charge of the societies. The Conference is intended so to fulfil these sacred trusts, as to be a means of raising up a people who shall be examples of Christian holiness in all the relations of life: for the Wesleyan ministry was never designed to accomplish either secular or party objects. "I am sick of opinions," says Mr. Wesley, "I am weary to bear them.

By "opinions," it is manifest from the general tenor of Mr. Wesley's writings, he meant, not the truths of Christianity, as some of his adversaries have insinuated, particularly the late Archbishop Magee. These are not "opinions," but eternal verities, which men are bound to receive upon the testimony of God himself. He meant a cold and formal assent to the Gospel, while the heart remains unchanged, and the life unreformed; and especially matters of doubtful disputation, concerning which persons of equal piety may innocently differ; and yet which some persons have made the subjects of angry controversy, as if the whole of religion consisted in an adherence to them in some of their modifications.

My soul loathes this frothy food. Give me solid and substantial religion; give me an humble, gentle lover of God and man; a man full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy; a man laying himself out in the work of faith, the patience of hope, the labour of love. Let my soul be with these Christians, wheresoever they are, and whatsoever opinion they are of. 'Whosoever' thus 'doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.'

Wesley's Works, vol. viii., p. 244. Octavo edit.

The manner in which Mr. Wesley intended the Conference to fulfil its momentous trust, is to be learned from his own example; for a Conference with his Preachers was held by him every year through the greater part of his public life; and the method which he adopted in conducting these assemblies he unquestionably designed to be followed by the men whom he appointed to take his place when his spirit had returned to God. Now it was an essential part of his plan to subject his Preachers to a personal examination, not only when they were accepted as fellow-labourers, but at every Annual Conference to the end of their lives. The same plan has been strictly followed to the present day; so that every man who for the last hundred years has entered into this ministry, has entered it with this understanding; and this annual examination has included, not merely inquiries respecting the character and conduct of the Preachers, addressed to other parties; but, in all cases where it was deemed necessary, questions affecting their own views and deportment have been addressed to the Preachers themselves, which they have been expected and required to answer. This fact is proved beyond all controversy by the Minutes of the successive Conferences, which have been published, and are therefore accessible to all classes of readers. At the very first Conference, which was held in the year 1744, this kind of examination was distinctly recognised, and that as matter of course, as the following question and answer show:—

"Q. Do we sufficiently watch over our Helpers?

During Mr. Wesley's life-time the Preachers who had the care of Circuits were called "Assistants;" their colleagues were denominated "Helpers;" both of them at first acted under the joint direction of John and Charles Wesley. At length Charles declined this kind of service; and John took upon himself the oversight of the Preachers and societies generally.

"A. We might consider those that are with us as our pupils, *into whose behaviour and studies we should therefore make a particular inquiry every day*. Should we not frequently ask each, Do you walk closely with God? Have you now fellowship with the Father and the Son? At what hour do you rise? Do you punctually observe the morning and evening hour of retirement? Do you spend the day in the manner which we advise? Do you read the books we advise, and no other? Do you fast as often as your health will permit? Do you converse seriously, usefully, and closely? Do you pray before, and have you a determinate end in, every conversation?"

Minutes of Conference, vol. i., p. 16.

The following extracts from the Minutes of successive Conferences will show how this recognised principle of personal examination was acted upon:—

Conference of 1746.

"Q. How shall we try those who think they are moved by the Holy Ghost, and called of God, to preach?

"A. Inquire, 1. *Do they know God, as a pardoning God? Have they the love of God abiding in them? Do they desire and seek nothing but God?* and are they holy in all manner of conversation?

"2. Have they gifts (as well as grace) for the work? Have they (in some tolerable degree) a clear, sound understanding? Have they a right judgment in the things of God? Have they a just conception of salvation by faith? and has God given them any degree of utterance? Do they speak justly, readily, clearly?

"3. Have they fruit? Are any truly convinced of sin, and converted to God, by their preaching?

"As long as these three marks concur in any, we believe he is called of God to preach. These we receive as a sufficient proof that he is moved thereto by the Holy Ghost.

"Q. But how shall we know whether they concur or not in any particular person?

"A. 1. If he is near us, *we will talk with him* on the three preceding heads, and then hear him preach.

"2. We will *desire him to write down* or relate the reasons why he thinks he is called of God thereto.

"3. We will examine those who seem to have been convinced of sin, or converted to God, by his preaching.

"4. If he is at a distance, we will *desire the Assistant to do this*; and to inquire what is the judgment of the society in that place concerning him.

"Q. What method may we use in receiving a new Helper?

"A. A proper time for doing this is at a Conference, after solemn fasting and prayer."

Minutes of Conference, vol. i., pp. 20, 30.

Conference of 1766.

At this Conference eleven Preachers were admitted into full connexion, all of whom were subjected to the following examination:—

"*William Ellis, have you faith in Christ? Are you going on to perfection? Do you expect to be perfected in love in this life? Are you groaning after it? Are you resolved to devote yourself wholly to God and his work?*

"*Do you know the Methodist doctrine? Have you read the Sermons? the Notes on the New Testament?*

"*Do you know the Methodist plan? Have you read the Plain Account? the Appeals?*

"*Do you know the Rules of the Society? of the Bands? Do you keep them?*

"*Do you take no snuff? tobacco? drams?*

"*Do you constantly attend the church and sacrament?*

"*Have you read the Minutes? Are you willing to conform to them?*

"*Have you considered the twelve rules of a Helper? especially the first, tenth, and twelfth?*

"*Will you keep them for conscience' sake?*

"*Are you determined to employ all your time in the work of God?*

"*Will you preach every morning and evening, endeavouring not to speak too loud, or too long? not lolling with your elbows? Have you read the Rules of Action and Utterance?*

"*Will you meet the society, the bands, the select society, the Leaders of bands and classes in every place?*

"*Will you diligently and earnestly instruct the children, and visit from house to house?*

"*Will you recommend fasting, both by precept and example?*

"The same questions were proposed to the rest severally before they were admitted."

Minutes, vol. i., pp. 52, 53.

Conference of 1770.

"Q. Two years ago it was agreed that Itinerant Preachers ought not to follow trades. How can we secure the observance of this?

"A. It is agreed, by all the brethren now met in Conference this 9th day of August, 1770, that no Preacher who will not relinquish his trade of buying and selling, or making and vending pills, drops, balsams, or medicines of any kind, shall be considered as a Travelling Preacher any longer. And that *it shall be demanded of all those Preachers who have traded in cloth, hardware, pills, drops, balsams, or medicines of any kind, at the next Conference, whether they have entirely left it off or not?*"

Ibid., pp. 89, 90.

Conference of 1776.

"Q. Are there any objections to any of our Preachers?

"A. Yes. It is objected that some are utterly unqualified for the work; and that others do it negligently, as if they imagined they had nothing to do but to preach once or twice a day.

"In order to silence this objection for ever, which has been repeated ten times over, *the Preachers were examined at large, especially those concerning whom there was the least doubt.* The result was, that *one was excluded for insufficiency; two, for misbehaviour:* and we were thoroughly satisfied that all the rest had both grace and gifts for the work wherein they are engaged. I hope, therefore, we shall hear of this objection no more."

Minutes, vol. i., p. 122.

Conference of 1777.

"Q. Are there any objections to any of our Preachers?

"A. Yes. It is objected that most of them are not called of God to preach. This deserves our serious consideration. In the Large Minutes we ask, 'How shall we try those who think they are called by the Holy Ghost to preach?'

"Q. Is this method of trial sufficient? can we find a better? Weigh this matter impartially.

"A. We cannot find any better method; any more scriptural, or more rational.

"Q. But suppose they were called once, have not many of them forfeited their calling?

"A. *Examine them one by one;* and whoever has any objection or doubt concerning any one, let him now speak without any disguise or reserve, or for ever hold his peace."

Ibid., pp. 128, 129.

Conference of 1791.

Mr. Wesley died on the 2d of March this year; and the Conference, when assembled in the month of July following, made the subjoined entry in their Journal:—"It may be expected that the Conference make some observations on the death of Mr. Wesley; but they find themselves utterly inadequate to express their ideas and feelings on this awful and affecting event. Their souls do truly mourn for their great loss; and they trust they shall give the most substantial proofs of their veneration for the memory of their esteemed Father and Friend, by endeavouring, with great humility and diffidence, *to follow and imitate him in doctrine, discipline, and life.*"

Minutes, vol. i., p. 234.

It is added, in the Minutes of the same Conference, "Is it necessary to enter into any engagements in respect to our future plan of economy?"

"A. *We engage to follow strictly the plan which Mr. Wesley left us at his death.*"

Ibid., p. 246

Conference of 1802.

"Q. Can any improvement be made in our present mode of receiving Preachers on trial?"

"A. At present the Candidate is supposed to have passed the Quarterly-Meeting, from which he is recommended to the District-Meeting. In addition to this, let him, if possible, *attend the District-Meeting, and be examined before all the brethren present*, respecting his *experience*, his *knowledge of divine things*, his *reading*, his *views of the doctrines of the Gospel*, and his *regard for Methodism in general*. The Preacher who examines him shall be chosen by the ballot of the District-Committee. After the examination, the Candidate shall withdraw, and the Committee shall deliberate on the propriety or impropriety of his admission on trial; and determine whether he shall be recommended to the ensuing Conference or not. If it be not convenient for the Candidate to attend the District-Meeting, three of the Committee shall be chosen by ballot, and appointed to act in this instance for the District."

Ibid., vol. ii., p. 142.

Conference of 1804.

"Q. What directions shall be given in respect to those Preachers to be received on trial, who have not been examined by the District-Committee?"

"A. They shall be *examined respectively by the three nearest Superintendents.*"

Minutes, vol. ii., p. 241.

Conference of 1805.

"Q. Are not some of the younger Preachers in danger of departing from our leading doctrines?"

"A. We fear they are; and resolve that, in future, before any Preacher be admitted into full connexion, *he shall be required to give a full and explicit declaration of his faith, as to those doctrines, in the presence of the Conference.*"

Ibid., p. 290.

Conference of 1807.

"Q. Can any improvement be made in our present mode of admission into full connexion?"

"A. After the present year, *no Preacher*, unless employed in the Foreign Missions, shall be entered on our Minutes, as admitted into full connexion with us, without being present at the Conference, and *personally examined there*. Every Preacher who has travelled four years shall be at liberty to attend the Conference for this purpose; and if he omit to avail himself of such liberty, he shall be considered as still remaining on trial."

Ibid., p. 402.

Conference of 1812.

"Q. Is any regulation necessary respecting the annual examination of Preachers in our District-Meetings?"

"A. Let it be clearly understood that every Chairman is required to ask the following questions, *distinctly and successively*, concerning *every brother*; viz.,

"1. Is there any objection to his *moral and religious* character?"

"2. Does he *believe* and *preach* our *doctrines*?"

"3. Has he duly observed and enforced our *discipline*?"

"4. Has he competent *abilities* for our itinerant work? —A *separate* answer to *each of these questions* is

expected to appear in the District-Minutes."

Minutes, vol. iii., p. 295.

Conference of 1815.

"Q. Can any additional methods be devised in order to promote the mental improvement of our Preachers?

"A. The Chairmen of Districts shall, at each District-Meeting, *examine every Preacher on trial respecting the course of theological reading* which he may have pursued in the course of the preceding year. For this purpose, every such Preacher is *required to deliver to the Chairman of his District a list of the books which he has read* since the preceding District-Meeting. These lists shall be laid before the Meeting, that the senior brethren may have an opportunity of giving to the junior Preachers such advices and directions respecting their studies as may appear to be necessary.

"2. Before any Preacher, having travelled four years, is recommended by his District-Meeting, for admission into full connexion, *he shall undergo a careful examination*, by the Chairman of that Meeting, respecting his *acquaintance with Mr. Wesley's Works* in general, and especially with his Sermons, and his Notes on the New Testament, in addition to the other examinations required by our existing rules: and *no Preacher shall be so recommended*, unless the result of his examination be *satisfactory to the Meeting*."

Ibid., vol. iv., pp. 122, 123.

Conference of 1821.

"The Conference directs that in future *all the Preachers* who are recommended by their respective District-Meetings to be admitted into full connexion, shall be required to attend the Conference of *that year*, to *undergo the usual examinations*; and, if approved, to be publicly set apart, without delay, to the Christian ministry."

Minutes, vol. v., pp. 253, 254.

Conference of 1827.

"Q. Can any additional securities be provided in reference to the character, qualifications, and scriptural orthodoxy of persons proposed as candidates for our ministry?

"A. The Chan-men of Districts are again required, not only *to examine very minutely*, in their District-Meetings, *all persons* proposed to travel *as Preachers among us*, but also to report distinctly in their District-Minutes, for the consideration of the Conference, the opinion of the District-Meeting, after such examination, respecting their *health, piety, moral character, ministerial abilities, knowledge and belief* of our *doctrines*, attachment to our *discipline*, and *freedom from debt*, as well as from all *secular incumbrances*. In the same District-Minutes, the Preacher who recommends any candidate shall state his age, and sign a recommendatory character of him, which may forthwith be copied, if the Conference receive such candidate upon trial, into the book provided for that purpose."

"The Conference resolve, that it is the *acknowledged right*, and, under existing circumstances, the *indispensable duty*, of every Chairman of a District, *to ask all candidates* for admission upon trial amongst us, if *they believe the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship* of our Lord Jesus Christ as it is stated by Mr. Wesley, especially in his Notes upon the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, to be agreeable to the Holy Scriptures; and that also it is the *acknowledged right*, and, under existing circumstances, the *indispensable duty*, of the President of the Conference for the time being, *to examine particularly* upon that doctrine *every Preacher proposed to be admitted into full connexion*, and to require *an explicit and unreserved declaration* of his *assent to it*, as a truth revealed in the inspired oracles."

Ibid., vol. vi., pp. 279, 280.

Conference of 1835.

"It is indispensably necessary to the purity of our ministry, and to the spiritual welfare of our societies, to retain, and on all proper occasions to use, the *right of fully inquiring into the conduct of its own members*, and judicially dealing with them, which *the Conference, in its annual assemblies*, and (during the periods intervening between its yearly meetings) by means of its *District-Committees*, has *hitherto exercised*."

"Q. Is it expedient, on account of recent occurrences, to reassert, by *declaratory Resolutions*, any of our rules or usages, which individuals have attempted to contradict or pervert?

"A. We think it is expedient; and therefore the Conference *unanimously declares* as follows; viz.,

"1. That *not only the Conference*, but *all its District-Committees*, whether ordinary or special, possess the

undoubted right of instituting, in their official and collective character, any *inquiry or investigation*, which they may deem expedient, into the *moral, Christian, or ministerial conduct of the Preachers* under their care, even although no formal or regular accusation may have been previously announced on the part of any individual; and that they have also the authority of coming to such decisions thereupon, as to them may seem most conformable to the laws of the New Testament, and to the rules and usages of our Connexion. In the District-Meetings, especially, the Chairman has the official right of originating such inquiries, if he think necessary; because our rule declares that 'the Chairman of each District, in conjunction with his brethren of the Committee, shall be *responsible* to the Conference for the execution of the laws, as far as his District is concerned.'

"2. That *all Preachers* who desire to remain in ministerial communion with us are considered as retaining that communion *on the distinct condition*, that they hold themselves individually *pledged to submit*, in a peaceable and Christian spirit, to the *usual disciplinary investigations*, not only of the Conference, but of all its District-Committees, whether ordinary or special, when summoned according to our rules and usages; and that any Preacher who refuses to submit to the friendly examination of the Chairman and of other brethren, or to take his trial, regularly and formally, before the Preachers either of an ordinary or of a special District-Committee, when duly required so to do, shall be considered as, *ipso facto*, inclining the penalty of suspension until the ensuing Conference; because *no possible security can be found even against the worst forms of moral or ministerial delinquency*, if persons charged with any misconduct, and summoned to trial, be allowed to evade with impunity our established *modes of investigation*."

Minutes, vol. vii., pp. 544, 549, 550.

These extracts from the printed Minutes of the Methodist Conferences, extending through a period of more than ninety years, suggest the following observations:—

1. That the Wesleyan ministry has been uniformly guarded with singular vigilance and care. All the men who have been admitted into this ministry have from the beginning been subjected to the most searching scrutiny in respect of their personal piety, their knowledge of evangelical truth, their soundness in the faith, their ability to teach, and the purity of their morals. The reason for all this care is obvious. Mr. Wesley regarded the Christian ministry not as a mere profession, but as a divine vocation. He believed, in accordance with the Church to which he belonged, that every true Minister of the Gospel is called of God, and moved by the Holy Ghost, to take upon himself the sacred office which he sustains; and that upon the right discharge of its duties, the actual salvation of men is made to depend. He did not believe that men are made Christians by being born in a Christian country, and by an external conformity to the ordinances of the Gospel; but that, as all men are born in sin, and are by nature children of wrath, so they can only be saved from sin, its guilt and curse, its misery, pollution, and reigning power, by a personal faith in Christ as their Redeemer, and their Advocate with God. Such a faith he believed to be the gift of God, preceded and accompanied by unfeigned repentance, followed by peace of conscience, by purity of heart, and by a holy life. As faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God, so Mr. Wesley felt that all this amount of spiritual good is instrumentally produced by an evangelical ministry; but then he saw that, generally speaking, no man can successfully exercise such a ministry unless he himself be a witness of the power of Christianity. For, how can he who is himself unsaved adequately explain the nature and method of salvation to others? and how can an unsanctified man successfully exercise the pastoral charge over a spiritual people, or sympathize with them in all the trials, sorrows, and joys of the divine life? Methodism, as administered by Mr. Wesley, and by the Conference which he constituted, acknowledges no man as a true Minister and Pastor, unless he be personally reconciled to God, and so renewed in the spirit of his mind as to be able explicitly to testify, "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."

2. The searching examinations to which the Wesleyan Ministers have from the beginning been subjected, have been personal. Candidates for this ministry, and men who were recognised as being in a state of complete union with the Conference, have all been expected to answer questions which were officially proposed to them. Not only have inquiries respecting their general spirit and behaviour been made of their colleagues and other persons, but the men themselves have been required to answer questions especially affecting their religious state, their belief, their regard for the Methodist economy, and their purpose to promote the objects of the Connexion in the advancement of true religion. These are questions which none but the parties themselves could answer; and answers to them have been both demanded and given, and that as matter of course.

3. These examinations have been annual. Not only have the Methodist Preachers been personally examined when they were admitted upon trial, and when they were received into full ministerial connexion with their brethren; but it has also been their established practice once a year to institute an inquiry into the personal and ministerial character of every one of them, whether he be a Missionary or labour at home. "*Are there any objections* to any of our Preachers?" is a question which is proposed in every regular District-Meeting, and in

every Conference; and the answer which is given in the printed Minutes is, "*They were examined one by one.*" This practice, and the terms in which it is recorded, were both originated by Mr. Wesley. When the question, "Does he believe and teach our doctrines?" is proposed in the yearly District-Meeting, every individual is expected to answer for himself; and the call is generally responded to with the utmost promptitude and cheerfulness; for what have honest men to conceal? "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." (John iii. 20,21.) In respect of this yearly examination of character, the Wesleyan economy differs from that of almost every other community. In the Church of England, and in the Church of Scotland,

The form of examination which is practised in the Church of England may be seen by a reference to the Book of Common Prayer. The following are the questions to which the Church of Scotland requires an answer from each of her Ministers on his appointment to the sacred office:—

"After the sermon, the Minister who hath preached shall, in the face of the congregation, demand of him who is now to be ordained, concerning his faith in Christ Jesus, and his persuasion of the truth of the Reformed religion, according to the Scripture; his sincere intentions and ends in desiring to enter into this calling; his diligence in praying, reading, meditation, preaching, ministering the sacraments, discipline, and doing all ministerial duties towards his charge; his zeal and faithfulness in maintaining the truth of the Gospel, and unity of the church, against error and schism; his care that himself and his family may be unblameable and examples to the flock; his willingness and humility, in meekness of spirit, to submit unto the admonitions of his brethren, and discipline of the church; and his resolution to continue in his duty against all trouble and persecution.

"In all which having declared himself, professed his willingness, and promised his endeavours, by the help of God; the Minister likewise shall demand of the people concerning their willingness to receive and acknowledge him as the Minister of Christ."

for instance, Ministers undergo a close examination at the time of their ordination; but in after-life, unless complaint be preferred against them, it does not appear that inquiries are ordinarily made into their spiritual state, or into the manner in which they discharge their public and official duties. Whereas Mr. Wesley thought that a man might be called of God to preach the Gospel, and afterwards forfeit that call by unfaithfulness; or that he might depart from the truth, lose the spirit of his calling, and so need reproof and godly admonition. The true spirit of the sacred office can only be preserved by incessant vigilance and prayer; so that whatever may be the natural and acquired abilities of a Minister, if he sink into a state of mental indolence, become self-indulgent, worldly in his disposition, vain and trifling in his conversation, ceasing to "watch for souls as they that must give account," he becomes rather a burden than a blessing to the people; and unless he can be roused to a due feeling of his responsibilities, the sooner he is superseded in his office the better. Even men that were disabled by the infirmities of age for the efficient discharge of ministerial duties, Mr. Wesley declined to appoint to the full labours of a Circuit.

"In the Large Minutes, Q. 25, it is asked, What is the office of an Helper? It is answered, 'To preach morning and evening.' Therefore none who does not can perform this office.

"*But he cannot:* Perhaps so. Then he cannot undertake this office.

"*I did this for many years. But I cannot do it any longer.*' Then you can no longer undertake this office. But you may be a Supernumerary, as John Furz and Richard Seed are." (Minutes of Conference, vol. i., p. 160.)

4. These strict examinations are indispensably necessary in order that the Conference may be able to fulfil its trusts with conscientiousness and fidelity. We have seen that upon the Conference devolves the task of appointing Ministers to the different chapels of the Connexion, and to the pastoral oversight of the societies. Who can estimate the amount of responsibility which this task involves! How can this trust be fulfilled, so that its great object may be realized in the conversion and salvation of men, that the approval of the Lord Jesus may be secured, and that the parties who execute it may have a conscience void of offence? The answer is, By a strict adherence to first principles; by selecting spiritual men, duly qualified; men of faith and holy zeal, who will give themselves to prayer, and to the ministry of the word; men who love the souls of their fellow-creatures, perishing in ignorance and sin, with a passion like that which brought the Son of God from heaven to die for our guilty race. But in order that the Conference may faithfully fulfil this most solemn trust, it must satisfy itself, by strict examinations, and every other available means, that the Ministers whom it yearly sends forth and sanctions are not only outwardly blameless, but that they also "live in the Spirit, and walk in the Spirit."

5. The Methodist societies and congregations generally are interested in this part of our economy, and are bound to maintain it. The Conference exists not for its own benefit merely, but for the benefit of the Connexion, with whose best and dearest interests it is intrusted; and hence Mr. Wesley denominated it, "The Conference of the people called Methodists." It is bound to regard the people's spiritual benefit, to the utmost limit of its power, by providing for them a holy, enlightened, and efficient ministry. To most of the congregations and

societies, the Preachers, when they are first sent, are entire strangers; but they are found to preach the same doctrines, breathe the same spirit, pursue the same objects, and adopt the same plans of operation, that their predecessors did; so that the ministerial succession is perceived and felt to be unbroken. Wesleyan Ministers all walk by the same rule, and mind the same thing. They are therefore received into the houses of our people with a cordial welcome; and the congregations confess that, although their Pastors change and itinerate, the Gospel trumpet, as it is heard from their pulpits, never gives an uncertain sound. The same truth is preached; the same divine influence is invoked and obtained; the same results follow, in the conversion of sinners, and the establishment of believers. But these objects could never be obtained, were it not for the kind fidelity with which the Methodist Preachers watch over each other, and the care which is taken by the Conference, that the men whom it appoints understand the Gospel of God, and are imbued with its spirit.

6. The Wesleyan Ministers stand in a near and peculiar relation to one another; and this is an additional reason for those faithful examinations to which they voluntarily submit. In the national Churches of England and Scotland, the Ministers express their assent to the same creed, use the same forms of public worship, and acknowledge the same ecclesiastical order and government; but as each Minister has his own distinct and separate charge, and seldom occupies any pulpit but his own, there is not among them the very close and intimate union which subsists among the Ministers of the Wesleyan body; who succeed each other in the different Circuits, sustain the pastoral relation to the same people, and hold precisely the same views of divine truth: for the Wesleyan Ministers have never tolerated among themselves that diversity of theological opinion which prevails in the two national Churches just mentioned. Unless, therefore, the Ministers belonging to the Wesleyan community have an entire confidence in one another, accompanied by a tender and cordial affection, their very union is to them a constant source of irritation, and they can never co-operate with satisfaction and comfort for the advancement of their common object, the spread of Christian holiness throughout the world. With the necessity of this mutual confidence and affection among his Preachers, Mr. Wesley was early impressed; and hence many touching and instructive references are made to the subject in the Conference Minutes. The following are examples:—

Conference of 1744.

"Q. What can be done in order to a closer union of our Helpers with each other?

"A. 1. Let them be deeply convinced of the want there is of it.

"2. Let them pray for an earnest desire of union.

"3. Let them speak freely to each other.

"4. When they meet, let them never part without prayer.

"5. Let them beware how they despise each other's gifts.

"6. Let them never speak slightly of each other in any kind.

"7. Let them defend one another's character, in everything, to the utmost of their power. And,

"8. Let them labour in honour each to prefer the other before himself."

Minutes, vol. i., p. 19.

Conference of 1769.

"It has long been my desire that all those Ministers of our Church who believe and preach salvation by faith, might cordially agree between themselves, and not hinder but help one another. After occasionally pressing this in private conversation, wherever I had opportunity, I wrote down my thoughts upon the head, and sent them to each in a letter. Out of fifty or sixty to whom I wrote, only three vouchsafed me an answer. So I give this up. I can do no more. They are a rope of sand, and such they will continue.

"But it is otherwise with the Travelling Preachers in our Connexion. You are at present one body. You act in concert with each other, and by united counsels. And now is the time to consider what can be done, in order to continue this union. Indeed, as long as I live there will be no great difficulty. I am, under God, a centre of union to all our Travelling as well as Local Preachers.

"They all know me and my communication. They all love me for my work's sake: and therefore, were it only out of regard to me, they will continue connected with each other. But by what means may this connexion be preserved when God removes me from you?

"I take it for granted, it cannot be preserved, by any means, between those who have not a single eye. Those who aim at anything but the glory of God, and the salvation of men,—who desire or seek any earthly thing, whether honour, profit, or ease,—will not, cannot, continue in the Connexion; it will not answer their design."

Minutes, vol. i., pp. 87, 88.

Conference of 1774.

"Q. Can anything be done now in order to lay a foundation for the future union of the Preachers? Would it not be well, for any that are willing, to sign some articles of agreement, before God calls me hence?"

"A. We will do it. Accordingly the following paper was written and signed:—

"We, whose names are underwritten, being thoroughly convinced of the necessity of a close union between those whom God is pleased to use as instruments in this glorious work, in order to preserve this union between ourselves, are resolved, God being our helper,

I. *To devote ourselves entirely to God*; denying ourselves, taking up our cross daily, steadily aiming at one thing, to save our own souls, and them that hear us.

II. *To preach the old Methodist doctrines*, and no other, contained in the Minutes of the Conferences.

III. *To observe and enforce the whole Methodist discipline*, laid down in the said Minutes."

Minutes, vol. i., p. 110

Conference of 1775.

"Q. What Preachers signed the agreement to adhere to each other, and to the old Methodist doctrine and discipline?"

This question is answered by the signatures of nearly the entire body of the Preachers who were then in connexion with Mr. Wesley.

Ibid., pp. 121, 122.

Conference of 1806.

"Q. How may the union of the brethren, who labour together in the same Circuit, be more effectually promoted?"

"A. 1. The Conference insists that no Helper shall countenance or encourage any person who opposes the Superintendent in the proper discharge of his official duties according to our rules.

"2. We advise the brethren to meet together once a week, or as often as it is practicable, in order to converse freely with each other, respecting the affairs of their Circuits."

Ibid., vol. ii., p. 348.

Conference of 1827.

"The Preachers of different Circuits, when resident in the same town, are advised to meet at least once in every month, for the purposes of mutual conference and prayer; in order to promote brotherly love, and to afford frequent and regular opportunities for friendly consultation on subjects of common concern in their respective Circuits."

Ibid., vol. vi., p. 281.

It has been felt, from the beginning, that Ministers who sustain a relation to each other, so intimate, peculiar, and delicate, must act towards each other with perfect openness and candour, otherwise their very union will rather be a bane than an advantage. Among them collisions of opinion would inevitably chafe their spirits, and mar the sacred work in which they are engaged.

Its recent Expulsions.

WITHIN the last three or four years the peace of the Wesleyan Connexion has been seriously interrupted by the publication of a series of mischievous and libellous pamphlets, which have been extensively circulated, by post and otherwise, for the professed purpose of correcting various alleged abuses, both in the Conference and several of its institutions. These pamphlets are all strictly anonymous, containing no author's name, and the name of no printer, but professing to be the joint production of a Corresponding Committee, the members of which were said to be resident in some of the principal towns of England and North Britain. They contain direct and repeated attacks upon some of the most gifted, useful, laborious, and esteemed Ministers of the body, representing them as indolent, proud, selfish, ambitious, and morally dishonest; especially the men whom the Conference has intrusted with the management of its important and widely extended Missions. The writers represent the members of the Conference generally, as mean and spiritless, not daring to think and act for themselves, but consenting to be blindly led by a few ambitious individuals, who are intent upon managing

everything for the gratification of their own selfishness, caprice, and vanity. These nameless authors profess to relate private and confidential conversations, to disclose the secrets of domestic life; and they even assail with strong but unrighteous censure the memory of the pious dead.

These things are dwelt upon by the writers, not in a tone of sorrow and regret, that evils of such magnitude should exist among religious people, so as to dishonour Christ, to neutralize the effect of his truth and ordinances, and to retard his work of mercy in the world. They are rather dwelt upon in a tone of scorn, and of bitter malignity, bearing, indeed, a character of personal hatred and vindictiveness; and in various instances the writers manifest a fearful disregard of truth. For a time it was hoped that the spirit of these writers would defeat their object, especially among religious people, whose sanctified nature instinctively abhors that which is evil; so that these vehicles of slander and defamation would sink into deserved neglect and forgetfulness. But, alas, appeals to the bad passions of our fallen nature are seldom harmless. Reflections upon the personal and public character of several of our Ministers were, by these anonymous scribes, pressed upon the attention of the Methodist mind with such pertinacity, and even hardihood of repetition, that at length a feeling of distrust was somewhat extensively produced in the body; and even men of pure minds, who were unwilling to believe evil of any one, and especially of the honoured Ministers of Christ who were recklessly assailed, began to fear that there might be some truth in the allegations. Evil surmising and evil speaking were extensively promoted, and religion was wounded in the house of her friends.

Here then was a sin of fearful magnitude and aggravation, committed in the bosom of a Christian community; the sin of slander, reviling, and defamation; the sin of propagating and placing upon public record flagrant untruths, which the writers knew, or might have known, to be such; the sin of attempting to render the public services of gifted, pious, and even aged Ministers of Christ useless, both to the church and the world; the sin of promoting evil-speaking, jealousy, and wrath among religious people, and that to the widest possible extent; the sin of attempting to shake the public confidence in the management of one of the largest and most successful Missionary Societies in the world, and of thus depriving self-denying Missionaries of their support; and of withholding the word of salvation from the perishing Heathen. This sin was not hastily committed, under the impulse of temporary and excited feeling; but was deliberately planned, and then pertinaciously perpetrated through a series of years, and that with unabated malignity; the writers never betraying the least signs of relenting towards the men whom they so bitterly maligned. Speaking of Mr. Wesley, the late Robert Hall has said, "I would not incur the guilt of that virulent abuse which Toplady cast upon him, for points merely speculative, and of very little importance, for ten thousand worlds."

Hall's Works, vol. v., p. 426.

Yet the abuse which Toplady lavished upon Mr. Wesley never surpassed, in rancour and malice, the abuse which the "Fly-Sheet" writers have poured upon several living Ministers of the Wesleyan body.

These proceedings, when compared with the law of Christ, appear in all their atrocity. "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the Law and the Prophets." (Matt. vii. 3—5, 12.) "Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another." "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." (Rom. xii. 9, 10, 18.) "Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another." "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." (Eph. iv. 25, 31, 32.) "But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice. . . . Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds." "Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel (complaint) against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness." (Col. iii. 8, 9, 12—14.)

The violation of these holy precepts, on the part of the "Fly-Sheet" writers, was the more inexcusable, because, as Methodists, and, above all, as Methodist Preachers, they were not only at liberty to seek the removal of any abuses in the Connexion that might come under their observation, but were bound and even pledged to seek their removal, in a constitutional and honourable manner. They knew that the regular courts of the body were open to them continually. A distinct challenge was also given to them twice every year, in the District-Meetings and in the Conference, to prefer any accusation against the Missionary Secretaries, and the Rev. Treasurer: the meeting of the Missionary Committee of review, which is held every year on the day which precedes the opening of the Conference, was accessible to them; and there they might have sought an

explanation of anything in the management of the Missions, which they might deem unsatisfactory; and there they might have even urged their complaints. But in all these places the accusers were as silent as death; they never showed their faces to the men whom they accused; they never preferred any complaint before the tribunals that were competent to deal with them: thus leading every disinterested observer to the conclusion, that these writers sought the removal of no grievances, but rather the gratification of some private resentment or jealousy, and the introduction of general confusion.

The duty of the Conference to attempt the extinction of this evil, few persons, it is presumed, will deny. It was an injury to some of the most useful men that the Wesleyan Connexion ever knew; and these men naturally looked for protection and redress to the Conference, whose faithful servants they were. The matter was an occasion of triumph to infidel scoffers, of deep and bitter sorrow to multitudes of devout people in our own societies, and an occasion of scandal to other denominations of Christians, who saw men publicly professing and teaching spiritual religion, thus "biting and devouring one another." In the year 1847, the Conference published a strong and decisive testimony against this organized system of calumny; but was not able at that time to lay its hand upon the guilty parties, who, it has since been ascertained, had pledged themselves to an inviolable secrecy.

Evils of this kind, however, are seldom permanently concealed; and the time at length arrived when the Conference was able to deal with at least some of the authors of this mischief. The great body of the Wesleyan Ministers purged themselves from all blame, by affixing their names to an explicit "Declaration," in which they not only asserted their innocence of all participation in the authorship and publication of these pamphlets, but stigmatized them as "wicked" and "slandrous." Some other Ministers at the Conference purged themselves by an oral testimony to the same effect. The men who had not purged themselves were now reduced to a very small number; and among them was the individual, whom almost every one suspected to be the prime mover of the whole concern.

Cases of delinquency the Conference generally deals with by means of specific charges, which are preferred by responsible men, given to the accused in writing, and judged of after the accused has been heard in his own defence; but in the present case this course was impossible, because of the concealment in which the offenders had shrouded themselves. The mischief was indeed apparent; and so was the fact, that it had been concerted and perpetrated by Methodist Preachers; but they had wrought in the dark; and although circumstantial evidence was strong and various, direct proof of their identity was not available. Two courses only were therefore open to the Conference: either that of passing the matter over, acknowledging the suspected men as brother Ministers, appointing them to our pulpits, and to the pastoral charge of our societies; or that of subjecting them to a personal examination as to their guilt or innocence in this matter. The continued recognition of them as brother Ministers, vehemently and generally suspected as they were of a fearful amount of moral guilt, appeared to be utterly incompatible with the solemn trust which the Conference sustained; for it necessarily involved unfaithfulness to Christ, and to the spiritual interests of his people. Can the purity of the evangelical ministry be lawfully sacrificed to a mere technicality? The Conference has from the beginning possessed the unquestioned right of examining not only Candidates for admission into connexion with it, but its own members, on all points affecting their Christian and ministerial character, or the peace and prosperity of the body; and it resolved to exercise this right in the case of these suspected men. Through the whole of their ministerial life every one of them had been annually questioned on the subject of his orthodoxy, and his continued attachment to the Wesleyan economy; and it was felt to be perfectly fair, in this fearful emergency, to question them as to whether or not they were concerned in this grievous system of immorality, by which the whole Connexion was dishonoured. Feeling that the law of Christ had been violated by one of the most vile and malignant conspiracies that ever disgraced a religious community; feeling at the same time that it was now in a situation to deal with the evil, and that if it neglected the opportunity, it would be a partaker of the sin; the Conference first called the suspected ringleader of the mischief, and, through the medium of its own officers, asked him whether or not he was concerned in the authorship, or in the publication, of the "Fly-Sheets." He replied, that, to this question he would give no answer. If charges were preferred against him, he would meet them, and defend himself; but to no such question as that which was now proposed, would he return any reply, even upon pain of expulsion. Other men, who were suspected of being in the confederacy, and some of whom were known to have been extensively concerned in the mischiefs of agitation, were questioned in the same manner, and avowed the same determination. Attempts were made to bring them to a different mind. A Committee, comprehending some of the most aged Ministers of the body, with others who had filled offices involving great trust and responsibility, was appointed, to meet with the men who thus placed themselves in an attitude of hostility towards their brethren, to hear their reasons, and, if needful, to remonstrate with them; but to no purpose. He who first made the declaration of refusal to answer, declined, even when sent for, to meet either the Conference or the Committee with reference to any argument on the subject. Of the others, two who met the Committee not only persisted in their refusal to answer the question proposed, but even to give any

pledge of abstinence from future agitation. The Conference therefore deemed it to be matter of solemn duty, both to God and his church, by three successive votes, to sever these men from ministerial connexion with itself.

The examination to which these men were subjected, *amounted simply to this*, as all the parties well understood:—Our union as Ministers of Christ, as you are well aware, is voluntary; it is founded upon mutual confidence and affection, and upon considerations which are purely religious. We have one faith, and one Lord. We have professed our belief of the same truth, and our adherence to the same system of church order; we exercise our ministry for the one purpose of advancing the glory of Christ, in the conversion and salvation of men; and we have pledged ourselves to countenance among each other no sin, but endeavour to promote each other's purity and usefulness in every possible way. It is our grief to find that a great sin has been committed among us. The "Fly-Sheets" have neither been written nor circulated by chance. "An enemy hath done this." The enemy is among ourselves. The Preachers in general have solemnly avowed their innocence. The men who are capable of writing and publishing such wanton falsehood and defamation as these pamphlets contain, and who will persist in such practices, are unfit for the ministry which we have received. They are not such men as our venerated Founder would have sent forth and sanctioned; they are not such men as he intended the Conference to send forth and sanction. Direct proof that you are the guilty parties has not been placed before us; we are willing to believe that you are innocent; but general suspicion falls upon you. If you are innocent, declare your innocence; and we will credit your testimony, as we have done every year during the entire period of your union with us; we will still give you the right hand of fellowship, and treat you with our wonted confidence and affection as fellow-labourers in the vineyard of the Lord. If you are not innocent, but have entered into temptation, acknowledge that you have done wrong; give us your promise that you will from this time desist from these practices; and, as we ourselves hope for the mercy of God, we will not withhold mercy from you. But if you will neither clear yourselves with respect to the past, nor give us a guarantee for the future, our duty to God, to his cause, and to his people, together with our own recorded vows and engagements, render it impossible that our ministerial union should any longer continue. You leave us no alternative in the case. Our union must now cease and determine.

I would ask all sober, candid, and religious men, Is this course of action a just subject of blame? Has the Methodist Conference any reason to be ashamed before either angels or men, of having thus acted in this sad emergency?

To thoughtless persons, listening to popular oratory amidst the excitement of a public meeting, it seems a marvellous exhibition of moral courage, that three men should have dared to set the whole Methodist Conference at defiance; and they think the men worthy of being compared with the great German Reformer, when he stood before the Diet of Worms. They forget that Luther stood there for the announcement and defence of the truth; and these three men for the concealment of sin.

In reference to the acts of discipline, which have now been expounded, two observations may be appropriately made. 1. They were performed with singular unanimity, and with a deep feeling of their necessity. Of the expelled men, one had been forty-three years in connexion with the Conference, partly as a regular Minister, and partly as a Supernumerary; another of them had been thirty years; and the third, seventeen. All of them, therefore, may be fairly presumed to have had an extensive circle of acquaintance, and several personal friends, among the Ministers who constituted the Conference; and yet, with regard to the act of expulsion, scarcely the slightest difference of judgment prevailed, in this the largest assembly of Wesleyan Ministers that was ever held. Indeed, the expulsion of the man who was regarded as the principal writer of the "Fly-Sheets" was proposed to the Conference by a senior Minister, who had been coaxed and lauded in those publications. It may be fairly assumed that such unanimity could not be produced upon light grounds; so that several hundreds of Ministers, with the father of the Conference at their head,—himself having been sixty-two years in this ministry, to which he was personally appointed by its Founder,—should all unite in an act which is at all times painful and unwelcome. Yet here we find Richard Recce, with all the gradations of age and of ministerial rank, down to the men who had been only a few days before ordained to the sacred office, including acquaintances and personal friends, uniting in the act of expulsion as matter of urgent and of solemn duty. In an assembly of brother Ministers, amounting to considerably more than five hundred, in favour of one of the expelled men three hands were held up, two of them being the hands of accomplices; in favour of another, one hand was held up; and in favour of the third, no hand at all. The act of expulsion, therefore, was not the act of a bare majority, but of the entire Conference, the exceptions being so inconsiderable as to be scarcely worth naming.

2. The act of expulsion was not hastily performed, but took place after much anxious deliberation and delay, and after every effort had been tried to save the men whose case was under consideration. Except these cases of discipline, there was no business of the Conference that required much time; so that its sittings were likely to be less protracted than usual. And indeed its speedy conclusion was on many accounts felt to be exceedingly desirable. The attendance was unusually large: the long detention of so many men from their

homes and their work was matter of serious inconvenience; especially when the prevalence of disease and mortality in many of the Circuits was considered. The sitting of so many men, also, from day to day, for several hours together, in a heated atmosphere, created considerable uneasiness, and even alarm; especially as one of the Ministers retired from his place in the Conference, and died in a few hours of malignant cholera; and not a few others became seriously ill. Yet the Conference prolonged its sittings till the last day, and almost till the last hour, that it could legally continue them, deferring other matters of an urgent nature, for the purpose of hearing these men, and of bringing them to a better mind, so as, if possible, to secure their continuance in the ministry to which they had been appointed. For their accommodation and benefit the regular and necessary business of the Conference was from time to time delayed, till all further delay was impossible, without endangering the very existence of the Connexion. In consequence of the large portion of time which was devoted to this case, the Stations of all the Preachers could not be considered with due care; and no small amount of domestic inconvenience and suffering is the result. In this matter, therefore, all semblance of haste, of precipitancy, and of rashness, was carefully avoided; ample space for reflection was given to the offending parties; but when it was found that there was absolutely no hope for the permanent peace of the Connexion, but by the severance of these men, the entire body of the Conference arose to the act of separation, with a calm and solemn fixedness of determination, which nothing could produce but a deep and conscientious feeling of duty to God and to his cause.

Objections Answered.

FEW acts which the Methodist Conference ever performed have been the occasion of so much misapprehension and clamour, as the recent expulsions which we have just described. With reference to them, the walls in some of our large towns have been covered with placards; public meetings announced; platforms erected; speeches delivered; resolutions proposed, seconded, and adopted, with every indication of strong excitement; and many good people have been frightened with the thought that Methodist Preachers are going to overturn all liberty, civil and religious, and either to introduce the Papal Inquisition, or something worse. Let us examine a few of the most popular topics of declamation that have been advanced in the shape of argument, and see whether or not they admit of a satisfactory answer.

1. It is said that the Conference by its recent acts of expulsion has violated its own recognised rules.

When any Preacher is accused, those rules provide that the charge which is preferred against him shall be given to him in writing, with the name of the accuser; and after hearing the evidence and the defence, the court to which the matter is referred for adjudication, shall pronounce a sentence of acquittal or of condemnation as the case may be. This course was not followed by the late Conference; and hence it is contended that the men who have been expelled, have just ground of complaint. Their expulsion was unconstitutional, and therefore unrighteous.

The answer is, that the design of law is to impose a restraint upon evil. "The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient." In the advancement of time, evil assumes an endless variety of new forms, against which human legislation has never yet been able effectually to provide. Hence it is that all regular governments have a provision for extraordinary emergencies. There are times when some of the most important parts of the British constitution are held in abeyance, and personal liberty is therefore infringed upon; but the people submit to these inconveniences without a murmur, because the safety of the state requires it; and that safety they justly regard as the supreme law, which must be secured at all hazards, and by every kind of sacrifice. So it is in Methodism, which requires an annual examination of all its Ministers. That examination, as we have seen, is partly personal. "Does he believe and teach our doctrines?" is a question which no man can satisfactorily answer for another. Every man is therefore expected to answer it for himself. The same is true with respect to the approval and enforcement of our discipline, concerning which inquiry is also made every year. These inquiries are not made as matters of idle form, but with a reference to ulterior proceedings; and hence the answers which are given to them in District-Meetings are always reported to the Conference, as the supreme authority under God. If it be found, when these inquiries are made, that any man has seriously departed from the truth, or suffered the discipline of the body to be trampled upon in his Circuit, he is admonished, or laid aside, according to the circumstances of the case. The men who have just been expelled were admitted into connexion with the Conference after a personal examination; they received, at the time of their admission, a copy of the form of discipline, with an inscription, signed by the President and Secretary of the Conference, "*So long as you freely consent to, and earnestly endeavour to walk by, these rules, we shall rejoice to acknowledge you as a fellow-labourer;*"

Minutes, vol. i., p. 30.

clearly implying, that, if they should at any time cease to "consent" to them, and to "walk" by them, the

Conference would cease to "acknowledge" them "as fellow-labourers." This was not only the implied condition of their union with the Conference, but the stipulated and recorded condition. Up to the time of the last Conference these men acted according to their original pledge; but then, being questioned on a subject which affected their honour and morality, they set the Conference at defiance, and thus peremptorily refused any longer to observe the discipline, a professed subjection to which was one ground of their admission into connexion with that body.

It is confessed that in this instance the recognised practice of personal examination was applied to a new subject, the authorship and publication of certain pamphlets; and that no example is upon record in which men were expelled for refusing to answer questions precisely similar to those which are now under consideration. This is indeed matter of thankfulness to God. The Conference has existed for a hundred and five years, and was never before humbled and disgraced by the astounding discovery among its members of such a conspiracy as that which has lately been brought to light. Never before was it known that a company of Methodist Preachers bound themselves together, if not by an oath, yet by something resembling it, to propagate falsehood and slander by means of a clandestine press, for the purpose of destroying the reputation of their brethren, while they were accustomed to meet those brethren with smiles, and profess towards them a perfect cordiality. If the proceeding of the Conference was novel, so was the crime with which it was called to deal. That Mr. Wesley, with all his tact and forethought, and with all his knowledge of the baseness to which fallen human nature can stoop, should not have contemplated such a conspiracy, and that it should not have been contemplated by the Conference in any of its legislative acts, may be readily conceived; and we may fairly hope that many centuries will pass away before another conspiracy, equally dark and hateful, will be formed. In dealing with this vile case, however, it is clear that the Conference has acted upon no new principle, and has therefore violated none of its own regulations.

Nor must it be forgotten, that Methodist Preachers, met together in their annual Conference, are not an assembly of Lawyers, who are retained for the purpose of assisting delinquents in extricating themselves from the meshes of law, by the discovery of technical difficulties and objections; but a body of plain, honest men, whose duty and aim it is to visit sin, by whomsoever it may be committed, with appropriate penalties, and in the fear of God to preserve in untainted holiness and efficiency the ministry with which they are intrusted. Such was John Wesley's course of proceeding; and the men who bear his honoured name can honestly say, "We are all one man's sons; we are true men." If it be right that they should every year examine one another as to their soundness in the faith, and their continued attachment to the economy of the body, to which they are solemnly pledged, these "true men" cannot perceive that it is either conventionally or morally wrong, in a season of peculiar emergency, to ask one another whether or not they are addicted to the practice of secret immorality, like that of "Fly-Sheet" lying and defamation.

2. It is further objected, that the expulsions have taken place under a law which is but of recent origin, being unknown in Methodism till the year 1835; a law, therefore, which Mr. Wesley never sanctioned, and which none of his Preachers were required to observe for nearly one hundred years.

This law, as it is called, is given p. 16, of this pamphlet, and need not be here repeated. The reader, however, is requested to turn to it, that he may at once perceive the character of the objection which has been urged, again and again, in speeches at public meetings, and even embodied in Resolutions, which are said to have been carried by acclamation. The answer is, that the objection is utterly unfounded, and shows with what haste even some good people have permitted themselves to judge of a subject which they never took the pains to understand. They have even pledged themselves to persevere in a course of agitation, till the rule, as they are pleased to denominate it, shall be expunged from the statute-book of the Connexion, lest other expulsions should be effected under its sanction. Whereas the fact is, as every one may see, no man was ever expelled under that rule, and never can be. It is, in fact, an explanatory declaration respecting the duties and rights of District-Meetings. But District-Meetings, as such, have no power of expulsion, and never had. That some Local Preachers, Class-Leaders, Circuit and Society Stewards, should have adopted Resolutions, and circulated them by means of the press to the widest possible extent, embodying so palpable a misstatement, is deeply to be lamented, and must be to themselves, when they shall reflect upon the matter, an occasion of unfeigned regret.

Officers in the Wesleyan body, who have suffered themselves to be thus misled, we conceive are all bound, as Christian men, to send forth counter-statements through the three kingdoms, with their own signatures affixed, recalling their former Resolutions, and asking pardon of the Ministers whom they were bound highly to esteem for their work's sake, but whom they have openly misrepresented and traduced. The late expulsions took place under no law of 1835, but under the common law of Methodism; the law upon which Mr. Wesley acted through the entire course of his public life, and upon which the Conference has invariably acted since his death; the law of examining all the Ministers connected with it every year, and of discarding all such as, in its conscientious judgment, are unfit any longer to be employed under its direction. Upon these terms Mr. Wesley received all the Preachers that laboured in connexion with him; upon these terms every Preacher, without

exception, is received by the Conference; and upon these terms the expelled men themselves were all received, and were continued, up to the very time of their expulsion.

3. It is alleged, that the manner in which the expulsions were effected was un-English, because the men were required to answer questions which might fix upon themselves the charge of moral blame. Whereas no Englishman is bound to criminate himself.

This is a very popular objection; but it will not bear the test of a strict scrutiny. In our courts of justice, indeed, persons who are under criminal charges are not required to say anything that might be of disservice to them in their defence; and cautions to this effect are often humanely given to them both by Magistrates and Judges. But then it is equally true that persons who are arraigned at our criminal tribunals are not the only people that have to do with English law and English usage. Even in our criminal courts, witnesses are often not only compelled to appear, but to submit to a searching examination as to the past transactions of their lives, and to disclose facts which inflict a permanent injury upon their reputation; for without such examinations the ends of public justice could not be secured. In the Court of Chancery parties are treated in a somewhat similar manner, being compelled to give distinct and explicit answers to questions, which for ever damage their own character. Who has not read in the public papers the torturing examinations to which insolvent debtors are compelled to submit in the Court of Bankruptcy? In the County Courts, in the department of the Customs and of the Excise, and in the enforcement of the Income Tax, the system of personal examination is pursued, to the great annoyance of parties whose intentions are not perfectly upright.

The same course is pursued in domestic life, and among professional and commercial men. When any mischief occurs in a family, is it not the universal practice to question the children and servants as to their participation in it? Who deems such inquiries "un-English?" or will be satisfied with less than an explicit answer? What company of naval or military officers, or society of literary or of scientific men, would remain silent, when it had been ascertained that one or more of themselves had published a libel upon the rest? Suppose a company of men to enter into a partnership, for the purpose of conducting to their mutual advantage any particular business; and after they have for some time prosecuted their plans with success, they find that one of themselves is, by some secret process, counterworking the rest, so as to secure his own gain, and their ruin; would not the injured men feel themselves entitled to ask every member of their fraternity, whether or not he was the guilty man? Would the plea of "English liberty" avail to screen any one of them from the inquiry, and from the obligation to return an explicit answer? And would not measures be immediately taken to dissolve all partnership with the man who should pertinaciously say, "I will meet any charges that you have to prefer; but I will answer no questions?"

With respect to the questioning of Englishmen on matters which affect their own reputation, we would invite attention to that very solemn form of adjuration with which the marriage-service of the Church of England begins. Thus the proposed bridegroom and his spouse are addressed from the altar: "I require and charge you both, as ye will answer at the dreadful day of judgment, when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed, that if either of you know any impediment why ye may not be lawfully joined together in matrimony, ye do now confess it. For be ye well assured, that so many as are coupled together otherwise than God's word doth allow are not joined together by God; neither is their matrimony lawful."

The following principles are involved in this solemn appeal:—(1.) That there may be something in existence which would render a proposed marriage sinful in the sight of God. (2.) That one or both of the parties may have a knowledge of this fact. (3.) That they have, nevertheless, come to the house of God for the express purpose of doing that which they know He has forbidden. (4.) That a third party may and ought, in a matter of such importance, to interpose, by solemn inquiry, for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not there is any guilty concealment in the case. (5.) That the parties are bound to confess this secret, so that the sin may not be actually committed. It cannot be said, that this example of questioning, with the design of bringing to light possible criminality, is "un-English;" for it received the sanction of the English Legislature ages ago; and millions of English people, of both sexes, and of every grade in society, have for several generations submitted to it without a murmur.

When these facts are duly considered, perhaps it will be thought that to ask questions respecting personal conduct is not quite so alien from English practice as some people have hastily supposed; and certainly examples of it occur in holy Scripture, and that under the direct sanction of Almighty God, whose own recognised servants were employed in making the inquiries. "And *Joshua said* unto Achan, My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession unto him; and *tell me now what thou hast done; hide it not from me*. And Achan *answered Joshua*, and said, Indeed I have sinned against the Lord God of Israel, and *thus and thus have I done*." (Joshua vii. 19, 20.) The question which *St. Peter* addressed to Sapphira had a similar bearing. She and her husband had agreed together to practise deceit, "And Peter answered unto her, *Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much?*" This question was followed by the repetition of a lie, which was punished with instant death. (Acts v. 8—10.)

4. It has been urged, as an objection against the Conference, that before it proceeded to deal with the supposed writers of the "Fly-Sheets," it ought to have instituted an inquiry into the truth of the charges which these pamphlets contain.

This language is held by several parties, who profess to be the friends of Methodism, and of fair-dealing; but with singular injustice and inconsideration. Here are certain accusers; but they are nameless and intangible, and they adduce no proof of their allegations; the parties accused avow their innocence, and challenge investigation; the Conference does not believe the charges, but is ready to hear evidence, if any man, or body of men, will come forward and produce it. Let, then, the men who in printed Resolutions insinuate their belief of the "Fly-Sheet" slanders, and therefore call for investigation,—that it may be ascertained whether some of the most esteemed and useful Ministers that the Wesleyan body ever knew are not in reality worthless knaves,—themselves come forward as accusers and witnesses, if they have anything to say, and any right to be heard; or, as Mr. Wesley said in a similar case, let them hereafter for ever hold their peace. This is the only course that is open to them as honourable men.

5. It is objected that the proceedings of the late Conference were "tyrannical," "cruel," and "an infringement upon the rights of Englishmen."

Let us examine these charges in detail. The Conference is accused of "tyranny" in proposing certain questions to some of its members, and requiring of them a promise as to their future conduct. "What light," it has been said, "had the Conference either to propose the questions, or to demand the promise?" The answer is, The Conference had the right, because the parties had conceded it of their own free will; and if they wished to withdraw the concession, their duty was quietly to retire. The Conference has no right over any of its members, but what is thus conceded. It is intrusted with the appointment of men to the occupancy of the Wesleyan pulpits; but they must be men of certain peculiarities of character, holding certain tenets, and pledged to a certain course of moral conduct and of church order. Persons who prefer this ministry offer themselves as Candidates for it; they voluntarily submit to the required examinations, and, if approved, engage to comply with all the regulations and usages of the body with which they are united. As their entrance into this ministry is voluntary, so is their continuance in it. No man is compelled to remain in it an hour longer than he feels it to be a privilege and a duty. To talk of "tyranny" is palpably absurd where all is perfectly optional.

As to "torture" under the questionings of the Conference, and "torture" compared with that of the Romish Inquisition, if there was any, it could only arise from an uneasy conscience. It can be no "torture" to an innocent man to have an opportunity of declaring his innocence before brethren who are willing to receive his testimony; or even to avow the uprightness of his intentions with respect to the future. In such a case all "torture" implies conscious guilt.

That the discipline under which a Methodist Preacher is placed is "an interference with the rights of Englishmen," is very true, but very irrelevant; for so are the regulations of all voluntary associations into which Englishmen think it desirable to enter. An Englishman has a right to keep his money in his pocket; but when he enters into a benefit society, he is bound to certain payments, by which that right is to some extent superseded. An Englishman, as such, is not bound to any particular form of religion. He may be a Deist, or even an Atheist; but when he joins a Methodist society, he must meet in class, read his Bible, sanctify the Sabbath, attend public worship, and adorn the doctrine of his God and Saviour. So when a man enters the Wesleyan ministry, he comes under an obligation to observe all the rules by which that ministry is controlled and directed. But having done this of his own choice, he is still a free man; for even the discipline to which he submits is beneficial; and if it be not so regarded, he can shake it off whenever he pleases. To complain of being shackled by the rules of a voluntary association is the perfection of folly. Why were the shackles put on, why are they worn, if they are not looked upon as a means of securing some important benefit?

6. It is alleged that the expelled Ministers would have dishonoured themselves, if they had submitted to answer the questions which the Conference proposed to them; and that the questions therefore ought not to have been proposed. One of the men who refused to answer, urged this plea repeatedly: "I cannot answer," said he; "for were I to do so, I should feel myself dishonoured."

To show the unsatisfactory nature of this excuse, we would observe that the feeling of personal honour is a very equivocal rule of duty among Christian people. The confession of sin to God is always required; and the confession of it to men is often matter of imperative obligation. But when a man knows himself to be innocent of a suspected crime, he cannot be dishonoured by declaring the truth. Upwards of eleven hundred Wesleyan Ministers have declared their innocence of the "Fly-Sheet" sin, and are held in undiminished respect by every pure-minded man.

But it may be asked, How have wise and good men generally acted in similar cases, when evil has been imputed to them, or they have been under suspicion? Hear John Wesley, speaking of himself, when he was clamorously assailed by the Dublin press, at the close of his upright and eventful life! "This is my answer to them that trouble me, and will not let my grey hairs go down to the grave in peace. I am not a man of duplicity:

I am not an old hypocrite, a double-tongued knave. More than forty years I have frequented Ireland. I have wished to do some good there. I now tell a plain tale, that the good which is in me may not be evil spoken of. I have no temporal end to serve. I seek not the honour that cometh of men. It is not for pleasure that, at this time of life, I travel three or four thousand miles a year. It is not for gain.

*'No foot of land do I posses
No cottage in this wilderness;
A poor way-faring man,
I lodge awhile in tents below,
Or gladly wander to and fro,
Till I my Canaan gain.'*

Wesley's Works, vol. xiii., pp. 237, 238. Octavo edit,

When Charles Wesley was basely slandered by an apostate Methodist, of the name of Williams, in the year 1744, he published a hymn, from which the following stanzas are selected:—

*"O my Galilean King,
Can I glory in this shame?
Can I this dishonour bring
As a suffering for thy Name?
Lord, Thou know'st, and Thou alone,
All our hearts to Thee are known.*

*"Naked, and without disguise,
In Thy sight my spirit stands;
Have I not from outward vice
Wash'd in innocence my hands,
From the great transgression free?
LORD, I dare appeal to THEE!*

*"Inwardly, like other men,
Wholly born in sin I am;
Only Thou didst still restrain
For the honour of thy Name;
Kept by Thine almighty grace,
THEE I render all the praise!"*

Charles Wesley's Journal, vol. i., pp. 390, 391.

But we have higher authority to plead than even that of the Wesleys. The inspired Apostles of our Lord did not hesitate to avow their own moral integrity when it was called in question, and when their ministry was therefore in danger of being despised. Thus the Apostle of the Gentiles speaks of himself, and of his brethren: "Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; but have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." (2 Cor. iv. 1, 2.) "Receive us; we have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man." (2 Cor. vii. 2.)

That which was done by the Wesleys, and by the Apostles of our Lord, could be no dishonour to a Methodist Preacher, standing before his brethren in the Conference, supposing him to have a good conscience, and therefore to be under no restraint from an inward sense of guilt.

7. It is further maintained, that in regard of the expulsions which are the subject of our present inquiry, the Conference must be in the wrong, because it is opposed and censured by the public press.

To this we answer, that in many quarters the public press is neutral, having declared no judgment on either

side; and that, in several cases, the public press has taken the part of the Conference; especially that section of the press which is characterized by high moral bearing, by consistency of principle, and by the advocacy of sound Protestantism. But let us glance at that portion of the press which is hostile to the Conference, and we shall perhaps find that its opposition can be accounted for, and that it is less formidable than some people have imagined.

First, there is the "Weekly Dispatch," which is decidedly opposed to the Conference in this whole affair. But then this paper is a recognised organ of infidelity and licentiousness in their grossest forms, and is the favourite vehicle of intelligence with Sabbath-breakers, drunkards, and all classes of irreligious people: so that its hostility is incomparably more honourable than its friendship, in all cases where religion and Christian morals are concerned.

Next there is a large class of secular papers, both metropolitan and provincial, which affect a character of liberalism. They are mostly occupied with politics and general intelligence, so as seldom to introduce religion, except when any quarrel among its professors happens to occur, and a hint can be advantageously given that people should carefully abstain from being "righteous overmuch." The conductors of such journals, of course, think that the expelled men have been harshly treated; for why should the Conference question its members either in respect of their tenets or practices? Other people can believe and act as they please, and why may not Methodist Preachers? To question men respecting points of doctrine and of moral practice, in the estimation of these gentlemen, is as intolerable as the Inquisition, and the proceedings of Laud in the Star Chamber. "The carnal mind is enmity against God;" and religious people only deceive themselves if they suppose that in this "liberal age," that "enmity" has undergone any abatement in unsanctified men. It is as deep and intense as it was when the Wesleys were buffeted by the mobs of Staffordshire; and if Methodist Preachers will still appear as the unflinching advocates of spiritual religion, and of the faith and holiness which the Gospel enjoins, bearing a faithful testimony against sin in all its forms, they may escape the violence of mobs, but they will receive no mercy from the men who deem religious truth of little moment, and would place Popery on a level with Protestantism, and Hindooism with Christianity. And such, to a great extent, is the character of the liberalism with which much of our periodical literature is imbued, but with which true Methodism has no sympathy.

The organs of Popery and Tractarianism are, of course, opposed to the Conference, because its Ministers, having only received Presbyterian ordination, are not in the assumed "apostolical succession;" so that for them to perform ministerial acts is a most unpardonable presumption. The writers of these prints would persuade the Methodists that the exercise of private judgment is connected with so much turmoil, they would do well to wave it, and allow "holy mother church" to think for them, and just tell them what to believe and do; but as we have no confidence in her wisdom, we decline the advice.

We must not forget the Dissenting press, which is bitterly hostile to the Conference, as it always has been; and for this plain reason,—the Conference is the centre of union to all the Wesleyan societies, and many Dissenters would like to see all those societies transformed into Independent churches, after their own example. There is also another ground of hostility. Within the last few years some of the Dissenters have put forth strenuous efforts to effect a separation between the Church and the State, and have not succeeded. They wished the Conference to join them in this enterprise, and were refused; its members feeling that, whatever the opinions of individuals among themselves might be, as this was no object of their union, so it would neither be respectful to their Founder, nor consistent with their own often-repeated professions. On these grounds, and others that might be named, the Dissenting journalists, without any intentional provocation from the Wesleyans, pour forth against the five or six hundred Ministers, who composed the late Conference, the most intolerant and disgraceful vituperations.

Far be it from us to include the entire body of English Dissenters in this censure. Not a few of them breathe the spirit of Christian toleration, while they profess its principles. Some of these, it is probable, without any feeling of hostility to their Wesleyan brethren, not perceiving the exact nature of the relation in which Methodist Ministers stand to each other, may think that the Conference has acted with undue severity in its recent expulsions. Let us, then, suppose the case of an Independent or of a Baptist Minister, who has a co-Pastor. They occupy the same pulpit, they teach the same doctrine, they administer together the memorials of redeeming mercy, they sustain the same pastoral relation; and are thus united by the most sacred ties that can by possibility bind man to man; at the same time that they have by solemn vows bound themselves to the strict observance of an unchangeable fidelity. After labouring together in harmony and with success for many years, the senior Minister is surprised by the appearance and circulation of a pamphlet, reflecting in the severest terms upon his public and personal character, and also upon the character of his family. It represents him as indolent, ambitious, selfish, extravagant in his habits, intemperate, and morally dishonest. The pamphlet bears no name of either printer or author. It is followed by a second, a third, and a fourth; and the system of annoyance is carried on for three or four years with unmitigated malignity, till the friends of the persecuted man are staggered, his usefulness as a Minister is impaired, and his family distressed. He mentions the case to the

members of his church, and to various persons belonging to his congregation, and expresses an anxious desire to discover the author of the mischief. They declare, as with one voice, that, beyond all doubt, his co-Pastor is the man; for the pamphlets breathe his bitter and sarcastic spirit; they embody things which he has often been heard to utter in conversation; they accord with his well-known habit of anonymous writing, and they correspond with his usual style. We ask, Would not this injured Minister be bound to mention these suspicions to his co-Pastor, and ask him whether they were true or not? Would not justice both to himself and his colleague require this? justice to himself, as deeply injured; and justice to the other, who might be innocent, and should therefore have an opportunity of dealing himself. Suppose that the suspected man, instead of giving a frank and candid answer, and of expressing sympathy with his suffering brother, should assume an air of importance, talk of his rights as an Englishman, and, in a tone of insult, should say, "If you have any evidence against me, produce it: but I will answer none of your questions. I defy you." Would not the injured man be justified in believing the worst, and in saying, "I am not at present provided with direct evidence of your guilt; but since you deny me all assurance that you are innocent of this act of enormous immorality, our co-pastorship must now end: I can never publicly acknowledge as a brother Minister a man who is universally suspected of such wickedness, and who will not even deny it; because such conduct would, on my part, be a tacit confession that I am guilty of the things which are laid to my charge?" Supply the names, and all the particulars of this supposed case are applicable to the Conference and to the men whom it has expelled.

In the category of hostile journals we must also place a weekly print, whose title and contents form a perfect contrast to each other. It is one of a series of publications, by which it has been attempted, under the name of WESLEY, to pull down what it was the business of John Wesley's life to build up. Its efforts are incessantly directed to the setting of young Ministers in the Wesleyan body against aged Ministers, the Local Preachers against the Itinerant Preachers, the societies against their Pastors, the Connexion against the Conference, and evangelical Christians in general against the Wesleyan Missionary Society. The title which this print bears is as palpable a fraud as would be a periodical defence of Popery under the name of Luther; of sedition under the name of Wellington; or of infidelity under the name of St. Paul. Religious people who imbibe the spirit of this print will inevitably in the same proportion lose their piety. They will cease to be charitable, prayerful, and happy; and will become jealous, malignant, and disputatious; and parents who place it within the reach of their children will soon see their unsuspecting offspring loathe the very name of Christian godliness. One of the greatest injuries that can by possibility be inflicted upon a youthful mind, is the exhibition of incessant reviling in connexion with a profession of spiritual religion.

Conclusion.

NECESSARY and justifiable as it is contended the recent expulsions by the Conference were, it cannot be denied, that they have given deep offence to many persons who not only belong to the Wesleyan societies, but who also sustain important offices in them. This is no more than might have been expected, considering the attempts which have long been made, by a selfish and unscrupulous press, to bring the Ministers of our body generally under suspicion and contempt: so that, if these expulsions had not occurred, occasion would unquestionably have been taken from something else, to give expression to hostile feelings for which many minds have been prepared, by a long course of unblushing misrepresentation. Even the late Conference has been publicly described as disorderly, riotous, capricious, and intolerant, regardless of all propriety, and of the rules by which deliberative assemblies are usually governed. It has been so described in the print to which reference has been just made; and these sinful misstatements have been left to produce their effects. I have been accustomed to attend the Annual Conferences for more than forty years; and I solemnly aver, that on no former occasion of the assembling of that body did I witness more striking indications of devout feeling, a greater regard for order, or a stronger desire to extend mercy to the utmost limit that was at all consistent with the maintenance of its own purity. But the Conference could not suffer its time to be wasted by irrelevant and vituperative speeches, which, after all, were manifestly intended less for its members than for the public; nor could it allow itself and its officers to be treated with insult and contumely.

It is also to be observed that nearly all the men who have put forth Resolutions against the late Conference, have said that the expulsions took place under the rule of 1835, than which there could not be a greater error. Under that rule (or declaratory resolution rather, for it is nothing more) no man ever was expelled, or ever can be, for a reason which has been already stated, and which every one must perceive. The men are said to have been expelled for contumacy. This is true, but it is not the whole truth. The Conference is not wont to visit cases of ordinary contumacy with so severe a penalty as expulsion. The man who was regarded as the principal offender was expelled for contumaciously refusing either to acknowledge his guilt, or to purge himself from a course of flagrant immorality,—the publication of a series of atrocious libels upon personal character; such

libels as no honourable society of professional men would tolerate in any of its members; such libels as have rendered many a British subject amenable to the laws of his country, and have subjected to heavy fines, and even to imprisonment in a common jail. Was it right that such a man should receive the public sanction of the Methodist Conference, as a Minister of Christ? For this exercise of discipline some office-bearers in various Circuits have unceremoniously published censures upon the entire and collective pastorate of the body to which they belong; and even threaten to withhold their support from the several funds by which the cause of Christianity is maintained and extended.

Cases of this nature, however much they are to be lamented, are, unhappily, no novelties, as the records of the church too plainly show. Even the Apostles were not exempted from trials of this kind. "The disciple whom Jesus loved" had occasion to mention at least one person of influence and distinction in the church, who "prated against him with malicious words." St. Paul also speaks of his "perils among false brethren," as well as from Heathens and Jews. In consequence of his extraordinary diligence in his ministry, continued for two years in one particular region, it is said, "All they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks." (Acts xix. 10.) That his success among them was great, is manifest from the following chapter, which contains his parting address, and a warning that "from among themselves would men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." These men were successful in their divisive schemes, so that when the Apostle was "about to be offered up," and "the time of his departure was at hand," he had occasion to say to his son Timothy, "This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me." (2 Tim. i. 15.) A sad proof this of instability even among religious people. If the "many tears," the public preaching, the pastoral visitation, the devotedness, the self-denial, of St. Paul were thus requited, if he were left to pine in a dungeon, and to die by the hand of the public executioner, without the slightest sympathy from immense bodies of people whom he had instrumentally turned to Christianity, from the guilt and misery of Heathenism,—let not Wesleyan Ministers either murmur or be surprised, if their spiritual children, in the hour of temptation, should listen to the mis-statements of an ungodly press, and traduce the men whom they are bound by every tie to esteem and love. It was not in vain that this inspired servant of Christ said, "Be patient toward all men." Yet the people who were "turned away" from St. Paul were all undeniably in the wrong.

With the official men among the Methodists, who have published Resolutions against the Conference, it may be hoped, however, that the dispute will soon terminate; for most of them declare an inalienable attachment to Methodism as it was administered by Mr. Wesley. Now we have shown that in the very first Conference Mr. Wesley laid down the principle of personal examination as applicable to all the Preachers that should labour in connexion with him; upon that principle he acted with respect to every one of them to the end of his life; he devolved upon the Conference the task of carrying out his plans after his death; and in the "Deed of Declaration," by which he invested the Conference with its powers, and defined its duties, he distinctly intimated that the annual examination of its members was to be no matter of mere form, but a means of preserving the body, in every respect, pure and uncorrupt: for he thus stated his purpose: "The Conference shall and may expel and put out from being a member thereof, or from being in connexion therewith, or from being upon trial, any person, member of the Conference, or admitted into connexion, or upon trial, for any cause which to the Conference may seem fit or necessary; and every member of the Conference so expelled and put out, shall cease to be a member thereof, to all intents and purposes, as though he were naturally dead."

Wesley's Works, vol. iv., pp. 508, 509.

In the fulfilment of its trust, the late Conference, in the examination of its members, found three who were deemed unfit to be any longer intrusted with this ministry, and therefore dismissed them, agreeably to Mr. Wesley's own practice and arrangements. This mode of dealing with men who are regarded as unfaithful is therefore no novelty, and no innovation; but is as old as Wesleyan Methodism itself. It cannot be then, that men who revere the memory of Mr. Wesley, and in reality approve of his plans, will long persist in raising a clamour against the Conference on account of its late expulsions. The extracts which we have given from the Minutes of Conference, published by Mr. Wesley himself, clearly prove that he required from his Preachers answers, which were quite as stringent and searching as any that were proposed by the late Conference to the men whom it was reluctantly compelled to disown.

But it was never difficult to create prejudice against authority. Even Moses, who acted solely as the vicegerent of God, and whose divine commission was demonstrated by miracles which caused "amazed heaven and earth to shake," was openly resisted, and accused of "taking too much upon himself." A vain and worthless son of David succeeded in alienating the people from their allegiance, and in sending the aged Monarch into exile. It has, therefore, been justly and beautifully observed, by a wise and holy man of a former age: "He that goeth about to persuade a multitude that they are not so well governed as they ought to be, shall never want attentive and favourable hearers, because they know the manifold defects whereunto every kind of regiment is subject; but the secret lets and difficulties, which in public proceedings are innumerable and inevitable, they have not ordinarily the judgment to consider. And because such as openly reprove supposed disorders of state

are taken for principal friends to the common benefit of all, and for men that carry singular freedom of mind: under this fair and plausible colour, whatsoever they utter passeth for good and current. That which wanteth in the weight of their speech is supplied by the aptness of men's minds to accept and believe it. Whereas, on the other side, if we maintain things that are established, we have not only to strive with a number of heavy prejudices deeply rooted in the hearts of men, who think that herein we serve the time, and speak in favour of the present state, because thereby we either hold or seek preferment; but also to bear such exceptions as minds so averted beforehand usually take against that which they are loth should be poured into them."

Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, book i., see. i.

Some persons seem to think that the system of Conference questioning, although instituted by Mr. Wesley, and intended by him to be practised as long as that body might remain, should now be abandoned, as being contrary to "the spirit of the age," and therefore distasteful to the public mind. To people who entertain these views we would take leave to say, that "the spirit of the age," in whatever light it may be viewed, is a variable and evanescent thing; so that the spirit of one age is not the spirit of another: whereas the principles of evangelical truth and morals, like their divine Author, are immutable. Christians are not to be carried about by the fluctuating opinions of the world; but having ascertained the mind of God, by a prayerful study of His word, are to "walk by the same rule, and to mind the same thing;" remembering the apostolic admonition, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God." It is in perfect consistency with "the spirit of the age" for large masses of people to assemble, consisting of young and old, male and female, infidels, libertines, Chartists, scoffers, and professors of religion, and at the mention of the names of even aged Ministers, whom God has long blessed and owned in their work, to hiss and groan and stamp like Legion, just come from the tombs; but there is "another Spirit," which says, "We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake." (1 Thess. v. 12, 13.) "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you." (Heb. xiii. 17.) If our blessed Lord and his Apostles, if Mr. Wesley, and other eminent instruments of usefulness, had taken "the spirit of the age" for their guide, what would have been the state of the world at this day?

It has also been said that as the system of questioning, as it is practised by the Conference, is liable to abuse, it would be well, on this account, to abandon it, and thus prevent all future occasion of offence and excitement, such as now prevail. Men have thus expressed themselves in public meetings; but it is difficult to believe that they are serious. If we ought to renounce everything that may be abused, what are we to retain? We must neither eat nor drink; for both have been abused to the purpose of intemperance. We must not profess religion; for this has been used as a covering of base designs. Class-Leaders are to see the members of their classes once a week, to inquire how their souls prosper. Is this also to be given up, because it may be abused by impertinence? But then this practice, so far as the Conference is concerned, never has been abused. It has been in use for more than a century; and no instance of its abuse has been recorded; nor was any complaint against it ever heard of till the late Conference, when it was applied to parties who shrunk from the test. They, of course, complain of it; but others regard this instance of its application as a public benefit, and would not, on any account, reverse what has been done, especially considering the spirit of the men on whom these acts of discipline have been passed.

It is further to be observed that the system in question has not only been harmless, but eminently useful; having been one principal means of preserving the doctrinal purity of the Wesleyan ministry; so that it has never, at any period, assumed an heretical character. When any departure from catholic truth has appeared, it has instantly been resisted and suppressed. It was the honest boast of Mr. Wesley, more than a century ago, that the societies who were under his care were all sound in the faith. "Where is there a body of people in the realm," said he, "who, number for number, so closely adhere to what our Church delivers as pure doctrine? Where are those who have approved and do approve themselves more orthodox, more sound in their opinions? Is there a Socinian or an Arian among them all? Nay, were you to recite the whole catalogue of heresies enumerated by Bishop Pearson, it might be asked, Who can lay any one of these to their charge?"

Wesley's Works, vol. viii., p. 205.

At this day there are connected with the British Conference one thousand seven hundred and seventy Ministers and Preachers on trial; and in respect of doctrinal sentiment, Mr. Wesley's appeal is strictly applicable to the whole of them. Is it a light matter that such a body of men, whose labours are incessant, widely extended, and carried on in perpetuity, should have been preserved from the pestilential errors, which have utterly ruined many churches that were once large and flourishing; and that their teaching should have uniformly been of a healthy character? Let the unthinking men who would remove one of the strongest guards of orthodoxy in the Wesleyan body, contemplate the withering effects of doctrinal error upon the Presbyterian churches of England, upon the Protestant churches of Poland, of Germany, of Switzerland, and of France, and learn wisdom by the

facts of history. Men who duly consider the importance of truth, and the terrible effects of corrupt doctrine, at different periods of the church, will pause seriously and long before they hastily abandon a practice from which the most substantial benefits have arisen for more than a century. Many parts of Christendom at this day, through the want of an efficient discipline among Ministers, are a barren waste; while the Wesleyan section of the church, with its Conference and its strict disciplinary arrangements, is as the garden of the Lord, equally verdant and fruitful.

Besides, if the Conference were to be so infatuated as to discontinue the practice of examining the Wesleyan Ministers, it would at the same time abandon its great trust, the trust for the execution of which it was itself created; and in this case it would be bound in honour to dissolve itself. A Conference sending forth from year to year unexamined Ministers, who should be at liberty to preach what they pleased, and to live as they pleased, so as not to outrage public decency, and to provoke an impeachment, would not be the Conference that John Wesley constituted. But the evil would soon work its own cure; for pious people would refuse to receive such men, and to submit to their pastoral rule; so that the appointments of a faithless Conference would be null and void.

And as Wesleyan Methodism, founded on the connexional principle, has worked well in respect of the maintenance of Christian doctrine and morals; so it has worked no less beneficially as to the spread of divine truth, and the advancement of spiritual religion. We have no quarrel with Christians of the Independent denomination, some of whom at present, through the medium of their recognised organs, load us with abuse; nor should we ever publicly animadvert either upon them or their system, if they would allow us peacefully to follow our own plans of evangelical labour. But they force us to a comparison of their ecclesiastical system and our own. Christianity is intended by its Author to be the one religion of mankind: for He has commanded that his Gospel should be preached to every creature; and therefore to the retired villager, as well as to the inhabitant of the crowded city. But what has Independency ever done for the scattered peasantry of either this or any other nation? It has ranked under its banners many Ministers equally eminent for scholarship and piety; it has erected large chapels, and collected large congregations, in populous districts and towns; and their influence in their several localities has been and is now a public blessing, in which every good man is bound to rejoice. Independency took its rise in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, more than a century before the Wesleys were born; but where are its trophies among the thinly-scattered population of our agricultural villages? In less than half the time during which the principles of Independency have been in operation, Wesleyan Methodism, with its connexional form, and its Conference, has erected thousands of chapels in these villages, and raised up in connexion with them thousands of societies and congregations, with their Sunday-schools, their Missionary associations, and all the apparatus of a living Christianity. Ten thousand Methodist peasants at this day, in the midst of poverty and privation, present as fine examples of spiritual religion, both in life and death, as the church of God has ever seen, even in her best and palmiest days.

Whence arises this difference? Are such men as James and Leifchild less zealous for the honour of Christ and the salvation of men than Methodist Preachers are? Far from it. The difference is doubtless to be found in the systems. In the extension of the work of God, Independency is comparatively powerless, because it is single-handed. The strength of Wesleyan Methodism lies mainly in its connexional unity. Its Ministers are stationed, generally two or three of them together, in large towns, where they are principally supported by numerous societies, and are therefore able, upon a regular and systematic plan, to extend their labours into the surrounding villages and hamlets, without imposing any oppressive burden upon the humble peasants, to whom they minister the word of life; and if, after all, these country Circuits are unable fully to support their own ministry, the deficiency is usually supplied out of a general fund, to which all the societies and congregations contribute.

Shall then this beautiful system of evangelical operation, of which the Conference is the centre and bond of union, and upon which the blessing of God has so marvellously rested for more than a century, be broken up, and abandoned? So in effect say the Dissenting journalists, whose cry is, "'Rase it, rase it, even to the foundation thereof!' Extinguish the Conference, with all its discipline and regulations; set the people free, and let them choose their own Ministers, and act for themselves;" and it is matter of surprise and regret, that some of our own professed friends are so faithless or ill-informed as to abet these hostile journalists in their clamour; forgetting that if the Conference be extinguished, the itinerant ministry which Mr. Wesley instituted would necessarily cease. But even in this case, the societies would not be allowed to choose their own Ministers, upon the Independent plan. The appointment of them, according to the "Deed of Declaration," would be vested in the Trustees, and the people would have no power to help themselves.

"Whenever the said Conference shall be reduced under the number of forty members, and continue so reduced for three yearly assemblies thereof successively, or whenever the members thereof shall decline or neglect to meet together annually for the purposes aforesaid, during the space of three years, that then, and in either of the said events, the Conference of the people called Methodists shall be extinguished, and all the

aforesaid powers, privileges, and advantages shall cease, and the said chapels and premises, and all other chapels and premises, which now are or hereafter may be, settled, given, or conveyed, upon the trusts aforesaid, shall VEST IN THE TRUSTEES for the time being of the said chapels and premises respectively, and THEIR SUCCESSORS FOR EVER; upon trust that they, and the survivors of them, and the Trustees for the time being, do, shall, and may appoint such person and persons to preach and expound God's holy word therein, and to have the use and enjoyment thereof, for such time, and such manner, as TO THEM shall seem proper." (Wesley's Works, vol. iv., pp. 510, 511.)

But supposing all the societies were allowed to choose their own Ministers, there are thousands of them who could not support them when they were chosen; and hence endless bickerings and confusion would inevitably ensue. What could fifteen, or twenty, or even thirty farmers' labourers, with their wives and children, do in the support of an Independent Minister? But they are happy and prosperous as a Methodist society, connected with other societies, and aided in their Circuit by the funds of the body.

The question therefore naturally arises, "Will the Conference, in consequence of this pressure both within and from without, either violate its trust, or abandon it?" It is bound, by God's blessing, to provide for the Wesleyan pulpits a ministry which is at once evangelical, spiritual, and morally pure. It has hitherto fulfilled its trust, and stands pledged to the continued fulfilment of it. *In the faith of this pledge millions of money have been expended in the erection of Methodist chapels, and of Ministers' dwelling-houses; and upwards of three hundred and seventy thousand people, in the United Kingdom alone, have enrolled themselves as members of the Wesleyan societies, in the faith that they should have an itinerant ministry possessing these characteristics.* Shall all these interests be sacrificed? Shall the Conference either dissolve itself, or cease with conscientious care to examine the Ministers whom it sends forth with its sanction? Shall it force upon a confiding people men of doubtful orthodoxy, or of doubtful morals? Will the Conference so succumb to the clamour of worldly, infidel, or even Dissenting journalists, as to betray a trust so sacred and momentous, and involving the interests of generations yet unborn? The united heart of the Conference, and of its pious and intelligent societies throughout the world, responds, as with a voice of thunder, NEVER, NO NEVER, NO NEVER! A THOUSAND TIMES, NEVER!

Thank God, the Methodist Conference yet stands, after the changes and the lapse of a hundred years, as one of the most important institutions of the country, a witness to the truth, a conservator of vital Christianity, of social order, and of religious freedom; a breakwater against the intolerance of Popery and of its twin-sister Tractarianism, on the one hand, and against the equally violent intolerance of ultra-Dissent, on the other. The Conference was never stronger than it is at this day. It is strong in the religious and sanctified unity of its own members: it is strong in the consciousness of its own integrity, of which it has given demonstrative proof by expelling the men who know its affairs, and charge it with unfaithfulness and abuses; thus challenging and compelling its accusers to tell all that they know. The Conference is strong in the confidence, affection, and loyalty of the societies generally, of which they have given and still give substantial proof. Above all, the Conference is strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might; for, while in the fulfilment of its trust it is acknowledged to have fallen into inadvertencies, and has shown such infirmities as are incident even to the wisest and best of men, it has never, at any period of its existence, tolerated "either error in doctrine, or viciousness of life."

Let history then record the fact, that when a large portion of the British press combined to assail the Wesleyan Conference, and some of the Methodists themselves joined in the clamour, the mighty charge which they preferred against that venerable body was, that, in accordance with its own recognised principles and usages from the beginning, and to which it was solemnly pledged to adhere, it expelled one of its members, because he would not, when under general suspicion, purge himself of the meanness and the sin of propagating falsehood and slander by means of a clandestine press; and two others, his accomplices, because they would not promise to abstain from a similar system of annoyance and agitation.

Appendix.

Mr. Wesley's Power.

"THERE is nothing new under the sun." Eighty-three years ago, the very objections which are now so vehemently urged against the Conference were urged against Mr. Wesley, and in the very same terms, as the following extract from the Minutes of Conference, of the year clearly show. He was accused of "tyranny," of "shackling free-born Englishmen," and of introducing "Popery."

Q. But what power is this, which you exercise over all the Methodists in Great Britain and Ireland?

A. Count Z. loved to keep all things closely. I love to do all things openly. I will, therefore, tell you all I know of the matter, taking it from the very beginning.

1. In November, 1738, two or three persons, who desired to flee from the wrath to come, and then seven or

eight more, came to me in London, and desired me to advise and pray with them. I said, "If you will meet on Thursday night, I will help you as well as I can." More and more then desired to meet with them, till they were increased to many hundreds. The case was afterwards the same at Bristol, Kingswood, Newcastle, and many other parts of England, Scotland, and Ireland. It may be observed, the desire was on *their* part, not *mine*. My desire was, to live and die in retirement. But I did not see that I could refuse them my help, and be guiltless before God.

Here commenced my power; namely, a power to appoint, when, and where, and how, they should meet; and to remove those whose life showed that they had no desire to "flee from the wrath to come." And this power remained the same, whether the people meeting together were twelve, twelve hundred, or twelve thousand.

2. In a few days, some of them said, "Sir, we will not sit under you for nothing. We will subscribe quarterly." I said, "I will have nothing, for I want nothing. My fellowship supplies me with all, and more than I want." One replied, "Nay, but you want £115 to pay for the lease of the Foundry. And likewise a large sum of money will be wanting to put it into repair." On this consideration, I suffered them to subscribe. And when the society met, I asked, "Who will take the trouble of receiving this money, and paying it where it is needful?" One said, "I will do it, and keep the account for you." So here was the first Steward. Afterwards I desired one or two more to help me as Stewards, and, in process of time, a greater number.

Let it be remarked, it was I myself, not the people, who chose these Stewards, and appointed to each the distinct work, wherein he was to help me, as long as I desired; and herein I began to exercise another sort of power, namely, that of appointing and removing Stewards.

3. After a time, a young man came, T. Maxfield, and said he desired to help me, as a son in the Gospel. Soon after came a second, Thomas Richards, and a third, Thomas Westal. These severally desired to serve me as sons, and to labour when and where I should direct. Observe, these likewise desired me, not I them. But I durst not refuse their assistance. And here commenced my power, to appoint each of these, when, where, and how to labour; that is, while he chose to continue with me: for each had a power to go away when he pleased; as I had also to go away from them, or any of them, if I saw sufficient cause. The case continued the same when the number of Preachers increased. I had just the same power still, to appoint when, and where, and how, each should help me; and to tell any, if I saw cause, "I do not desire your help any longer." On these terms, and no other, we joined at first; on these we continue joined. But they do me no favour in being directed by me. It is true, my reward is with the Lord. But at present I have nothing from it but trouble and care; and often a burden I scarce know how to bear.

4. In 1744 I wrote to several Clergymen, and to all who then served me as sons in the Gospel, desiring them to meet me in London, to give me their advice concerning the best method of carrying on the work of God. They did not desire this meeting, but I did; knowing that "in a multitude of counsellors there is safety." And when their number increased, so that it was neither needful nor convenient to invite them all, for several years I wrote to those with whom I desired to confer, and these only met at the place appointed; till at length I gave a general permission, that all who desired it might come.

Observe: I myself sent for these of my own free choice; and I sent for them to advise, not govern, me. Neither did I at any of those times divest myself of any part of that power above described, which the providence of God had cast upon me, without any design or choice of mine.

What is that power? It is a power of admitting into, and excluding from, the societies under my care; of choosing and removing Stewards; of receiving or not receiving Helpers; of appointing them when, where, and how, to help me; and of desiring any of them to meet me, when I see good. And as it was merely in obedience to the providence of God, and for the good of the people, that I at first accepted this power, which I never sought, nay, a hundred times laboured to throw off; so it is on the same considerations, not for profit, honour, or pleasure, that I use it at this day.

5. But several gentlemen are much offended at my having so much power. My answer to them is this: I did not seek any part of this power. It came upon me unawares. But when it was come, not daring to bury that talent, I used it to the best of my judgment.

Yet I never was fond of it. I always did, and do now, bear it as my burden; the burden which God lays upon me, and therefore I dare not yet lay it down.

But if you can tell me any one, or any five men, to whom I may transfer this burden, who can and will do just what I do now, I will heartily thank both them and you.

6. But some of our Helpers say, "This is *shackling free-born English-men*" and demand a free Conference; that is, a meeting of all the Preachers, wherein all things shall be determined by most votes.

I answer, It is possible, after my death, something of this kind may take place; but not while I live. To *me* the Preachers have engaged themselves to submit, to "serve me as sons in the Gospel." But they are not thus engaged to any man, or number of men, besides. To me the people in general will submit. But they will not yet

submit to any other.

It is nonsense, then, to call my using this power "shackling free-born Englishmen." None needs to submit to it, unless he will; so there is no shackling in the case. Every Preacher and every member may leave me when he pleases. But while he chooses to stay, it is on the same terms that he joined me at first.

"But this is *arbitrary power*; this is no less than *making yourself a Pope*."

If by arbitrary power you mean a power which I exercise singly, without any colleagues therein, this is certainly true; but I see no hurt in it. *Arbitrary*, in this sense, is a very harmless word. If you mean unjust, unreasonable, or tyrannical, then it is not true.

As to the other branch of the charge, it carries no face of truth. The Pope affirms, that every Christian must do all he bids, and believe all he says, under pain of damnation. I never affirmed anything that bears any, the most distant, resemblance to this. All I affirm is, "The Preachers who choose to labour with me, choose to serve me as sons in the Gospel;" and "the people who choose to be under my care, choose to be so, on the same terms they were at first."

Therefore, all talk of this kind is highly injurious to me, who bear this burden merely for *your* sakes. And it is exceedingly mischievous to the people, tending to confound their understandings, and to fill their hearts with evil surmisings and unkind tempers towards me; to whom they really owe more, for taking all this load upon me, for exercising this very power, for shackling myself in this manner, than for all my preaching put together. Because preaching twice or thrice a day is no burden to me at all; but the care of all the Preachers and all the people is a burden indeed!

Minutes, vol. i., pp. 58—61

AT a later period Mr. Wesley had occasion to complain that persons who were under the deepest obligations to him, "lifted up the heel against him," because he declined to adapt his system of church order to their views. His society in Bristol shared largely in his pastoral attention; yet, in the year 1779, several persons in the society there cherished towards him a feeling of deep prejudice, and even of hostility. The ringleader of the faction said, "I think it ray duty to pray that God would take Mr. John Wesley away; that he may do no more harm in the church. It would be a great mercy, if he was dead." In the midst of the agitation Mr. Charles Wesley met the society; and after reasoning and expostulating with the disaffected members, he said, "I will leave you to your own reflections, and call upon *you who love him*, to join me in prayer for his life, in the following hymn:—

Jesus, thy hated servant own, And
send thy glorious Spirit down,
In answer to our prayers;
While others curse, and wish him dead.
Do Thou Thy choicest blessings shed,
And crown his hoary hairs.

Not for his death, but life, we pray,
In mercy lengthen out his day,
Our venerable guide;
Long may he live thy flock to keep,
Protect from wolves the lambs and sheep,
And in his bosom hide.

Long may he live to serve thy cause,
To spread the victory of thy cross,
To minister thy grace;
And late to' increase thy church in heaven.
With all the children thou hast given,
Appear before thy face.

Thou God that answerest by fire,
With fervent faith and strong desire,
Whom we present to Thee,
Fill with pure love his ravish'd breast,
And let the Spirit of glory rest
On all thy church—and me!

Me, me thy meanest messenger,
Admit his happiness to share,
And, intimately one
Through life, through death, together guide,
To sing with all the sanctified,
Around thy azure throne."

In a letter to his brother, describing this scene, Mr. Charles Wesley adds, "You may more easily imagine, than I describe, the effect. God bowed the hearts of all the people, as the heart of one man, towards Himself, I trust, and towards his servant. They received a large measure of love for you, as their tears witnessed. I have heard of but one exception."

These facts, which I copy from the hand-writing of Mr. Charles Wesley, show that the former days were not better than these. We have not heard that the present opponents of the Conference pray for the speedy death of its members in general, or even of its officers; yet, in the Methodist society of Bristol, prayers to this effect were recommended with respect to the venerable man who founded that society, and who watched over it with more than paternal care for half a century. Let us hope that tears, such as those which Mr. Charles Wesley describes, may be shed by some of the parties who are now taught to cherish a spirit of opposition towards their spiritual guides and Pastors.

Mr Wesley's Deed of Declaration.

WHEN Mr. Wesley had drawn up his "Deed of Declaration," constituting one hundred of his Preachers the "Conference of the people called Methodists," a violent outcry was raised against him. Several of the Preachers were greatly offended, because their names were not inserted in this important document; and other persons were alarmed lest the trust which was thus created should be abused. In the midst of this excitement he inserted the following paper in his monthly Magazine, under the title of "Thoughts upon some late Occurrences." It is important, as showing that the object which he had in view when he constituted the Conference was the unity and continuation of his societies, by securing for them in perpetuity the itinerant ministry, to which they were accustomed, and which they highly valued.

1. In June, 1744, I desired my brother and a few other Clergymen to meet me in London, to consider how we should proceed to save our own souls and those that heard us. After some time, I invited the Lay Preachers that were in the house to meet with us. We conferred together for several days, and were much comforted and strengthened thereby.

2. The next year I not only invited most of the Travelling Preachers, but several others, to confer with me in Bristol. And from that time for some years, though I invited only a part of the Travelling Preachers, yet I permitted any that desired it, to be present, not apprehending any ill consequences therefrom.

3. But two ill consequences soon appeared: one, that the expense was too great to be borne; the other, that many of our people were scattered while they were left without a shepherd. I therefore determined, (1.) That for the time to come, none should be present but those whom I invited; and, (2.) That I would only invite a select number out of every Circuit.

4. This I did for many years, and all that time the term "Conference" meant not so much the conversation we had together, as the persons that conferred; namely, those whom I invited to confer with me from time to time. So that all this time it depended on me alone, not only what persons should constitute the Conference,—but whether there should be any Conference at all, this lay wholly in my own breast; neither the Preachers nor the people having any part or lot in the matter.

5. Some years after, it was agreed, that, after the decease of my brother and me, the Preachers should be stationed by the Conference. But ere long a question arose, What does that term mean? Who are the

Conference? It appeared difficult to define the term. And the year before last all our brethren who were met at Bristol desired me to fix the determinate meaning of the word.

6. Hitherto, it had meant (not the whole body of Travelling Preachers, it never bore that meaning at all; but) those persons whom I invited yearly to confer with me. But to this there was a palpable objection,—Such a Conference would have no being after my death. And what other definition of it to give, I knew not; at least I knew none that would stand good in law. I consulted a skilful and honest Attorney: and he consulted an eminent Counsellor, who answered, "There is no way of doing this but by naming a determinate number of persons. The deed which names these must be enrolled in Chancery: then it will stand good in law."

7. My first thought was to name a very few, suppose ten or twelve persons. Count Zinzendorf named only six who were to preside over the community after his decease. But on second thoughts, I believed there would be more safety in a greater number of counsellors, and therefore named a hundred, as many as I judged could meet without too great an expense, and without leaving any Circuit naked of Preachers while the Conference met.

8. In naming these Preachers, as I had no adviser, so I had no respect of persons; but I simply set down those that, according to the best of my judgment, were most proper. But I am not infallible. I might mistake and think better of some of them than they deserved. However, I did my best; and if I did wrong, it was not the error of my will, but of my judgment.

9. This was the rise, and this is the nature, of that famous Deed of Declaration, that vile wicked Deed, concerning which you have heard such an outcry! And now, can any one tell me how to mend it, or how it could have been made better? "O yes. You might have inserted two hundred, as well as one hundred, Preachers." No; for then the expense of meeting would have been double, and all the Circuits would have been without Preachers. "But you might have named other Preachers instead of these." True, if I had thought as well of them as they did of themselves. But I did not: therefore I could do no otherwise than I did, without sinning against God and my own conscience.

10. "But what need was therefor any Deed at all?" There was the utmost need of it: without some authentic Deed fixing the meaning of the term, the moment I died the Conference had been nothing. Therefore any of the proprietors of the land on which our preaching-houses were built might have seized them for their own use; and there would have been none to hinder them; for the Conference would have been nobody, a mere empty name.

11. You see, then, in all the pains I have taken about this absolutely necessary Deed, I have been labouring, *not for myself* (I have no interest therein,) *but for the whole body of Methodists*; in order to fix them upon such a foundation as is likely to stand as long as the sun and moon endure. That is, if they continue to walk by faith, and to show forth their faith by their works; otherwise, I pray God to root out the memorial of them from the earth.

The End.

London:—printed by James Nichols, Hoxton-Square.

Transubstantiation. A Lecture Delivered at Clapham, By John Cropp.

There are some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema. As we said before, so now I say again; if any one preach; you a gospel, beside that which you have received, let him be anathema.—[unclear: Galatiam] i. 7, 8, 9. *Reimish Translations*, A.D. 1852.

Printed by Request.

[FOURTH THOUSAND.] With Additions.

PUBLISHED BY J. W. KING, 172, FLEET STREET, AND E. HANDS, CLAPHAM. London: TILLING, PRINTER, 20, ROCHESTER ROW, WESTMINSTER. 1856.

Price 2d.

In sending to the Press this Lecture, I have yielded to the request of some who heard it delivered, hoping that it may be made useful to my Protestant neighbours, in the midst of whom a Jesuitical priesthood, from the Clapham Monastery, are labouring to propagate their soul-corrupting delusions.

Transubstantiation.

No subject is so all-important to man as salvation, for in it is contained all that he needs for time and eternity; and all that the God of all grace has to bestow; "for he that spared not even his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how hath he not also with him given us all things." "What shall I do to be saved?" "How shall man be justified with God?" are questions that agitate the human soul, but which the light of reason, or the unaided mind of sinful man, can never satisfactorily answer; the revelation of God alone removes all darkness and doubt, and makes known to our fallen race the way to happiness and heaven. "The Holy Scriptures," says

St. Paul, "can instruct thee to salvation, by faith which is in Christ Jesus;" they proclaim the glad tidings that "God is love," and that "he will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." What is truth? enquire many. But, alas! like Pilate of old, they wait not for a reply. Some answer for themselves, and seek to obtain the favour of God by establishing their own righteousness, and strive, by works of charity, to merit heaven. Others fly for refuge to the Sacraments of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, and in the ordinances of God's house imagine they find all that they require; whilst the vast majority live in a total carelessness of all means to secure their eternal welfare. Few there are, however, who, living by faith and prayer, are witnesses for Jesus, in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation; never were their influence and prayers more needed than at the present time, for the Popish priesthood are lifting up their voices, and concentrating their most strenuous efforts to render paramount their power, and to persuade the millions of the people, that they alone are the Church of God, that the truth is to be found only with them, and that all not in their communion are the slaves of error, denounced by the church, and exposed to the dread anathema of heaven. To repudiate the proud pretensions of Rome, and to overthrow her errors, is the duty of every man who has any regard to God's Word, any love to truth, or any sincere desire to promote the present happiness, and the eternal salvation of his race. Actuated by these principles, the Lecturer feels it to be a duty he owes to God, to society generally, and to his neighbours in particular, in the midst of whom Popery is now rampant, to take his sling and his stone, and, however feeble his powers, yet, trusting in the name of the Lord, he is resolved to do what he can to bring down this boasting Goliath, who defies daily the armies of the living God, and by his pride and sinful doctrines, blasphemes the Lord of Hosts. Ardently praying for Divine assistance, that this Lecture may be made, by the Holy Spirit, instrumental in the eternal blessedness of many a deluded and priest-ridden Papist, (towards whom, in the spirit of the Gospel, the Lecturer feels the sincerest love,) in the preservation of the wavering Protestant, from the soul-destroying dogmas of the Papacy, and in the awakening of the careless sinner, so that he may be induced to seek and find that truth by which alone he can be saved. O that, divesting ourselves of prejudice, bigotry, and pride, we may learn at the feet of Him who was meek and lowly of heart; then, casting away for ever all merely human doctrines, we shall find rest to our souls. Truth is so all-important, that St. Paul declares, as recorded in the Douay, or Roman Catholic Bible, (from which book most of the quotations in this Lecture will be made.) "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you, beside that which we have preached unto you, let him be anathema. As we said before, so now I say again, if any one preach to you a gospel beside that which you have received, let him be anathema." Gal. i. 8, 9. With these words before us, we purpose proving that Popery, as a system, is not in accordance with the Gospel preached by St. Paul; but that many of its doctrines, particularly *Transubstantiation*, as taught by its priests, and defined by its Councils, are directly opposed to the teaching of all the Apostles, and the whole revelation of God; in short, that it is another gospel, alike fatal to its preachers, and to the masses of their deluded victims; for if an angel from heaven were to preach the errors of Popery, he would, in our opinion, be in danger of the anathema here pronounced. We would, however, observe, that Popery, as defined by its Councils, and taught by its ministers, is not altogether error, but that there is in the system much of divine truth—truth held by all Protestants, and dear to the hearts of all God's people; but which truth, alas! has been neutralized if not all but destroyed, by the traditions and fables of men, which, by the voice of the Romish Church, are declared to possess equal authority with the words of the living God. We rejoice, however, when we think it possible that there are, and always have been, some of its people, who are and were much better than their creed, much wiser than their teachers, and who, taught by the Spirit of God, and trusting by faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, are, by the mercy of our heavenly Father, saved in time and for ever. But we with all charity too, the number of such is exceedingly small. The Church of Rome claims to be infallible; *she* declares that *she* cannot, at any time, cease to be pure in doctrine, nor can she fall into any destructive error, and pronounces her anathema on any denying her infallibility. All Romanists must therefore consent to the following proposition, that if they, by any argument, are convinced that their church holds and propagates any *one error*, they must cease to regard her as the true church, and must believe her to be a lying and false church, and that with these views they are bound to abandon her communion, and to seek in a more Scriptural way the salvation which is of God.

The error to which my hearers are now principally directed, is one of the most prominent, and one of the most destructive of all the delusions in the Papacy, namely, transubstantiation; of which, as related by Drelincourt, Cardinal Perron, being asked in his last sickness what he thought, replied, "It is a monster." Let us look at what the Council of Trent says of it. They observe—

Canon 1st. "Whoever shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially contained; the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and, consequently, Christ entire; and shall affirm that he is present there in a sign and figure, or by his power, let him be anathema.

Canon 3rd. Whosoever shall deny that Christ entire is contained in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, under each species, and under every part of each species, when they are separated, let him be

anathema.

Canon 6th. Whosoever shall affirm that Christ, the only-begotten, is not to be adored in the holy Eucharist, with the external signs of that worship which is due to God, and that those who worship the same are idolaters, let him be anathema."

To show you that the curse of the Romish Church under any circumstances is most awful, we quote one now in use, extracted from the PONTIFCALE ROMANUM:—"May he be cursed in his home and out of his home; may he be cursed in the state (or city), and in the field; cursed in watching, and cursed in sleeping; cursed in eating and drinking; cursed in walking and sitting; may his flesh and his bones be cursed, and from the sole of his foot to the crown of his head may he enjoy no health. May there light upon him the curse which the Lord sent in the law by Moses on the sons of iniquity. May his name be erased from the book of the living, and not be recorded with the righteous, may his partition and his heritage be with Cain, the fratricide, with Dathan and Abiram, with Ananias and Sapphira, with Simon Magus, and with Judas, the traitor, and with those who said to God, 'Depart from us, we will not follow thy ways;' may eternal fire devour him with the devil and his angels, unless he make restitution and come to amendment."

If the Transubstantiation Canons of Trent be true, this is of all God's miracles the greatest that he ever performed, and this overwhelming miracle the Council of Trent would have us believe is wrought every time a Priest, in any part of the world, chooses to say mass, and perform its varied ceremonies; and that in that service the Divine Being changes daily by his miraculous power, it may be tens of thousands of pieces of bread, into his own essence, and into the very body, blood, and soul of our Lord Jesus Christ, to be eaten and digested by any, and every Catholic priest or lay member who partaketh of the Eucharist: and this wondrous miracle is, upon pain of anathema, to be believed by rational men, on no other evidence and authority than that of a number of priests assembled in council, or by the words of individual priests, affirming what they have been taught by other men like unto themselves; whilst all the senses of both priests and people declare (and these organs are the only means by which we can judge of the actual performance of the miracle), that after all the powers of the priest have been exerted, and all the appointed ceremonies of the church have been performed, there is still nothing but bread itself to be found, which, like all other bread, is liable to corruption and decay. Our Lord appealed in his miracles directly to the senses of those he wished to convince; he said, The works that I do in the name of my Father, they give testimony of me; the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, and the poor have the Gospel preached unto them. But, suppose none of these works had been discoverable by the senses of the people themselves, who among them would have believed in his miraculous power? His mode of proceeding in relation to his disciples, when proving the reality of his resurrection, was very different to that of the Romish priesthood, when insisting upon the submission of all minds to their *ipse dixit* in regard to the real presence of our Redeemer in the elements of the Eucharist. Christ having manifested the reality of his resurrection to two of his disciples on their way to Emmaus, they informed the Apostles who were assembled at Jerusalem of what they had seen and heard, and whilst so doing, "Jesus stood in their midst, and said unto them, Peace be unto you, it is I, fear not; they being troubled and frightened, supposed they saw a spirit; he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? See my hands and feet; it is I, myself, handle and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have; and when he had said this, he showed them his hands and feet. Whilst yet they believed not and wondered for joy, he said, have you here anything to eat? and they offered him a piece of broiled fish and a honeycomb, and when he had eaten before them, taking the remains he gave to them"—Luke xxiv. 36, 43. Thus feasting with them, and giving their senses incontrovertible proof that it indeed was their [unclear: sisen] Lord and Master. On another occasion, eight days after this event, "his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; Jesus cometh, the door being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be to you; then he said to Thomas, put in thy finger hither, and see my hands, and bring hither thy hand and put it into my side, and be not faithless but believing"—John xx. 26, 28. Thomas at this was overcome; overwhelming evidence had put doubt to flight; when, with heartfelt gratitude and glowing love, he exclaimed, "My Lord, my God." After thus appealing to their senses, to demonstrate the reality of the miracle of his resurrection, who can for a moment believe that, supposing our Lord had at that time taken a piece of bread, and presenting it to his Apostles, had told them it was now no longer bread, for he had transubstantiated it into his own body, blood, soul, and divinity—whole and entire,—they could have credited the wondrous statement: and if he had commanded them to fall down before it, and worship it, for it was now their God, they would have done so: is there, I ask, any man uninfluenced by Popish teaching, who would answer this question in the affirmative? I think not; yea, I doubt whether even a majority of the disciples of the Papacy itself would venture to say they would, without they had further evidence to satisfy their senses of the truth of the Saviour's assertion. And yet, the Romish hierarchy anathematize all who do not believe their consecrated wafer to be the Lord Jesus Christ, body, soul, and divinity, and who do not at *their* bidding adore it with the external signs of that worship which is due to God alone. O distressing truth! one blushes for the honour of our species, when we remember that the priesthood and

their emissaries have—in the name of the God of love—taken believers in our Lord Jesus Christ, holy and converted men of God—bound them with chains of iron to stakes, and publicly burnt them to ashes, for not believing that which to them was impossible, that the host was the Creator of the heavens and the earth, the very Christ who was born of the Virgin Mary,—a falsehood the most glaring, and the most blasphemous, that the father of lies ever attempted to palm upon the understanding of a rational creature.

Now the boast of Popery is, that it is infallible, and unchangeable; if so, whatever are its professions to the contrary, we are bound to believe, that if the Popes, Cardinals, and priests of Rome could ever regain the secular power they once possessed in this, and other realms, the fires of persecution would again blaze, and auto-de-fés would again be common. It pains our heart thus to speak, but taught by the past, we are bound to believe that such scenes would be again fearfully realized.

Let us briefly consider the circumstances which transpired at the first establishment of the Lord's supper. Our Lord having made, by his providence, provision for celebrating the feast of the Passover with his disciples, and the hour having come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him; and he said to them, "With desire I have desired to eat this Pasch with you before I suffer, for I say to you, I will not eat of it from this time till it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God: and taking bread, he gave thanks, and brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you: do this for commemoration of me; in like manner, the chalice also, after he had supped, saying, This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you." Luke xxii. 15, 20. The apostles, St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Paul, give a similar account to that of St. Luke. There seems in these statements but little or no foundation to build such a superstructure as the Church of Rome has raised thereon. We think all must acknowledge that our Lord must have had more power to change the bread and wine into his own body, blood, soul, and divinity, according to the views of the Council of Trent, than any Pope, Cardinal, or priest ever possessed. According to their [*unclear*: doctrine] we must believe that Jesus took a piece of bread into his hand, which remained bread till he said "This is my body," that it then immediately ceased to be bread, and became the body, blood, soul, and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ himself, the very Christ that was born in Bethlehem, the very God that created the universe, ---and breaking it into at least twelve pieces, he gave a whole God and a whole Christ to each of his Apostles, who all eat of this wondrous creation. Supposing our Lord partook of the Eucharist with his disciples, as some have imagined we must then believe, if the Canons of Trent be true, not only did the Apostles eat of their Lord and Master, but Christ eat himself, body, soul, and divinity. This conclusion is but a legitimate deduction, if Popish transubstantiation be true; but is not the very supposition itself contemptible, monstrous, and blasphemous?

This doctrine cannot be true, the body of our Lord being material—"for he was made in all things like unto his brethren"—therefore he cannot be in ten thousand different places at one and the same time. God's own Word settles this matter. Peter declared that the heavens had received Christ, till the times of the restitution of all things; and the angels, at his ascension, declared that "this Jesus who was taken up from you into heaven, shall so come as you have seen him going into Heaven." Paul says, "this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, sat down for ever on the right hand of God," and therefore he cannot be on Popish altars every time the mass is performed. Prophecy also, by David, had declared that God would not suffer his Holy One to see corruption. Our blessed Lord, by his obedience unto death, magnified the Law and made it honourable; rendering it possible for God to sustain before his own universe of mind, the twofold character, a just God and a Saviour; he would not after this allow his Holy One to be further degraded, and triumphed over by death. And he did, by the glorious resurrection of Christ, vindicate his personal innocence, and declare him to be his immaculate and triumphant Son, in whom he was ever honoured and well pleased. But transubstantiation, in defiance of this prophecy, robs Christ of his glory, and gives the lie to the Word of God, for it declares that the real body of our Lord Jesus is eaten, by priests and their followers, daily and hourly; that it is undergoing decomposition, and is turning to corruption in their vile bodies. The profanity and wickedness of such an awful doctrine is painful to contemplate, is degrading to dwell upon; but as Popery in this matter will reject all figurative interpretations, and will insist upon the literal alone, it is for its votaries to take the legitimate consequences to which it leads, and to digest, with what appetite they can, the absurdity, the wickedness, and the impiety, which of necessity are bound up in this horrid doctrine.

The transubstantiation scheme destroys our Lord's design in the establishment of his last supper. It was ordained for the purpose of a solemn commemoration; "for, as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come." But if in the sacrament Christ be present, and we eat and drink his body and blood really and substantially, this would not be an act of remembrance, for we remember an absent person, and not one present with us; we are to do this till he come; this is a clear proof that he is now in heaven, and not really present in body when the bread and wine are eaten and drunk at the feast of the Eucharist.

If this doctrine be true, it undermines Christianity, it destroys one of the strongest proofs of its divine authenticity,—namely, its miracles. We only know of the existence of miracles through the medium of our senses; but if transubstantiation be true, miracles can be performed, though all the senses are directly opposed

to the conviction of their existence; by what rule or authority, are Christ's miracles to be subjected to, and tested by the senses, and the Pope's to be believed, though in direct opposition to them. Admit the conclusion that the senses are not to be trusted, who then can be sure that miracles have ever existed, even in support of Christianity itself?

One favourite argument of the advocates of the supposed miracle of transubstantiation is, that God, being omnipotent, can do all things; nothing, they say, is impossible with God. This is not true, we speak it reverently, when we say it is impossible for God again to make *that* which he has already made, for that would be a perfect contradiction; again, we say it is impossible for God to give his son Jesus Christ for the world, as he has already given him; it is impossible for Christ again to be born of the Virgin Mary, as when she, according to the prophecies, gave birth to our Lord in the stable of Bethlehem; even *so* it is impossible, that *Romish priests* have the power, by the performance of the ceremonies of the mass, to cause a perfect God and Christ to enter their wafer, and to be eaten by them, and their deluded followers, on all sacramental occasions; and equally impossible, is the horrid supposition that they have power in the breaking of the wafer into ten, it may be twenty or a hundred pieces, to cause the existence of as many Christs, body, soul, blood, and divinity, as there are pieces, and yet the Romish priests have solemnly sworn to believe, and preach this awful delusion.

This marvellous multiplication of the divine and human nature of Christ is by the priests enforced upon their hearers, not by any rational arguments, but by the usual and oft repeated anathema. They also attempt to establish it by the following illustration They say:—In a large looking-glass you have a perfect representation of your person, cut or break that glass into ten or twenty pieces, every single piece gives you also a correct likeness of yourself, and thus with their deluded thousands they settle the matter The lecturer, when in a Papist chapel, had to listen to this puerile and absurd simile.

Again, we are told by way of argument, that it is a mystery, and must be received by faith; but, for the right exercise of faith, there must be authority, there must be evidence that the report to be believed emanates from God. Even Christ himself, with prophecy in his favour, wisdom such as man never listened to before, holiness of life such as was never before exhibited, yet even *he* declares to the Jews, if he had not done his mighty miracles among them, they would, in the rejection of him have been without sin. But before we can be legitimately required to believe in transubstantiation, we have a right to demand evidence that it is of God. We are told by its advocates that nature is full of mysteries, this we must acknowledge, but there is nothing like the wonders of the *Trent mystery* in nature. Though we cannot define the mystery of our own existence; how body and soul are united, how vegetation is carried on in the bosom of the earth, how the winds come and whither they go, yet there is nothing in all this that stands opposed to our reason, and in direct opposition to our senses, as does this Popish doctrine of transubstantiation. It is no proof of its authenticity, for an interested priesthood to be attempting to answer all objections, by the oft-repeated cry of mystery, mystery. We can behold in it, nothing but pride, absurdity, and blasphemy; for the only mystery we see in this Popish dogma is the mystery of iniquity, condemned by St. Paul in Thessalonians; or the name Mystery, as it is written on the forehead of Babylon the great. That Romish priests may fully succeed in this delusion, and triumph over the minds and the consciences of their fellow-men, they have found it necessary to denounce God's holy Word as a rule of faith, and generally to deny it to the laity, or forbid them to form an opinion of its contents, demanding an entire submission of thought on all spiritual subjects, to the decision of the priests alone.

The priests themselves are taught to pay more respect to human writings than to God's Word; this is illustrated by the following anecdote. More than a quarter of a century ago, conversing in the court-yard of the College of Maynooth, where many of the Irish priests are prepared for the ministry, with a young student, the Lecturer asked him among other questions, "That if I were deeply sensible of my lost state as a sinner, and were to come to you with this question—'What shall I do to be saved? what answer would you, as a Catholic priest give me?' His reply was, 'O, sir, that is an important question, and would require a Doctor of Divinity properly to answer, and I have been in Maynooth only eighteen months.'" "But, sir," said the Lecturer, "do you not know that in the New Testament, in the very next verse to the question is the answer?" "No," he replied. "What, do you not read the Scriptures then?" "No," said he, "Not till we have gone through a course of study of the Fathers, and the various commentaries approved of by our Church."

The creed of Pope Pius the fourth, to which every priest subscribes, says, "You are not to interpret the Scripture but with the unanimous consent of the Fathers;" but their opinion is to be defined by the priests in a general council, with the Pope at their head, whose canons are said to be infallible. This doctrine of transubstantiation must be received and believed by every Papist under the penalty of anathema, for the Council of Trent has defined it, and commands the implicit obedience and belief of all the members of their Church.

Let us hear what the advocates of this strange doctrine have to say in its behalf. Their principal argument is founded on a literal application of the words of Christ, "*This is my body*, which is given for you." "Does not our Saviour," they exclaim, "positively say, 'this is my body,' and of the wine, 'this is my blood,' and it certainly must be so, whatever our senses or our reason may suggest to the contrary." But the question is, whether these

words, in their most obvious sense, declare anything in favour of transubstantiation. Papists say they do, we say they do not, and independently of our preceding reasons against the truth of their views, we join issue with them. If we take the words used by our Lord literally, they do not support transubstantiation. Christ, it is said, took bread, and calling it his body, he gave it to his Apostles, who all eat of it, but they did not touch their Lord and Master, who remained whole and entire; he said also that his body was given for them, when as yet it was not offered on the cross. The chalice which he commanded them all to drink of, he styles the New Testament in his blood, which shall be shed for you for the remission of sins: mark, it was not yet shed, not yet given, but it *would* be poured out, his body *would* soon be broken; the wine he also called the fruit of the vine, even after he had given it to the Apostles. St. Paul says, in his account of the establishment of the Eucharist, "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this chalice, you shall show the Lord's death, until he come." Let our Roman brethren mark well, Paul does not say, as often as ye eat this body and drink this blood, but, "as often as ye eat this bread," (and he calls it bread four times in his short account,) "and drink this chalice," (which Romanists call blood; although he calls it "chalice" five times,) "you do show forth the Lord's death till he come." Our brethren who advocate nothing but a literal meaning to the words, must here take bread, and not the body, for one element; the chalice or cup, and not blood, for the other.

Few will have the hardihood to say, that if there be no transubstantiation of the elements into the body and divinity of Christ, Papists who worship the wafer are not idolaters.

"Dr. Milner, however, in his "End of Religious Controversy," tries to roll away this crime of idolatry from the Popish Church. He states that they believe, after consecration, "there is no bread nor wine, but Christ alone, true God as well as man present in it," and as such they worship it. In reply to this doughty champion of Romanism, we observe that the belief of a man does not constitute that to be truth, which he believes to be so. The followers of Johanna Southcot believed she was to be the mother of Shiloh; the Mormonited that Joseph Smith, the sailor, was a true prophet, and that the Book of Mormon is of God, as firmly as the Pope or the Romish priesthood, believe that the bread of the Eucharist is very Christ and very God; but their faith makes no difference in the one case or the other; faith in each and in every case, which has not the truth of God for its foundation, only shows the humiliating possibility of mankind (especially on religious subjects) being often induced to believe a lie.

Another argument he lays great stress upon is, he supposes a case. If, in presenting an address to the sovereign, he make a mistake, and present it to a courtier, or to an effigy dressed in royal robes and placed on the throne, would he be guilty of treason? he replies, Certainly not; the inference he then deduces from these premises is, that if, after all, there is no change of the elements, and the host is not a god, but simply bread, the Catholics are not idolaters any more than the party in the supposed case is a traitor. In reply, did Dr. Milner forget the second commandment, "Thou shalt not adore anything thou hast made." It may be possible for a man to mistake a courtier for a king, an effigy on a throne for his sovereign; but to mistake a wafer in the hands of a priest for our Lord Jesus Christ's body, soul, and divinity, and to bow down before, and adore it as a god, is a far different matter, and is something so unreasonable, so unscriptural, and blasphemous, that if it were not demonstrated to be the fact by the universal practice of the priests, and the people of the Roman Church, no sensible man could believe so wondrous a thing. And what is their authority for their conduct in this matter? They say the words of Christ, "This is my body." Supposing, for the sake of argument, it was as the priests affirm, that the bread became his body, where is the proof that, he delegated the changing power to the priests of Rome? and if Christ, as they say, changed the bread into his material body, where is their evidence that he changed it at the same time into a god? Where, we ask, is their authority that they, as instruments, have power to transubstantiate a piece of wheaten bread into the Almighty? It is all supposition, mere imagination, and despicable priestcraft. They tell us they do not worship the elements on the altar, for they cease to be material; they worship God who is present. Away with such subterfuge. The worshipper of Buddhu tells us the same, that he does not worship the household idol. He has bought it of the artist; he knows it to be wood, or stone, or silver; but he worships Buddhu, whom the idol represents, and who he believes is present. The cases are one and the same. If the Buddhist is an idolator, so is the Papist, that gives by the direction of the Council of Trent, and his priest, divine worship to the consecrated wafer. May God in his great mercy show the priests and people of the Romish faith their sin, their danger, and teach them to worship the Lord Jehovah alone, in spirit and truth, through Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and man, for such the Father seeks to worship him.

With the views of this ordinance, as expressed by the Trent Canons, this simple commemorative service of our holy religion, designed by the great Head of the Church to be a means of grace to all his followers to the end of time, is made a mass of absurdity, contradiction, and lamentable idolatry. Even, if it were as Papists say it is, real flesh and real blood, what is gained by the change? The Lord himself has told us "the flesh profiteth nothing; it is the Spirit alone can quicken, and without faith it is impossible to please God." But, taking the words in a figurative and Protestant sense, and regarding the Holy Sacrament as a feast in remembrance of Christ; a standing memorial of his love, which was stronger than death: the broken bread representing his

broken body; the red wine poured out of the chalice representing his streaming blood, flowing from his hands, his feet and his side, a fountain of salvation, all is clear, reasonable and holy. O may we by faith contemplate the dying Lamb of God, who gave himself for us, and join with one of the sweet singers of our Israel, and pray,

The atonement of thy blood apply,
Till faith to sight improve,
Till hope in full fruition die,
And all my soul he love.

Passages in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel are often quoted by Papists in favour of their views of transubstantiation. Jesus said to them, "Amen, amen, I say unto you, except you eat of the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up in the last day. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him." This passage, judging from the context, has no reference whatever to our Lord's Supper, having been spoken by Christ, it may have been years before that event; besides, it cannot be applicable to the Eucharist, as in that case it would not be true; for if so, all not partaking of it never had life, and never shall have life in them; and, on the other hand, all who do communicate, ever abide in Christ, and he in them, and they can never be lost, or apostatize, for they have eternal life, and he will raise them up in the last day. The boldest advocates of the Romish views of this passage dare not say, that all, not having partaken of the Eucharist, have perished, and that all who have are eternally saved. It is astonishing how blinded by prejudice, must be the understanding of the Papist laity, who are often heard quoting this passage in support of transubstantiation, that they do not perceive in these words their own eternal condemnation; for to be saved, according to them, the parties must eat the flesh, and drink the blood; but the priests with the most daring presumption, have forbidden the wine to the laity. Teaching them that after consecration, the perfect Christ, body, soul, blood, and divinity, is in the bread alone. Obedience here to the priest, is sin against Christ himself, who has commanded his people, saying "Drink ye all of it." If the Laity prefer the domination of their priests to the authority of Christ, they must, abide the consequences of their flagrant disobedience. To their great master they must stand or fall. Is it not marvellous, that whilst the priests deny the wine to the laity, they invariably take it themselves.

As these words of St. John's Gospel are much used in this controversy, we must still further consider them. The Romish Church is anything but unanimous about their applicability to the Eucharist. "Even the Council of Trent itself," says the Jesuit Salmeron, who was present, "did not, after much disputation, decide what was the proper and most natural sense of the words of Christ in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, on account of the various interpretations of the holy fathers, and of the doctors, which were brought forward on both sides." Pope Innocent III. expresses himself in these words, "The Lord spake, in the sixth chapter of St. John, of spiritual manducation, saying, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you; in this way the righteous alone eat the body of Christ." Pope Pius II., arguing against the Bohemians, says, "The Lord makes known, in John vi. by these words, the secret mysteries of spiritual eating and drinking, and not carnal, saying, It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." Thomas Aquinas says upon the words, "Except ye eat my flesh ye have no life in you. If this refers to spiritual manducation, the sentence is free from all ambiguity, for he who is a partaker of the unity of the church, as it is effected by charity, does spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and Drink his blood." Ignatius, who, we are told, was a disciple of St. John, in his Epistle to the Trilestians, distinctly disclaims all recognition of transubstantiation. "Do you, therefore, resuming long-suffering, re-establish yourselves in faith, which is the flesh of the Lord, and in love, which is the blood of Jesus Christ." Many other passages of a similar import might be quoted, but time will not allow. Our Lord declared he would give his flesh for the life of the world. He did so; for he was put to death in the flesh; his life-blood was shed for us; for without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sins. We have life by his expiring groan. Faith in his atonement is absolutely necessary. Believing in our hearts that he hath loved us, and given himself for us, is the only eating and drinking of his flesh and blood that can save or profit a poor, lost, and dying sinner. O that every hearer of this lecture may, by faith, eat his flesh and drink his blood, and thus live by him, and in him: of such he says, "They shall live for ever." In regard to the words used by our Lord, "This is my body," we have already shown the folly and impropriety of taking them literally. We still further, to illustrate the absurdity, if not the absolute wickedness, of Papal interpretation and deductions as seen in their accredited writings, proceed to show you the awful degradation to which the Church of Rome conceives the body of Christ to be liable. We quote from the preliminary remarks to the *Missile Romanum*, entitled "Defectibus Missæ," a work which no Roman Catholic can dispute. It is to this effect—

"If the bread be not wheat, or if of wheat, it should be mixed with grain of another kind in so great a

quantity that it does not remain wheaten bread, or if otherwise corrupted, the sacrament is not formed.

"If the host, when consecrated, should disappear—as by wind, or by a miracle, or be taken by some animal, and cannot be found, then let another be consecrated.

"If the wine have become altogether vinegar, or altogether putrid, or be made from sour or unripe grapes, or if so much water has been mixed with it that the wine is corrupted, the sacrament is not formed.

"If something poisonous have fallen into the chalice, or calculated to excite sickness of the stomach, the consecrated wine is to be placed in another cup, and other wine with the water is to be placed again for consecration.

"If, through carelessness, some of the blood of Christ have fallen; if indeed on the earth, or the boards, let it be licked up with the tongue, and let the place itself be scraped as much as is sufficient, and let what has been scraped off be burnt."

Who, on hearing these quotations, can be otherwise than astounded at the horrible idea, that the body, blood, soul, and divinity of the Son of God, may be run away with by an animal,—say a mouse, or a dog; or blown away by the wind. Do not such dreadful sentiments approach nearly to a crucifying afresh the Son of God, and putting him to an open shame. But another, and if possible, a worse and more awful passage, occurs in the *Defectibus*, it is as follows: "If the priest vomit forth the Eucharist, if the species appear entire, let them be reverently again taken, unless nausea arise, for in that case, let the consecrated species be carefully separated, and let them be replaced in some sacred place until they are corrupted, and afterwards let them be thrown into the *Sacrarium*. But, if the species do not appear, let the vomit be burned, and the ashes thrown into the *Sacrarium*."

These quotations are not given to cast ridicule or contempt upon our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, but to show the folly, absurdity, and criminality into which we may fall, when we substitute for the Word of God the traditions of weak and fallible men.

Having, we think, shown the folly and impropriety of taking our Lord's words in regard to this subject in a literal sense, we shall briefly vindicate their figurative application. All will agree there is nothing more common in every language than to give to the sign the name of the thing signified. We say of a picture, "that is Cardinal Wiseman; but nobody would be so foolish as to suppose that we mean the canvass, with its coloured oils upon it, is the real body, blood, and soul, of that individual. The Scriptures are full of this mode of speech; for instance, our Lord said the "cup is the New Testament in my blood;" how can a cup be a testament Again, Christ calls himself a door, a good shepherd, a Way, the truth, a vine, and his Father, a husbandman, his people branches; in Revelation, the morning star, the seven stars, are called angels, the seven churches, seven candlesticks, &c. Now these signs only represent certain existing qualities or attributes. St. Paul says, the rock smitten in the wilderness was Christ, that is, it represented Christ. He also says, in Eph. vi. 29, speaking of the union of the Church with Christ, "we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones;" surely, these words are not by our Roman Catholic brethren to be taken literally also. Isaiah says, "all flesh is grass can any one be so absurd as to imagine all mankind are nothing but the grass of the field? Upwards of seventy passages similar to the above may be found in the sacred volume, which Romanists are compelled to take in a figurative, and not in a literal sense. How will they be able to justify the adoption of a figurative meaning to all these passages, and yet reject all figure in the interpretation of our Lord's word "This is my body, this is my blood;" and insist here on a literal application alone Following this universal mode of speaking our Lord said, as every man would have said, in Eastern countries especially, intending to convey the same idea, This is my body, that is, it represents my body, and as you cannot, have me always, inasmuch as I go to the Father, and therefore, must leave you, I hereby institute this commemorative feast, that as oft as you eat this bread, and drink this chalice in my absence, ye do show forth my death till I come again.

It cannot be denied that the advocates of transubstantiation do bring some passages from the early Fathers, which have the appearance of being favourable to a physical eating of the body of Christ in the Eucharist; but these quotations are either separated from the context, and are thus made to speak a sense never intended by the writers; or they, when rightly understood, or when illustrated by other passages from the same Fathers, convey only a spiritual meaning. Acting in this way with the Communion Service of the Church of England, the advocates of transubstantiation might find powerful arguments to prove that that Church holds the Popish views of the real bodily presence of our Lord. We quote the following from her Liturgy,—"Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us." And when the minister gives the elements, he says, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee," and when presenting the cup he says "the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life;" but no one understanding the doctrines of this Church can believe for a moment that she holds as a fundamental doctrine the literal, and not the figurative meaning of the words in her Eucharistic service, though some of her semi-papistical sons try to

prove that she does hold the former.

The novelty of this doctrine is also a powerful objection to it, as it was unknown in the Church as a dogma for the first eight centuries.

A brief sketch of the early history of transubstantiation is as follows—"Pascasius Radbert, a monk, afterwards abbot of Corbey, in Picardy, in the year 831, published a Treatise concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, in which he did not hesitate to maintain, that after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, nothing remained of those symbols but the outward form or figure, under which, the body and blood of Christ were really and locally present, and that it was the identical body which had been born of the Virgin Mary, had suffered on the cross, and had been raised from the dead. This excited universal indignation and astonishment, and accordingly many writers exerted their talents against it. Amongst these was the celebrated John Scotus, who laid the axe to the root of the tree, and shaking off the literal interpretation, distinctly and powerfully stated, that the bread and wine used in the Eucharist were the signs or symbols of the absent body and blood of Christ. This subject continued to agitate men's minds for a considerable time; but the Western Churches during the ninth and tenth centuries fell in with the views of Radbert. In the eleventh century, it was strenuously opposed by several distinguished Christian writers, amongst whom Berrenger holds the most conspicuous place. He, however, had a number of opponents, who possessing the highest stations in the Church, saw that the views of transubstantiation exalted the priesthood and increased their wealth. Several Councils at last assembled, who condemned the views of Berrenger, and a Synod, held at Rome in 1058, under Pope Nicholas II., threatened to put him to death if he did not recant; he, not having sufficient courage to stand firm against their cruelty, recanted, and confessed he had been in error, and thus abandoned his principles. But the celebrated Council of Lateran, held in 1215, consisting of 412 bishops, and 800 abbots and priors, at the instigation of Innocent III. (one of the most arrogant and presumptuous of the pontiffs), did explicitly adopt the doctrine of transubstantiation in the monstrous form in which it is now held in the Popish Church, as an article of faith, and pronounced an anathema against all who would not assent to it. The Lateran decision was approved of at the Council of Constance, and finally confirmed at Trent. In the Greek Church it was long rejected, and not generally embraced until the 17th century." (See Rev. R. Watson's Theological Dictionary.)

In reflecting on this account of the origin of transubstantiation, we are reminded of the question often put by Romanists with an air of triumph to Protestants, "where was your religion before Luther?" The answer, at least on one occasion, was very just and apposite, "In the Bible, where your's never was." But we will, with these historical facts before us, ask the members of the Romish Church, where was their's before Pascasius Radbert, or rather before the Council of Lateran, in A.D. 1250, when transubstantiation was first adopted and enforced by anathema? We answer for them, and say, Not in existence: for without transubstantiation and purgatory, Popery would be all but a nonentity, its priests would be shorn of their power, they would become as other men, and would no longer dare to profess, to offer the body, and blood, and divinity of Jesus Christ as a sacrifice for the living and the dead; and thus the streams of wealth which for ages have been pouring into the coffers of the Church, for masses performed for souls said to be in purgatory, would be dried up for ever; and the priests would be compelled, as the preachers of another system, to declare, if not the true Gospel, at least one infinitely more like it, than that which they now proclaim.

This doctrine of transubstantiation, as defined and carried out by the Romish priesthood, has done much to exalt them in the presence of the people. It forms a fitting part of that supremacy claimed by these *pretended* successors of the Apostle over the souls and bodies of their fellow men—that which has been for ages the curse and ruin of millions that have been bowed beneath it. Let but a man believe that his priest possesses the power, if only as an instrument, to transubstantiate the wafer to a god, and he must, so believing, look upon him with a reverence bordering almost upon adoration itself; and this by the priests is evidently designed to be the case; for in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, on the Sacrament of Orders, they boldly declare, "Wherefore they (the priests) are not only justly called angels, but gods, because they possess among us, the strength and the power of the immortal God." Still further to exalt the power and increase the wealth of the priesthood, the Church of Rome teaches that the mass is a true propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead, and the Council of Trent declares "assuredly God is appeased by this oblation, and grants grace and the gifts of penitence, and discharges the greater crimes and iniquities. For it is one and the same sacrifice which was offered by Christ upon the Cross, only the mode of offering is different." This awful and fatal error is enforced upon priests and people by anathema. Thus boldly do the priests of Home exalt themselves, deny God's word, and dishonour the Lord that bought them. Jesus, the sacrifice and the priest, when on the cross of Calvary bowed his head, and cried with a loud voice, "It is finished," and gave up the ghost; thus, by the one offering of himself he became the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. St. Paul tells us, That this man after he had offered *one* sacrifice for sins for ever sitteth on the right hand of God, and that Jesus needed not daily as the priest of Aaron to offer first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people, for this he did *once* in offering himself: nor yet that he should offer himself *often*, but now *once* in the end of ages, he hath appeared for the

destruction of sin by the sacrifice of himself. So Christ was offered *once* to exhaust the sins of many, (See Douay Bible—Hebrews.) God declares that without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sins, but the priests of the Roman Church assert that their, unbloody sacrifice offered daily by them from thousands of altars, atones for the sins of the living and the dead; Oh, which is the world to believe? Let God be true, and every man that opposeth his truth a liar, and his word declares that any man adding to the prophecies of his book He will add unto him the plagues written in his book.

And to increase this respect and authority, they have, with a cunning and treachery almost superhuman, invented and propagated the doctrine of priestly intention as being necessary to the true performance of all the sacraments of the church. Thus the Council of Trent declares (in imitation of the Council of Florence, Sess. 7. Can. 2), "whosoever shall affirm that when ministers perform and confer a sacrament, it is not necessary that they should have at least the intention to do what the church does, let him be accursed." "Should any priest not intend to consecrate but to act deceitfully, he does not consecrate because intention is necessary" (Roman Missal). So that without the intention of the priest there is no real sacrament; this is to magnify the power of the priesthood over the laity—to make them tremble before, and fear to offend them, lest they occasion the withholding of the priestly intention, so that no blessing would follow the administration of any of the sacraments.

If this doctrine of intention be true, it is of awful import to the laity, for none of them can be sure that the priest intended to transubstantiate the wafer used in the Eucharistic service; he may have been a wicked man, a mere Judas in the ministry, having had no intention to cause a God and Christ to enter the wheaten bread; he may have been an infidel in heart and principle, and therefore could have had no purpose to do that which he abhors and laughs at. The intention of the priest may have been absent myriads of times in the services of the Romish sanctuary, when all the worshippers of the elevated host, if the Council of Trent be correct, must have been accursed idolators.

We now propose concluding this Lecture, with a few practical observations.

As every man is interested in this subject, Jesus Christ having tasted death for every man, and instituted the Eucharist, as a commemoration of His love to a fallen world; so it is the duty of all to obey Him, in partaking of this established feast of our holy religion, the command of Christ being imperative,—"*Do this in remembrance of me,*" is equally binding on all, and any refusal on the ground of moral unfitness to obey him in this duty, is a tacit acknowledgment of an unfitness to die, and of the absence of that holiness without which no man can see the Lord. May these considerations lead many to seek by repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, that gracious work of the Holy Spirit, which shall enable them to keep all our Lord's commandments; that they, in the great Day of Judgment, may hear Him say, "*Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.*"

We would most solemnly entreat our Roman Catholic hearer, if there should be one before us, to ponder well in his heart the facts and arguments he has heard in this Lecture; and if he should feel any misgivings relative to the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation; and as a man (in defiance of his priest), he exercise the rational powers God has given him, he doubt the evidence adduced for the support of this dogma, and begin to see that after all the wafer consecrated by the priest is not a god, is not Jesus the Son of the blessed Mary, let him go at once to God, fall down before him, and ask of Him, in the name of Christ, wisdom to direct him into all truth; God has said it shall be given him, and liberally too. Our Heavenly Father will not upbraid him for past ignorance and error. Let him reflect on the danger of offering divine worship again to the host, and turn from the act with abhorrence lest he be eternally condemned, as an idolator; lest adopting, and upholding another Gospel, than that preached by St. Paul, the dread anathema pronounced shall be his portion in time and for ever.

The subject of this Lecture demands the most serious attention of the wavering Protestant. To unite with Rome, *he* must abandon his Bible; he must cease to think and act as a rational being: must give up his independence as a responsible being; and cast himself at the feet of a dominant priesthood, whose words and authority, however opposed to the revealed will of Jehovah, must be heard and obeyed. He must come to the Eucharist, not to obey the command of Christ, to eat bread and drink wine, in remembrance of His most holy passion; but if the church of his adoption is to be believed, to eat and drink literally of the flesh, blood, soul, and divinity of his crucified Lord; yea, and under the penalty of an anathema too; he must fall down and worship the wafer god of the great apostacy, he must embrace all the errors of the Romish Church (and they are Legion). May God save the semi-popish and wavering ministers, and people of the Establishment of this realm, from the folly and the wickedness of apostatizing from the truth, and amalgamating with accursed error.

Of the *true* Christian, whose iniquity is pardoned, whose heart is changed, we have no fear. It is impossible for him, believing in Christ as he does, ever to be otherwise affected by the errors of Rome, than with sorrow and abhorrence; whilst at the same time he feels love and pity in his heart for the devotee of priestcraft and delusion whom he would rescue from his thralldom, and would bring into the light and liberty of the glorious Gospel of the grace of God.

Of the priests of Rome we would ask, by what authority do they enforce this dogma of transubstantiation upon the millions of redeemed men, who through their craft and power, bow at their feet, submit their minds to their teaching, as unto so many gods; and implicitly entrust their future welfare, the eternal destiny of their souls to their care? Is it by the command of our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles they do this? They dare not say it is; they know it is not. Is it by the authority of the unanimous consent of the Fathers? This they know they do not possess—for what with spiritual and physical manducation, they are upon this subject of transubstantiation, as upon many others, a mass of confusion. If they reply we have our power from the Church, we ask what Church. If they answer with truth, they must say, not the Church of Christ, but the Church of Rome. We doubt, and have reason for doubting, that even as priests of Rome, few of them really can believe, that on their intentions and acts depends the performance of the mightiest miracle ever wrought by God himself,—that of changing a morsel of wheaten bread upon their altar, into the real person of our Lord Jesus Christ, his body, blood, soul, and divinity; and this, too, every time, they perform the ceremonies of the mass. And that they have the power, when they choose to separate it even into a hundred pieces, to make as many whole and entire Christs as there are pieces. This they are required to believe on pain of the curse of their Church, and this they have sworn to believe and to teach. And these monstrous doctrines Popish priests have enforced in the manner and spirit of Mahomet, who went forth with his system of doctrines, infinitely less repugnant to reason than theirs, taking his Koran in one hand and his scimitar in the other, the only alternative with the hosts he subdued to his authority, was to believe or die. The priests of Rome, when in the ascendant, have gone forth, like him, with their consecrated wafer in one hand, and a lighted torch in the other; and with no argument to convince the judgment, but in the exercise of despotism alone, have enforced their principles leaving no alternative to their victims but to believe, or burn to ashes. Thousands upon thousands, in bygone ages, have been by them sacrificed as martyrs to the truth of God; thus their predecessors have acted, and we fear were Romish priests to gain the power they are now aiming to possess, they would be no better than their forefathers.

We have a justifying reason for believing this of the Papacy, when we consider the awful oath taken by their dignitaries on their induction into office, and which oath, most likely was taken by Doctor Wiseman lately at Home, and is found in *the Pontificate Romanian*, "All heretics, schismatics, and rebels, against our Lord the Pope, and his successors, I will persecute and attack, to the utmost of my power."

The celebrated Cardinal Bellarmine teaches, "If the heretics are stronger than we, and if there is danger in that, if we attack them in war, more of us may fall than of them, we are to keep quiet."

In Den's Theology, which is a text book at Maynooth College, he observes "Heretics (that is Protestants) are infamous, necessarily and rightly they are deprived of Christian burial. It belongs to ecclesiastical courts to take cognizance of heresy; having done so, heretics are then to be punished with other bodily punishment, such as exile, imprisonment, and death, all of which they deserve," Upon which follows the question, "Are heretics rightly punishable with death?" and the answer is, "Certainly; because coiners of false money, and other disturbers of the commonwealth, are justly punishable with death; and such men are heretics, who are coiners of a false faith, and as experience shows, are great disturbers of the commonwealth." These awful sentiments have never been repudiated by the Church of Rome, and are not only not renounced, but where she has the power, carried out in the punishment of heretics. But if we are to believe English Papists, their Church is in this country all that is amiable and lovely; they do not hold, they say, with the doctrine that heretics should be prosecuted. We would ask, Has the Pope and his Cardinals one system of Popery for Italy, and another for England? O, no doubt I but it is only while they think, that if they were to go to war with us Protestants, more of them would be killed than of the heretic's. This sentiment was clearly illustrated some time since at this place [Clapham.] One of our respectable tradesmen was attacked by one connected with the monastery, about the errors of Protestant, in regard to the Eucharist, but getting the worst of the argument, he left the shop in great excitement, observing to the tradesman's wife, When we gain the ascendancy, won't we make your husband's bones crack!"

We would say to every priest of Rome, were it possible our voice could reach them,—Men, brethren, you have souls, they are in jeopardy; you are preaching for doctrines the commandments of men. Our blessed Lord has said, "If any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his."—"Woe unto the world because of offences, but woe unto that man by whom the offence cometh." We charge the Romish priesthood with having poisoned the pure streams of the Water of Life with their destructive errors. We charge them with having changed the truth of God into a lie, with the impiety of professing to change a piece of bread into the Almighty, and with having worshipped the creature, a wafer of their own making, rather than the Creator, who is blessed for evermore. We say and have proved that they have preached and do preach another Gospel. We entreat them, as they value their immortal souls, to embrace the truth as it is in Jesus Christ; ere the dreadful curse falls upon them, which would destroy an angel, where he to preach as they have preached, and where he to act as they have acted. We pray the God of all grace to pour his Holy Spirit on them, and dispel from the minds of the

Romish priesthood the darkness of error, and give them eternal salvation in the belief of the truth. When viewing the doctrine of transubstantiation, and its baneful results, we exclaim, accursed priestcraft, thou hast for ages dishonoured the Lord's Christ, and by fraud and violence thou hast doomed millions of God's saints to prisons and to death! Thou hast bowed hosts of immortal spirits to thy ruinous sway! Thou hast opposed and lifted up thyself above all that is called God and is worshipped, so that, sitting in the temple of God, thou showest thyself as if thou wert God! Again we say, thou hast preached another Gospel, and if thou wert an angel from heaven, thy doom is pronounced—thou art anathema! The Lord Jesus shall slay thee, thou son of perdition, with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy thee with the brightness of his coming; amen, amen, even so, come Lord Jesus, come quickly!

In conclusion, I cannot but rejoice in the noble display of Protestant feeling which of late years has been manifested. It seems that encouraged by the admiration and support given to the Church of Rome by the Tractarian ministers, and their followers in the Church of England, the Pope, Cardinals, and Priests are making most strenuous efforts to enforce upon our beloved country again the accursed doctrines, idolatrous practices, and enslaving principles of the great apostacy; I trust their efforts will be in vain and will ultimately lead to such a scriptural resistance that will result, in the emancipation of this realm from all the delusions of priestcraft, spiritual despotism, and destructive heresy. But in such a consummation so devoutly to be wished, we would not desire the infliction of legal pains and penalties; we would not for an instant wish to see the strong arm of the law grasping its zealous but mistaken Popish victims. No! we abhor persecution in Rome; do not let us, then, as Protestants practice it in England. Though we cannot look on penal enactments against religious opinions alone, in any other light than that of persecution, there can be no legitimate objection to a Protestant government adopting such measures as they may deem necessary, to prevent the political and temporal power of Popery ever again exercising its ruinous, and deadly influences in these lands.

If the soul-destroying doctrines of Popery are to be put down, it must be by the triumphs of mind, by the dissemination and power of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; that alone is mighty, through God, and that alone will ultimately prevail. Let every Christian gird himself for the war: let him seek more personal holiness, that he may have more power with God in prayer; for the weapons of our warfare must not be carnal but spiritual, if we intend to pull down the strongholds of Satan, to bring down imaginations, the high things that exalt themselves against God, and against his Christ.

Some will say, Can the State do nothing in this matter? Yes, it may do much. The most effectual blow the government of this country could deal out on Popery, in our opinion, would be to adopt immediate measures for a thorough purging of the ministry; and everything savouring of Popery remaining in the Established Church of this empire; that she may become a pure, a spiritual, a really Protestant church; that her mighty energies of wealth, of piety, and of talent, might be blessedly devoted to the instruction, and salvation of the millions brought within her influence.

Then let the ministers, and people of God, of every name among us, rouse themselves to the conflict, caring only for the salvation of souls, and the glory of God. Let them go forth against Popery, and against sin. Let but the piety and power of Protestantism, the Christianity of these lands, thus bear upon the soul destroying system of Popery, it will then vanish, and as the mists of the morning disappear before the bright beams of the noon-day sun; so will the night of Popery pass for ever away; and Babylon the Great shall be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all; whilst all the people, as it were with the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, shall be heard shouting the praises of God, saying, Alleluia! Alleluia! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.

Finis.

Printed by R. Tilling, 20, Rochester Row (opposite the Church) Westminster.

Pre-Millenarianism Weighed In the Balances of the Sanctuary.

A Lecture:

By James H. Rigg,

Wesleyan Minister,

"The LORD JESUS CHRIST, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom."—2 Tim. iv. 1.

"In the day when GOD shall judge the secrets of men by JESUS CHRIST according to my Gospel."—Rom. ii. 16,

Printed for the Author

By W. Maillard, Lefebvre-Street, Guernsey.

Sold Also

By J. Mason, 14, City-Road, London.

Price, Threepence,

Advertisement.

MANY who heard the following Lecture have expressed a wish to see it printed. The Author has felt it his duty to comply with their wish. In preparing the Lecture for Press, he has, however, made considerable additions and alterations, he has endeavoured to render the argument as clear and complete as it was possible to do in the compass of a pamphlet of moderate size. His hope and prayer is, that, by the perusal of it, some who have strayed from the old path may be brought to see their error, and that others may be continued by it in their ancient faith.

J. H. R.

Mount-Row, Guernsey,

July 6, 1852.

Pre-Millenarianism.

A Lecture.

"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years. And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison. And shall go out to deceive the nation which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea."

—REV. XX. 4-8.

IT is with great reluctance that I have come to the conclusion that it is my duty to undertake directly and explicitly the subject of the Pre-Millennial Resurrection. I have felt very loth publicly to oppose views which I am aware that some of my hearers have for a considerable time past warmly cherished; and it is only with great diffidence that I can attempt to furnish any positive explanation of the very obscure and difficult portion of Scripture, which has been read as the subject of this evening's exposition. I feel no manner of doubt, indeed, as to the utter insufficiency of the passage in question to sustain the doctrine which some have endeavoured to build upon it. But while it is very easy, as I think, taking the light of plain didactic Scripture to guide us, to say what it does *not* mean, he would probably be rather a rash or an ignorant than a wise, modest, and well-instructed expositor, who should undertake confidently to lay down, and absolutely to define, what it does mean.

The extent, however, to which a doctrine said to be plainly taught in this Scripture, but which is opposed at every turn to many of those "tilings which have been most surely believed among us," has obtained credit among our Societies in this place; the impossibility in which your Ministers have found themselves of preaching plainly and fully some of the most glorious and blessed truths of the New Covenant—the mediatorial reign of Christ, the doctrine of the Resurrection, the awful realities of the Judgment-day, the reward of the righteous in the presence of their King—or even of expounding almost any prophecy of the Old Testament, without coming into continual collision with this doctrine, and thus offending the prejudices or contravening the cherished opinions of some of their hearers; the unhappy and injurious state of uncertainty, on all these points, in which not a few have been involved; the ceaseless efforts made by too many of the adherents of the doctrine in question to unsettle the minds of those who have not adopted their views; the earnest wish of many to have their ancient faith clearly and fully explained and defended, and arguments put into their hands whereby to sustain the views they had been taught and in which they had been accustomed to find "strong consolation" and "great delight"; and, finally, the consideration that the doctrine of the "Pre-Millennial Resurrection" has served, in many cases, and will serve, it is to be feared, in many more, as a bait or decoy-doctrine by means of

which those who embrace it are led also to receive a whole system of antinomian error, in which "repentance toward God" is blotted out as one of the conations of salvation, and the law is made void through faith—these reasons in conjunction have at length decided me, as a matter of imperative, though very painful duty, to devote this evening to the examination of the doctrine I have referred to and the grounds on which it is said to rest.

It deserves preliminary remark, that "*the seat* of this doctrine" is to be found, according to the acknowledgment of Pre-Millenarians themselves, in the passage which has been read in your hearing. Other places of Scripture there are which are thought indirectly and incidentally to confirm it; but this alone is even alleged directly to teach it. In other words, this point of most important doctrine is revealed, not in the didactic and properly doctrinal parts of the teaching of Christ, or of the Apostolic writings, but in a much-disputed passage of the most obscure symbolic and prophetic book of Scripture. Surely, this is not the manner in which we should beforehand have expected such a doctrine to be taught.

I believe there are some persons who profess to find no special difficulty in the interpretation of the Apocalypse. To these persons every part of Scripture is alike easy; and they find themselves as much at home among the symbols of the Apocalypse, or the latter chapters of Ezekiel, or the final chapter of Zechariah, as in reading the parable of the prodigal son. These persons deny that education, learning, or research, is in any degree needful or even serviceable to the understanding of the dark places of Scripture. They take the prophecy, "the way-faring men, though fools, shall not err therein," as if it meant that every Christian, however unlettered, should be infallibly guided into the meaning of all mysteries of Scripture, and they account themselves wiser than all their teachers. Yet the prophecy or promise so misapplied evidently refers only to the plain and practical truths of salvation and holiness—"the highway"—the beaten path of plain evangelical faith and practice—"the way of holiness." (Is. xxxv. 8.) Too often are such men "presumptuous and self-willed." Too many of them belong to that class of which ST. PETER speaks—"the unlearned and unstable, who wrest the Scriptures" to their own undoing. Not such have been the sentiments of the deeply learned and truly pious students of the Scripture. These have also been truly and deeply humble, and have confessed that there are many things in the Scripture beyond their depth or reach. SAUEIN said of the Apocalypse, that though "to a heart desirous of maxims and precepts, it was a work which gave rich satisfaction," yet, "to a spirit eager for knowledge and light, it was of all books one of the most mortifying." The judicious, learned, and pious DODDRIDGE found so many things "dark and mysterious" in this book, after all his study, that for some time he hesitated whether he should say anything at all upon it in his *Commentary*; and all that he finally did was to give a few critical hints here and there, and enforce its more practical parts. JOHN ALBERT BENDEL, "that great light of the last century," undoubtedly the finest critic of his day, was engaged in the preparation of his great work on the Apocalypse during twenty years, and, after all, only produced an ingenious and eminent failure. JOHN WESLEY "for many years did not study at all the intermediate parts" of the Apocalypse, as "utterly despairing of understanding them, after the fruitless attempts of so many wise and good men." But afterwards, having "seen the works of the great BENDEL," he adopted his views, and embodied them in his own "*Notes*," omitting, however, the details of criticism, which, he says, "are above the capacity of ordinary readers." Of course, he fell into BENDEL'S errors. But he was far too wise a man at any time to suppose either BENDEL or himself to have really mastered the whole subject. "I by no means," says he, "pretend to understand or explain all that is contained in this mysterious book. I only offer what help I can to the serious inquirer." Dr. ADAM CLARKE, to the end of his life, professed his entire inability to understand this mysterious book. MOSES STUART, the American, one of the closest and most profoundly-learned of modern students of Scripture, in his ponderous and immensely erudite work on the Apocalypse, tells us that, at the beginning of his course as Theological Professor, he "frankly told his pupils that he knew nothing respecting the book which could profit them, and could not attempt to lecture on it." Nor was it until after he had devoted *ten years* of study to the whole subject, that he "began with much caution to say a few things in the Lecture-Room respecting the book in question."

Surely, such instances as those should teach us caution and modesty in forming, much more in pronouncing and maintaining, our opinions as to the interpretation of this mysterious book. But, if anything were wanting to impress this lesson upon us, it would be the failures and errors of even such learned and holy men as I have referred to, when they came to deduce definite results from their criticism on this book. BENDEL, for instance, (and WESLEY followed him), deduced from his system of interpretation the following among other curious conclusions: that in the year 1836 precisely, the mystery of God would be fulfilled, the beast destroyed, and Satan bound, the millennium then beginning. Nor are the interpreters of the present day more happy in their endeavours to fix the date of those "times and seasons which the Father hath reserved in his own hands." Dr. CUMMING is, doubtless, the most popular and influential of pre-millennial expositors. In 1848 he published series of Lectures on the Apocalypse, delivered in Exeter Hall to crowded audiences. In these he predicts that in two or three years from the date of delivery the Turkish Empire would be at an utter end, and the Jews restored to their own land. More than four years have passed away, and the Turkish Empire seems quite as little likely to

fall as it did in 1848; while Israel is still as far, apparently, from being gathered as for years past. It is perhaps worth remarking in this connexion that, two centuries ago, it had been predicted with absolute confidence, by the Millenarians, or "Fifth-Monarchy Men" of that day, that the restoration of the Jews would take place punctually in the year 1650. (*Bishop Hall's "Revelation Unrevealed"*). Dr. CUMMING also teaches that in 1860, or thereabouts, the Judge will come.

In his Lectures on Daniel, published in 1850, Dr. C. adopts what he calls an ancient German prophecy, which, he says, "I do not *say* was *inspired*, but was certainly a strange guess for the Germans to make so long ago": "I would not be a king in 1848, I would not be a soldier in 1849, I would not be a grave-digger in 1850, I will be anything you please in 1851." Certainly, the *kings* were very badly off in 1848—in which year it is possible the prophecy was made; but the soldiers were no worse off in 1849 than in 1848; the grave-diggers had much less work in 1850 than in 1849 (the cholera year); and the prophecy for 1851 is so puerile and foolish as to make a fit close and climax to the folly of the whole. But what a school of prophetic interpretation it must be which uses such material as this!

Dr. CUMMING, for the most part, follows in the track of Mr. ELLIOTT, popularizing him for the multitude. Mr. ELLIOTT, however, is undoubtedly an able and learned critic and commentator; and his great work on the Apocalypse, however rash and unfortunate in some of its announcements, will be consulted with advantage by every student. Only it is monitory and instructive that he and Professor STUART, the two most able and elaborate, by far, of recent writers on the Apocalypse, should be antithetically opposed to each other as to the date and general scope of the whole book, and as to almost every controverted passage.

Yet it is upon a single passage in this very Book—unsupported, as I shall show, by any other passage of the New Testament, and in direct opposition to very many passages of luminous distinctness—that Pre-Millenarians attempt to found then peculiar doctrine.

That doctrine is, that when Christ comes the second time to earth, He will not come to raise and judge the quick and dead, both good and evil, but to raise the saints; that between the raising of the saints and the final Judgment, which will be confined to the wicked alone, there will intervene the millennial glory, and, after that, the rebellion and discomfiture of Gog and Magog, with Satan at their head; and that during the millennium, Christ, seated on the throne of David, the New Jerusalem being his glorious metropolis, will reign in person, with his risen and glorified saints, over a world of men yet in the flesh, and born in sin, who will remain eating and drinking, planting and building, marrying and giving in marriage, under this mysterious sway.

I shall endeavour, first, to show that this doctrine is destitute of all support, whilst the contrary is plainly and repeatedly taught, in other parts of the Scriptures; and then to explain in what way we may fairly understand the passage read for the text, so that it shall both harmonize with the context and agree with the general teaching of the "Word of God."

I.—(1.) It has been alleged that, although the doctrine in question may not be directly taught, yet it is at any rate confirmed, if not implied, in several passages of Scripture. Let us look at this.

ST. PAUL says in one place, (Phil. iii. 11), "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Why, it is asked, should ST. PAUL thus earnestly desire and press towards a mere *general* resurrection? The simple answer is: It was not a *mere* general resurrection—it was no general or abstract fact or doctrine that the Apostle was contemplating—but "the resurrection of the dead" as specially related to himself, a servant and follower of Christ—the general resurrection under its particular aspect towards himself, as a member of Christ, his raised and glorified Head,—"the resurrection of the dead," as bringing him, soul and body, to Christ, and Christ in glory to welcome him with all the consummated saints. Surely, all Christians, like the Apostle, rejoice in and turn with longing towards the "resurrection of the dead." Not till then shall we fully know "Him and the power of his resurrection." (v. 10). "Our citizenship is in heaven, from whence we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change this vile body," &c. (v. 20.)

Again: I have had 1 Thess. iv. 16. cited to me triumphantly—"The dead in Christ shall rise *first*." Yet how exceedingly foolish is this, when the context expressly explains that this means that the living saints then on earth "shall not prevent"—that is, *anticipate*, or *get before* "them which are asleep" in Jesus.

It has been asked, too, how it happens that in 1 Cor. xv. and 1 Thess. iv., chapters treating expressly of the Resurrection, there is no mention made of the resurrection of the wicked. The simple answer is, because those chapters treat expressly and exclusively of the "resurrection of the just." The Apostle is dealing with the privileges of Christians, as such. He "comforts" those to whom he writes "with these words." (1 Thess. iv. 18.) He urges them to be "steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch *as they know that their labour is not in vain in the Lord*." (1 Cor. xv. 58.) What has the resurrection of the wicked to judgment to do with such a subject as this? True, they also shall rise, and rise, as well as the righteous, "at the last trump," but not in the same company, or on the same principles, or to the same reward. "They will not rise as represented by and entitled to life in Christ. When He said to his disciples, 'Because I live, ye shall live also,' he enunciated a principle under which the wicked do not stand, and spoke of a life which they will never taste.

The *character* of that life, the *grounds* of it, and the *subjects* of it, are all restrictive."

DAVID BROWN on the Second Advent.

What have sinners to do with a resurrection of which Christ's is the model and the pledge? Do they belong to the harvest of which He is "the first fruits"? It is plain, then, why in these glorious chapters there is no reference to the resurrection of the wicked. Such a reference would be a sad and dark intrusion here. But, because of this omission of all reference to their resurrection, it would be quite as rational to argue, as Socinians have done, that they shall never rise at all, as that they shall not arise until after the interval of a thousand years.

Again: in Luke xiv. 14, we read of those who shall be "recompensed at the resurrection of the just." But, surely, this allusion gives us no reason whatever to believe that the "resurrection of the unjust" shall not take place till more than a millennium after that of the just.

These are, I believe, all the passages of Scripture in which it has been thought by pre-millennialists of any reputation that the doctrine of a "first resurrection" is implied or hinted at. This is the amount of confirmatory evidence which is adduced: and, certainly, the sum total comes to nothing. Passages which agree as well with the usual doctrine on this subject as with the pre-millennial cannot be reasonably adduced in support of the latter. And where is a passage to be found which, while it favours the latter, disfavours the former?

(2.) But now I proceed to show, that many plain passages of Scripture emphatically teach a doctrine entirely contrary to that of Pre-Millenarians. The constant teaching of Scripture is, that in the same "hour" all the dead, both righteous and wicked, will be raised by Divine power, and that, in the same "day" they shall all be judged by the Universal King.

The Judge Himself affirms "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the re-surrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." (John, v. 28-29.) Can words be plainer? Can authority on this point be more conclusive? And how broad a light do these words throw upon the prophecy of DANIEL: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." (Dan. xii. 2.) PAUL, standing on Mars' Hill, proclaimed to the Athenians that "God hath appointed a day, in the which He will JUDGE THE WORLD in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained." (Acts, xvii. 31.) Accordingly, he thus adjures his "son Timothy": "I charge thee before God, even the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and dead at his appearing and his kingdom." (2 Tim. iv. 1.) And how awfully distinct and impressive are his words in writing to the Romans! To make the sense more clear, in citing his words I omit the parenthesis towards the close. "The day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds, to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, and honour, and immortality,—eternal life; but unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile. For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law,—in THE DAY when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my Gospel." (Rom. ii. 5-12, 16.) This, then, was PAUL'S Gospel; and who-ever preaches otherwise, preaches "another Gospel" than PAUL'S, "which is not another." Listen to the same Apostle, teaching the Corinthian Church: "We must *all* appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that *every one* may receive the deeds done in the body, according to that he hath done, *whether good or bad*." (2 Cor. v. 10.) How startlingly bright and distinct, even as though illuminated by the very fire and glory of the Judgment-day, is the following revelation, contained in an epistle to which Pre-Millenarians are somewhat fond of referring: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, WHEN He SHALL COME to be glorified in his saints and admired in all them that believe IN THAT DAY." (2 Thess. i. 7-10.) Who now, after so plain a testimony as this, shall dare to deny that in one and the self-same day the Lord shall "come to be glorified in all them that believe," and to "punish the wicked with everlasting destruction"? Nor shall He be revealed more for the one purpose than for the other, or for the one before the other. No; but He shall be "revealed in flaming fire, to take vengeance," at the very time that He is "coming to be glorified in his saints." Now, can it be possible that the advocates of a literal interpretation of Scripture will endeavour to put any other sense upon so plain a passage as this?—I shall only add to the above two other passages, of themselves quite sufficient to settle the controversy:—"When the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all his holy angels with him, then shall He sit upon the throne of his glory. (Compare Mat. xvi. 27.) And before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: And He shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say to them on his right hand, Come ye blessed, (&c.) Then shall He say to them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, (&c.) And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." (Mat. xxv. 31-46.) "And I saw a great white throne, and him

that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their work. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." (Rev. xx. 11-15.)

Such a chain of luminous passages as I have thus given is far too bright to be obscured, too strong to be broken, and too long and comprehensive to be escaped or evaded. Yet many more links might have been added, not less impenetrably and irrefragably strong, though in some instances less impressively bright, than those arranged above. Let the inquirer on this subject refer particularly to Rom, xiv. 10, 12; 1 John ii. 28, iv. 17; Matt. xiii. 30, 38-43, xvi. 24-27, vii. 21-23, x. 32, 33; Rev. xxi. 7, 8, and xxii. 12-15.

(3.) My next argument against the pre-millenarian system is founded on 2 Peter iii. This chapter, it is admitted *on all hands*, refers to the changes which shall take place in the present terrestrial system at Christ's second coming. But we are here taught in the plainest possible terms that the whole of this terraqueous globe shall, at the coming of Christ, be consumed and dissolved in one "all-involving, all-reducing, conflagration." How, then, shall the Jews be preserved alive during this universal conflagration, to be converted and become missionaries to the Gentile nations, or how shall the Gentiles be preserved alive to be converted by the Jewish missionaries, or reigned over by the risen and glorified saints?

This difficulty is felt by all pre-millenarian writers. Some, to get rid of it, endeavour to make out that the conflagration will not be universal. But, surely, this is to "diminish from" the sayings of the "True and Faithful Witness," to tamper with the plainest revelations of Holy Writ. In that "day of the Lord," "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and all the works therein shall be burnt up, and all these things shall be dissolved." If these words do not describe a universal and all-dissolving conflagration, no words can be found to do so. Others think that, as Noah and his family were saved in the ark during the deluge of water, so a seed of Jews and Gentiles—including, of course, some of the family of "Gog and Magog," the great post-millennial rebels—shall in some way or other be caught up and preserved alive during this dissolution of all things, and then deposited again in the "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," to form a stock from which Palestine shall be repopled with Jews, of all the tribes of course, and the rest of the earth with "sinners of the Gentiles," to be converted by the Jews (how soon after the replacement on the earth must be left to conjecture). I need not answer such speculations as these.

(4.) Another and very obvious objection to the pre-millennial theory is, that it is degrading to the majesty of the Mediatorial King, and incompatible with the glory of the risen saints.

ST. PETER expressly teaches us that Christ is now upon the throne of his father DAVID, by the right hand of God exalted as a Prince and a Saviour, and seated on the right hand of his Father, there to remain until his enemies be made his footstool (Acts, ii. 30-35, v. 31.—Compare Is. ix. 7); St. PAUL, that when, having offered one sacrifice for sins, He had by himself purged our sins, He for ever sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, from thenceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. (Hebrews x. 12, compared with i. 3). From that glorious throne of his Holiness, He now upholds, rules, and administers all tilings by the "word of his power." "Angels, and authorities, and powers" are "subject unto him." (1 Peter iii. 22). Being thus unlimited in his power and resources, He is "Head overall things unto the Church, which is his Body, the fulness of Him which filleth all in all." (Eph. i. 22, 23). And can we believe that He who, from his throne in the highest heaven, thus "filleth all things," will one day limit and localize himself as resident ruler over the earthly realms of this sinful world, over nations of flesh and blood, born in sin and shapen in iniquity? That He, who is seated in sovereign majesty and in the unruffled glory of conscious Omnipotence, "expecting till his enemies be made his footstool," will ever come down to the battle-field of this earth, literally to "rule the nations with a rod of iron" and "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel"—literally to contend in Armageddon

Rev. xvi.—(See "*Delta on the Revelation*,"—a high pre-millenarian authority.)

with his earthly foes in "battles of shaking," where there is "confused noise and garments rolled in blood"? Or, that He who fought His fight in Gethsemane and on the Cross of Calvary will ever with his saints be beleaguered on earth by a literal rebellious Gog and Magog? Such ideas are more than degrading, they are revolting. No! my dear brethren, our Glorious King will not descend again to this earth, the scene of his humiliation, till he comes in final triumph. At the moment of his descending, "the last enemy shall be destroyed, even Death." Satan, Sin, and Death, shall all be vanquished then. His "expecting" will then be over. He will have seen "of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied." Without ever leaving his "*seat*,"

Christ is represented as *standing* to intercede, as our Mediatorial Priest; but always as *seated* when spoken of as Ruler or King, and as seated never to leave his throne again.

—for He will descend upon that throne from which He now rules heaven and earth,—He shall have "put all

enemies under his feet," and then, his last awful office as Mediatorial King of Men having been discharged, and the Judgment being over, He shall render up to the Father the Mediatorial trust and commission which he had received from Him, and the Son himself shall be subject unto Him who had put all things under Him that God may be all in all. (1 Cor. 24-28).

The same argument may be put in another form, less impressive perhaps, but still conclusive. Our Saviour is now "at the right hand of God in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and every name that is named" (Eph. i. 20-21); God hath given to Him "a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth" (Phil. ii. 9-10); "angels and authorities and powers" are now subject unto him." (1 Peter, iii. 22). These Scriptures certainly teach that God hath constituted his Son, Jesus Christ, the visible centre of angelic adoration; and that where He is there must all the hierarchies of heaven be gathered together. When Christ, then, shall descend to earth, what will happen? It is impossible to conceive that earth can compass or contain all heaven, or that heaven's full glory could be concentrated on earth. But if not, then must heaven, during the reign of Christ on earth, be deprived of its light and glory, of the presence of its adorable King.

Further, how could it be possible for men in "flesh and blood," still but earthly and sinful men, to behold the glory of the Son of God, and of the risen saints? The Israelites could not bear to look upon the radiance even of MOSES' face; MOSES himself could not see God's face and live; DANIEL, the man greatly beloved, when he saw celestial glory, fainted and was sick certain days, and there was no strength in him; the glory of the transfigured Christ altogether overpowered his chosen disciples; JOHN, the beloved disciple, who had known Jesus so well upon earth, and had been with him in the Mount of Transfiguration, when he beheld His flaming eyes and refulgent countenance in Patmos, fell at his feet as dead. And yet, in the millennium, some would have us believe that the tribes of men on the earth, "eating and drinking, building and planting, marrying and giving in marriage," shall mingle face to face and continually with the King of Glory and his risen and refulgent saints, all whose bodies shall be fashioned like unto His glorious body. If this may be, then may flesh and blood inherit the kingdom of God, and corruption inherit incorruption. (1 Cor. xv. 50).

Nay! we are required to believe that, even after this descent of heaven's power and glory to earth, the earthly race of Gog and Magog will dare, in open rebellion, to "compass the camp of the saints and the beloved city"!

(5) Another difficulty, on the pre-millennial scheme, is found in answering the following question: After the "first resurrection," and during the millennium, under what category must the living (but not glorified) saints of earth be reckoned, and under what dispensation of grace will they live?

We are taught in the Scripture that the whole Church of Christ will be complete at his coming. The harvest of which Christ is "the first fruits" shall be, without limitation, "they that are Christ's" (1 Cor. xv. 23); "Christ shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in *all* them that believe in that day" (2 Thess. i. 10), and so shall "He present unto himself" all that are His, "a glorious Church, without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." (Eph. v. 27). That will be the day in which He "shall make up his jewels." (Mai. iii. 17). Then shall the Bride, the Lamb's wife, have adorned herself, and made herself ready for the Bridegroom. But all this shall be past before the saints of the millennial age are called into being, or, at any rate, before their conversion. Where, then, is the place for them? In the first resurrection they have no part; and the second resurrection, after the millennium and "the little time," when the earth and the sea shall give up their dead, is, we are assured with one voice by Pre-Millenarians, the resurrection of the wicked only. They belong not to Christ's "glorious Church" and Bride, although they are His, and they appear not at the later resurrection—the resurrection of the unjust, of which Pre-Millenarians speak. What, then, becomes of them?

And under what dispensation do they live? Until the second coming of Christ, believers live "a life of faith" in Him "whom having not seen they love." The Bible is a revelation addressed and adapted to those who live under a dispensation not of sight, but of faith; and nearly the whole of it will be put out of date by the actual coming of the Saviour. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a commemorative ordinance only destined to continue until Christ's second coming. (1 Cor. xi. 26.) The preaching of the Word and the ordinance of Baptism are to continue only until the same great event. (See Mat. xxviii. 19-20—"Go ye, and teach all nations," &c.,—where it is agreed on all hands, Millenarians included, that by the "end of the world" we are to understand the period of Christ's second coming.) What, then, shall be the condition of the saints of the millennium, born indeed under the curse, and in sin even as we are, and included (as we are told) in the same covenant of grace, but who, unlike all other fallen and redeemed children of men, live under a dispensation not of faith but of sight, to whom the Books of the Covenant are obsolete, for whom the sealing ordinances of the Christian faith and the ministry of the Word exist no longer?

(6.) Finally, let me ask Pre-Millenarians, whence shall spring, and how shall grow, during the personal reign of the Omnipotent and Universal King, and the bright ages of their millennium, the seed of Gog and Magog, the nations whom Satan is to deceive and to lead against the camp of the saints and the beloved city?

(Rev. xx. 8-9.)

II.—We may safely pronounce the foregoing objections to the millenarian theory insuperable. Singly, they are strong, and indeed most, if not all of them, invincible: together, they settle the question with overwhelming force. Whatever the vision under consideration *may* mean, it *cannot be intended to teach a literal first resurrection of all the righteous*. It will be expected, however, that, having exploded one interpretation, I should be prepared to substitute a better. I am not, indeed, convinced that this should necessarily be required. We may well be able to say positively what a text does not mean, without being able to pronounce what it does mean. Plain texts may be understood by even a "wayfaring man," and such a man will have a right to refuse any interpretation of a difficult passage which contradicts the teaching of such plain texts; yet it does not follow that he must be able to explain such a difficult passage. It is often a mark of true wisdom and knowledge to confess our ignorance. Here we see through a glass darkly. "What we know not now we shall know hereafter." There are still many obscure passages in the "Word of God, which no interpreter has been able fully to explain. Very many there are of which I find it best to confess, like ADAM CLARKE and Professor STUART, that I know nothing. The Bible is a book for all minds, and for all time. All intellects may task their powers upon it, and yet have much to learn. It is an ocean of truth, where there are at the same time shallows in which a child may safely wade, and depths which the most vigorous and skilful diver cannot bottom.

"In the waters of life, the Scriptures, there are shallows, and there are deeps; shallows where the lamb may wade, and deeps where the elephant may swim. If we be not wise to distinguish, we may easily miscarry. He that can wade over the ford cannot swim through the deep, and, if he mistake the passage, he drowns. What infinite mischief hath arisen to the Church of God from the presumption of ignorant and unlettered men, that have taken upon them to interpret the most obscure Scriptures, and pertinaciously defended their own sense!"—Bishop HALL'S *"Select Thoughts"*, No. 44."

There are plain paths for the simple man, and deep and intricate harmonies for the scribe well instructed in the kingdom of heaven. "When I venture into the depths, I cannot do it without fear and awe. And, in dealing with so difficult and obscure a subject as the vision under our notice, I feel that only with the greatest diffidence ought I to explain my views, of the truth of which I am far from being so confident, that I dare recommend them to others as an article of faith, or stake my soul's salvation upon them. But I feel no doubt or hesitation in saying that if the Revelation is a part of God's Truth, and if God cannot deny or contradict himself, then the view of this passage, which I have this evening combated, cannot be true.—What is now to be unfolded is the most probable explanation, so far as I may judge, that can be given you.

- We must particularly take notice that the scene described in the vision before us, be it literal or be it figurative, is not a resurrection of all the righteous dead, but of the martyrs only. "The souls" seen by JOHN are of those who had been "beheaded" for Christ, and of those who had not worshipped the beast or his image, or received his mark. These last, we cannot doubt, though not spoken of as "beheaded," had been put to death, since we read (Ch. xiii. 15) that the fate of so many as refused to worship the image of the beast was that they "should be killed." The company, then, is composed of the brave witnesses of Christ, in two classes, who in the hour of fierce persecution, and even to the extremity of death, had been faithful to their Lord. The two classes are supposed to be those who had suffered under Pagan and under Papal Rome. The former class had been "beheaded"—a kind of punishment peculiarly characteristic of the heathen Romans; the latter put to death in various ways. Now, if we turn back to Ch. vi. 9-11, we shall see and hear the souls of the former class "under the altar." They "cry with a loud voice" unto the Lord of the temple for judgment and vengeance. Then white robes are given unto them, and they are told to "rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." Lo! now, the number of their fellow-servants *is* fulfilled. Both companies are seen together by the prophet. And the "judgment" for which the first company cried is now "given" unto both together. They are seated upon thrones of glory, and they live and reign with Christ a thousand years.
- But is this a literal or a figurative resurrection of the martyrs? Some have understood it to be literal. And if, like BENGEL, WESLEY, and MOSES STUART, we take it to be a resurrection of the martyrs at once from earth to heaven,—no visible reign on earth being supposed, and the general resurrection both of good and evil being understood to follow at the coming of Christ and the end of all things,—the opinion, whether true or false, cannot be considered dangerous. Such an opinion involves no plain contradiction of the manifest and momentous doctrines of Scripture. The martyrs, in this case, thus caught up into heaven itself, would constitute but an earnest of the vastly more numerous resurrection of the body of the righteous at the Judgment-day. There is, however, this great difficulty lying against this view. Why should those two classes of martyrs only be thus eminently distinguished and rewarded? Why should ABEL, ISAIAH, and STEPHEN—those who were in former days "stoned, sawn asunder, slain with the sword," or otherwise tormented, "of whom the world was not worthy,"—why should those be excluded

from these eminent rewards of martyrdom? Nay! if patience and constancy in confessing the name, and maintaining the faith, of Christ, be what are thus eminently rewarded, are there not many who have never been "beheaded," or in any way put to death, who are yet equally deserving of such distinction? There are other conflicts and sufferings, beside those that are bodily, not less, nay! more severe; there are true martyrdoms of soul where life was never taken away. I think, then, that in this view the literal resurrection of these martyr-companies, two in one, can hardly be maintained as the real purport of the vision. Of course, if they were conceived as literally enthroned and reigning *upon earth over mankind*, most of the arguments already adduced against the doctrine of the pre-millennial resurrection would lie against this supposition; and the more widely the honour of martyrdom should be extended—in order to meet the difficulty last raised—the greater would be the force of these objections.

Pre-Millenarians are accustomed to claim BENGEL for themselves; and sometimes they claim WESLEY, too. And they have made the utmost of the one point in which MOSES STUART coincides with them. But neither of these eminent men was a Millenarian. All of them believed that at the last great day, not only will all the evil, but the great body of the just, arise. None of them believed in anything like an earthly reign of the risen saints. Indeed, few men have been more severe than Professor STUART upon the "phantasies" and "dreams," as he calls them, of "the ancient or the modern enthusiastic interpreters, who find in our text a *temporal and visible* reign of Christ on earth, in the midst of a church militant and triumphant, mingled together in one and the same *terrestrial* abode." "To recite such" things, he says, "is to refute them." And how far BENGEL and WESLEY were from being Pre-Millenarians will be plain from their notes upon 1 Cor. xv. 23. BENGEL, after speaking of the resurrection of Christians, adds: "*Eodem tempore resurgent impii, sed illi non veniunt sub hunc beatum censum*"—that is, "At the same time the wicked will rise again, but they are not included in this happy reckoning." WESLEY'S note on the same passage is an echo or translation of BENGEL'S: "At the same time the wicked shall rise also, but they are not here taken into account." And the whole tenor of the "*Notes*," as well as the sermons, of our Founder, is in unison with this. Indeed, when Pre-Millenarians endeavour to support their views by the authority of names, they act very foolishly. It is true that opinions resembling their own have had supporters in every age. Similar notions as to the Messiah's reign were held by the Jews of our Lord's day, and even by the disciples themselves; but by our Lord himself such views were continually rebuked and refuted. He taught that "his kingdom is not of this world"; that it "cometh not with observation," that it is "within" the soul. That Judaized Christianity—or, perhaps, we should better call it, that baptized Judaism—which was the faith of those earliest of heretics, the Ebionites, embodied similar views. But these sectaries rejected all the epistles of PAUL, as anti-Jewish, and only held to a mutilated version of one Gospel (MATTHEW'S). Some weak good men among the early Fathers, also, were doubtless, to a considerable extent, led away by notions of the same general character. The "Fifth-Monarchy Men," likewise—a fanatical sect of CROMWELL'S time, were notorious on account of similar opinions. And a few good and really able men of more modern times—such as JOSEPH MEDE, "the Prince of Pre-Millenarians," as he has been called,—have held some of the fundamental views of Pre-Millenarianism; not being aware, apparently, into what results these must necessarily develope. But even JOSEPH MEDE, though a learned man, and an acute and ingenious critic, was of but slender capacity as a theologian. And in no age has Pre-Millenarianism, properly so called, been accepted by the great masters in theology. No really profound and comprehensive divine, no one of the calibre of AUGUSTINE, or CALVIN, or MELANCTHON, or TURRETIN, or HOWE, or BAXTER, or CHARNOCK, or OWEN, or the GOODWINS, or Bishop HALL, or Bishop PEARSON, or LIGHTFOOT, or (in recent times) Dr. PYE SMITH, or Dr. HARRIS, or Dr. WINTER HAMILTON, or RICHARD WATSON, or Dr. CANDLISH, or Dr. JOHN BROWN (of Edinburgh), has ever held any such views. Such views, indeed, are incompatible with profound theology. Though obscure, they are shallow; and, though mysterious, childish. I may add, that the kindred dreams of the early Chiliasts, or Millenarians, brought the book of Revelation into such discredit with the ancient Church, that, from the end of the third to the middle of the fifth century, its canonical authority was extensively doubted, and it was not suffered to be read in the churches. Nor is it possible to conceive anything more likely to bring the study of unfulfilled prophecy, and especially of the Revelation, into general disfavour than the extravagances of pre-millenarian interpreters.

- The vision, then, is one of a martyr-resurrection—a resurrection of Christian martyrs, who have suffered under the persecution of heathen Rome and of "the Beast": and yet it docs not seem that it can well intend a literal resurrection of these two martyr-companies. We are, consequently, shut up to understand a figurative resurrection,—that is, a resurrection of the principles of the martyrs and of the martyr-spirit in the persons of living men on the earth.

It was prophesied by MALACHI, that Elias, the Prophet, should re-appear on earth before the coming of the Messiah, to prepare His way. (Mai. iv. 5, 6). Hence our Lord's disciples, and the Jews generally, understood

that Elias was literally to descend again to earth before the arrival of "Him who was to come." But the prediction was in reality fulfilled, not by the re-appearance of Elijah, but by the coming of the Baptist. "This," said our Lord, "is Elias, which was for to come" (Mat. xi. 14.—Compare ch. xvii. 12 and Mark ix. 11-13): and the explanation was, that John the Baptist came "in the spirit and power of Elias." (Luke i. 17).—JOHN HUSS, in his prison at Constance, had a remarkable dream, which taught him that though the Popes and Bishops might stifle his testimony and silence his voice, yet the truths for maintaining which he was suffering, and was still to suffer, should, after his death, be taught anew and with impressive vividness by "much better preachers than himself." "The nation that loves Christ," he added, "will rejoice at this. AND I, AWAKING FROM AMONG THE DEAD, AND RISING, so to speak, FROM MY GRAVE, SHALL LEAP WITH GREAT JOY."

D'AUBIGNE'S "*Reformation*," vol. i., chap 6.

How vivid the picture! Surely, it is that of a martyr's resurrection, reviving in the person of others who inherited his spirit, and "living and reigning" joyfully upon the earth. So Mr. ELLIOTT mentions a medal (whether struck before or after the Reformation matters not for the purpose of my illustration,) which represents HUSS at the stake, and has around it, in Latin, a legend of which the translation is, "When a hundred years shall have revolved, YE SHALL ANSWER TO GOD AND TO ME." The reference is, of course, to LUTHER, as the representative and (so to speak) the resurrection of HUSS. In precise conformity with this manner of speech, a Brief was addressed by Pope ADRIAN, in 1523, to the Diet of Nuremberg, containing these words: "The heretics HUSS and JEROME are now alive again in the person of MARTIN LUTHER."

These instances now abundantly illustrate the interpretation of this martyr-resurrection which has been suggested. Nor will it avail anything to say, that because the death of the martyrs was literal, so also must be their re-surrection. Who knows not how often and how suddenly in Scripture there is a transition in the same connexion, or even in the same sentence, from a literal to a figurative, from a material to a spiritual or mystical, sense of the same word? As well say, that because ELIJAH, and no other, went away from earth, therefore ELIJAH, in his own person, and no other, must come back to earth, to fulfil the prediction which our Saviour has taught us was fulfilled by the coming of the Baptist. As well say, that because HUSS was looking to suffer, and did suffer, a literal death on earth, therefore he, in that exulting exclamation, must have looked forward to a literal resurrection upon earth. As well say, that Pope ADRIAN meant literally to affirm the resurrection of the two martyrs, HUSS and JEROME, in the one person of MARTIN LUTHER!

HUSS did, figuratively speaking, re-appear on the earth in the person of LUTHER. He lived again and reigned. He was even exalted to a throne, and judgment was given to him. The wrong that had been done him was reversed, his martyrdom became his glory, his name was exalted as one of the Leaders of the Truth, he became a Prince among the beloved and admired Benefactors of the Race. The principles which he had maintained re-appeared and gained a great ascendancy. The martyr-spirit was again abroad in the earth, confessing to the truth of God, and now its hour of victory had arrived. Such, but far more glorious, shall be this martyr-resurrection. "The only difference is, that what was realized at the Reformation in LUTHER and his compeers, was but as a drop in the bucket—'the little cloud as a man's hand'—compared with the millennial resurrection, not only in point of numbers, but of the completeness of the triumph. For while HUSS and JEROME, as witnesses for Christ, were put completely down by the anti-christian party in their day, LUTHER and his coadjutors at the Reformation were not able to put *them* completely down in their turn. But, at the time of our vision, the witnesses for Christ in every age shall not only 'live and reign' in their successors 'for a thousand years,' but the '*rest of the dead*' (the opposing party) '*will live not again till the thousand years be fulfilled. This is the first resurrection.*' And '*blessed,*' surely, shall he be whose lot is cast in such times, and '*holy shall he be that hath part in this first resurrection,*' representing in his person the zeal, and love, and faithfulness, and Christian truth and feeling of 'the noble army of martyrs,' yet without being exposed; as they were, to be crushed and swept off the stage, merely because Jesus and his truth were dearer to them than life itself."

DAVID BROWN on the Second Advent.

But the glory of the millennium will pass away—Satan will be loosed again for a little while—"the rest of the dead"—the same as "the remnant" (the same word in the Greek is used for "the rest" and "the remnant") spoken of in the last verse of the previous chapter—the slain followers of the "Beast and false prophet" shall "live again" upon the earth in *their* successors and representatives; that is, there shall be a revival of long-exploded and forgotten errors—the Tempter shall again "deceive the nations," who are still of the seed of Adam, and born in sin, and therefore liable to temptation and apostacy—the enemies of Christ, designated by the mystical name Gog and Magog, prompted by the evil spirit, shall again assault the Truth and Church of Christ—and shall be finally and utterly overthrown. Then shall be seen "the great white throne" in the heavens, and "the mystery of God shall be finished."

Such is the reading of this august scene which seems to me to be right. It may be wrong. I shall blame none for rejecting it after fairly weighing it. I shall thank any who will show me a better. But whether this is wrong or not—a matter of very minor moment—that must be wrong which directly contradicts the plainest revelations

of God's word.

In closing, I have still one or two questions to put to Pre-Millenarians. On your scheme, how is it that the "rest of the dead"—by which phrase you understand all the wicked—do not rise again, as they ought (v. 5), at the end of the thousand years, nor until the Judgment-day, which, though the intervening time is called, *in comparison of the thousand years*, "a little time," must yet, considering the events that intervene, be after an interval of some considerable length? (verses 7-10). Again: Who and what are Gog and Magog, and whence come they? I may perhaps mention, that Mr. PERRY in the last century, and Dr. CUMMING recently, have taught them to be the wicked-dead raised out of their graves; and that the Rev. J. BURCHELL, not long ago, published a work in which he teaches us that they are no other than "evil angels" come up upon the earth. The idea of Satan's "going forth to deceive" either the one or the other of these classes may be left without comment.

Dr. CUMMING supposes that he has got rid of the first of these difficulties by his solution of the second. And so he has; but only to fall into difficulties, if possible, greater still. He sees that the "rest of the dead" ought to re-appear on the earth after the expiration of the thousand years. Accordingly, he makes all the generations of the wicked then arise. But then, of course, he is compelled entirely to explain away the resurrection of the Judgment-day. The scene of "the sea and death and hell" "delivering up their dead" for judgment, on the appearance of the great white throne, means, it appears, that all these were delivered up a good while before,—so long before, that, under the name of Gog and Magog, they had meantime been gathered together from "the four corners of the earth" by Satan, and led against Christ and his risen saints in Jerusalem. After this, and after their discomfiture, comes the Judgment, when, if plain words have any meaning, they are represented as rising to meet their doom. Who can harmonize all this? Dr. CUMMING thus states his own view: "I suppose—and I believe it is the true solution of the difficulty—that the enemies that come from the four corners of the earth, are just 'the rest of the dead,' raised at the close of the millennium, and then and there, with all their vices unextirpated, their nature unregenerated, their hearts in the gall of bitterness, they shall be headed by the archangel's energy, and the archangel's hate, and shall make one last, dying and desperate attack upon the saints of God that dwell in the new Jerusalem, and there magnify and worship the Lamb." These are the "nations, Gog and Magog, which are in the four quarters of the earth"! and Satan "goes out to deceive" these! Dr. CUMMING "submits this as a thought that has occurred to his own mind, as probably the true and just solution of a great and acknowledged difficulty"! It is a pity he should not have the sole merit of so singular a solution, which he evidently regards as his own sole property. As we have seen, however, in the text, Mr. PERRY had anticipated him in this "solution." That a pious and sensible Minister, such as Mr. PERRY was, a good and clever man like Dr. CUMMING, and a grave divine like Mr. BURCHELL, should be driven by the theory they have adopted into such uncouth and incredible speculations as those named above, is a strong presumption that the theory itself is altogether unmanageable and untenable. No such difficulties as these, at any rate, lie against the explanation which, following approved authorities, I have ventured to offer in the text.

"To the law and to the testimony." Let every doctrine be "weighed in the balances of the sanctuary."

The End.

W. Maillard, Printer, Lefebvre-street, Guernsey.

The New Park Street Pulpit.

Fast-Day Service,

Held at the

Crystal Palace, Sydenham,

ON WEDNESDAY. OCTOBER 7TH, 1857, BY THE Rev. C. H. Spurgeon,

Being the Day appointed by Proclamation for a Solemn Fast, Humiliation; and Prayer before Almighty God: in order to obtain Pardon of our Sins, and for imploring His Blessing and Assistance on our Arms for the Restoration of Tranquillity in India.

Brief Invocation.

O GOD, the God of heaven and of earth, we do this day pay Thee reverence, and meekly bow our heads in adoration before Thine awful throne. We are the creatures of Thine hand; thou hast made us, and not we ourselves. It is but just and right that we should pay unto Thee our adoration. O God! we are met together in a vast congregation for a purpose which demands all the power of piety, and all the strength of prayer. Send down Thy Spirit upon Thy servant, that he, whilst trembling in weakness, may be made strong to preach Thy Word, to lead forth this people in holy prayer, and to help them in that humiliation for which this day is set

apart. Come, O God, we beseech Thee; bow our hearts before Thee; instead of sackcloth and ashes give us true repentance, and hearts meekly reverent; instead of the outward guise, to which some pay their only homage, give us the *inward spirit*; and may we really pray, really humiliate ourselves, and really tremble before the Most High God. Sanctify this service; make it useful unto us and honorable to Thyself. And O Thou dread Supreme, unto Thee shall be the glory and the honor, world without end. Amen.

#This Sermon was taken in Short-band by Messrs. REED, ROBESON and WOODWARD, of Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane, and revised by Mr. SPUEGEON.

Nos. 154-55. Penny Pulpit, Nos. 2,848-49.

Let us now praise God by singing the first Hymn. I shall read it through and then, perhaps, you will be kind enough to sing it through.

BEFORE Jehovah's awful throne,
Ye nations bow with sacred joy;
Know that the Lord is God alone;
He can create and he destroy.

His sovereign power, without our aid,
Made us of clay and form'd us men;
And when, like wand'ring sheep, we stray'd,
He brought us to his fold again.

We are his people, we his care,
Our souls and all our mortal frame;
What lasting honours shall we rear,
Almighty Maker, to thy name?

We 'll crowd thy gates with thankful songs,
High as the heav'ns our voices raise;
And earth with her ten thousand tongues,
Shall fill thy courts with sounding praise.

Wide as the world is thy command;
Vast as eternity thy love;
Firm as a rock thy truth must stand,
When rolling years shall cease to move.

Exposition.

DANIEL ix. v. 1—19.

"In the first year of Darius the Son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans,

"In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.

"And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes:

"And I prayed unto the Lord my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him and to them that keep his commandments;

"We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments:

"Neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets, which spake in thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land.

"O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee.

"O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against thee."

"To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him."

There is the first bright star which shines in the midst of the darkness of our sins. God is merciful. He is just—as just as if he were not merciful. He is merciful—as merciful as if he were not just, and in very deed more merciful than if he were too lenient; instead of blending a wise severity of justice with a gracious clemency of long-suffering. My brethren, we should rejoice that we have not this day to address the gods of the heathens. You have not to-day to bow down before the thundering Jove; you need not come before implacable deities, who delight in the blood of their creatures, or rather, of the creatures whom it is pretended that they have made. Our God delights in mercy, and in the deliverance of Britain from its ills. God will be as much pleased as Britain; yea, when Britain shall have forgotten it, and only the page of history shall record his mercies, God will still remember what he did for us in this clay of our straits and our difficulties. As to the hope that he will help us, it is a certainty. There is no fear that when we unite in prayer God will refuse to hear. It is as sure as that there is a God, that God will hear us; and if we ask him aright, the day shall come when the world shall see what Britain's God has done, and how he has heard her cry, and answered the voice of her supplications.

"Neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in his laws, which he set before us by his servants the prophets.

"Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God, because we have sinned against him.

"And he hath confirmed his words, which he spake against us, and against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon us a great evil: for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem.

"As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us: yet made we not our prayer before the Lord our God, that we might turn from our iniquities, and understand thy truth.

"Therefore hath the Lord watched upon the evil, and brought it upon us: for the Lord our God is righteous in all his works which he doeth: for we obeyed not his voice.

"And now, O Lord our God, that hast brought thy people forth out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand, and hast gotten thee renown, as at this day; we have sinned, we have done wickedly."

The prophet in his prayer pleads what God has done for them, as the reason why he should make bare his arm; he tells how God delivered Israel out of Egypt; and he therefore prays that God would deliver them from their present trouble. And, my brethren, not Israel itself could boast a nobler history than we, measuring it by God's bounties. We have not yet forgotten an armada scattered before the breath of heaven, scattered upon the angry deep as a trophy of what God can do to protect his favoured isle. We have not yet forgotten a fifth of November, wherein God discovered divers plots that were formed against our religion and our commonwealth. We have not yet lost the old men, whose tales of even of the victories in war are still a frequent story. We remember how God swept before our armies the man who thought to make the world his dominion, who designed to cast his shoe over Britain, and make it a dependency of his kingdom. God wrought for us; he wrought with us; and he will continue to do so. He hath not left his people, and he will not leave us, but he will be with us even to the end. Cradle of liberty! Refuge of distress! Storms may rage around thee, but not upon thee, nor shall all the wrath and fury of men destroy thee, for God hath pitched his tabernacle in thy midst, and his saints are the salt in the midst of thee.

"O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain: because for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us.

"Now, therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake.

"O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name: for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies.

"O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not I, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name."

And now for a few moments let us endeavour to pray:—

Prayer.

"OUR Father, which art in heaven," we will be brief, but we will be earnest if Thou wilt help us. We have a case to spread before Thee this day. We will tell out our story, and we will pray that Thou wouldst forgive the weakness of the words in which it shall be delivered, and hear us, for Jesus' sake. O Father, Thou hast smitten this our land, not in itself, but in one of its dependencies. Thou hast allowed a mutinous spirit to break out in our armies, and Thou hast suffered men who know not Thee, who fear neither God nor man, to do deeds for which earth may well blush, and for which we, as men, desire to cover our faces before Thee. O Lord God, Thou couldst not bear the sin of Sodom; we are sure Thou canst not endure the sin which has been committed in India. Thou didst rain hell out of heaven upon the cities of the plain. The cities of Inde are not less vile than they, for they have committed lust and cruelty, and have much sinned against the Lord. Remember this, O God of Heaven.

But, O Lord our God, we are not here to be the accusers of our fellow-men; we are here to pray that Thou wouldst remove the scourge which this great wickedness has brought upon us. Look down from heaven, O God, and behold this day the slaughtered thousands of our countrymen. Behold the wives, the daughters of Britain, violated, defiled! Behold her sons, cut in pieces and tormented in a manner which earth hath not beheld before. O God, free us, we beseech Thee, from this awful scourge! Give strength to our soldiers to execute upon the criminals the sentence which justice dictates; and then, by Thy strong arm, and by Thy terrible might, do thou prevent a repetition of so fearful an outrage.

We pray Thee, remember this clay the widow and the fatherless children; think Thou of those who are this day distressed even to the uttermost. Guide the hearts of this great multitude, that they may liberally give, and this day bestow of their substance to their poor destitute brethren. Remember especially our soldiers, now fighting in that land. God shield them! Be thou a covert from the heat! Wilt Thou be pleased to mitigate all the rigours of the climate for them! Lead them on to battle; cheer their hearts; bid them remember that they are not warriors merely, but executioners; and may they go with steady tramp to the battle, believing that God wills it that they should utterly destroy the enemy, who have not only defied Britain, but thus defiled themselves amongst men.

But, O Lord, it is ours this day to humble ourselves before Thee. We are a sinful nation; we confess the sins of our governors and our own particular iniquities. For all our rebellions and transgressions, O God have mercy upon us! We plead the blood of Jesus. Help every one of us to repent of sin, to fly to Christ for refuge, and grant that each of us may thus hide ourselves in the rock, till the calamity be overpast, knowing that God will not desert them that put their trust in Jesus. Thy servant is overwhelmed this day; his heart is melted like wax in the midst of him; he knoweth not how to pray. Yet, Lord, if thou canst hear a groaning heart which cannot utter itself in words, thou hearest his strong impassioned cry, in which the people join. Lord, save us! Lord, arise and bless us; and let the might of Thine arm and the majesty of Thy strength be now revealed in the midst of this land, and throughout those countries which are in our dominion. God save the Queen! A thousand blessings on her much-loved head! God preserve our country! May every movement that promotes liberty and progress be accelerated, and may everything be done in our midst which can shield us from the discontent of the masses, and can protect the masses from the oppression of the few. Bless England, O our God. "Shine mighty God, on Britain shine;" and make her still glorious Britain! "beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth." Lord accept our confessions; hear our prayers, and answer us by thy Holy Spirit! Help thy servant to preach to us; and all the glory shall be unto thee, O Father, to thee, O Son, and thee, O Holy Spirit; world without end. Amen and Amen.

Let us now sing the second hymn. It is made up of verses selected from different psalms, which I thought to be appropriate to the occasion.

OUR God, our help in ages past,
"Our hope for years to come,
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home.

Under the shadow of thy throne,
Thy saints have dwelt secure;
Sufficient is thine arm alone,
And our defence is sure.

Our foes insult us, but our hope
In thy compassion lies;
This thought shall bear our spirits up,
That God will not despise.

In vain the sons of Satan boast
Of armies in array;
When God has first despised their host.
They fall an easy prey.

Our God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Be thou our guard while troubles last,
And our eternal home.

Hoping to receive help from God's Holy Spirit, I shall now proceed to address you from a part of the 9th verse of the 6th chapter of Micah:—

Sermon.

"Hear ye the rod, and who hath appointed it."
—*Micah vi. 9.*

THIS world is not the place of punishment for sin; not *the* place; it may sometimes be *a* place, but not usually. It is very customary among religious people, to talk of every accident which happens to men in the indulgence of sin, as if it were a judgment. The upsetting of a boat upon a liver on a Sunday is assuredly understood to be a judgment for the sin of Sabbath-breaking. In the accidental fall of a house, in which persons were engaged in any unlawful occupation, the inference is at once drawn that the house fell because they were wicked. Now, however some religionists may hope to impress the people by such childish Stories as those, I, for one, forswear them all. I believe what my Master says is true, when he declared, concerning the men upon whom the tower of Siloam fell, that they were not sinners above all the sinners that were upon the face of the earth. They were sinners; there is no doubt about it; but the falling of the wall was not occasioned by their sin, nor Was their premature death the consequence of their excessive wickedness. Let me, however, guard this declaration, for there are many who carry this doctrine to an extreme. Because God does not usually visit each particular offence in this life upon the transgressor, men are apt to deny altogether the doctrine of judgments. But here they are mistaken. I feel persuaded that there are such things as national judgments, national chastisements for national sins—great blows from the rod of God, which every wise man must acknowledge to be, either a punishment of sin committed, or a monition to warn us to a sense of the consequences of sins, leading us by God's grace to humiliate ourselves, and repent of our sin.

O, my friends, what a rod is that which has just fallen upon our country! My poor words will fall infinitely short of the fearful tale of misery and woe which must be told before you can know how smartly God hath smitten, and how sternly he hath chidden us. We have to-day to mourn over revolted subjects, for to-day a part of our fellow countrymen are in open arms against our government. That, of itself, were a heavy blow. Happily the government of this land is so constituted that we know little of revolutions except by name; but the horrors of anarchy, the terrors of a government shaken to its foundations, are so great, that should I preach alone upon

that subject, you might hear the rod, and cry aloud beneath its strokes. But this is as but the letting forth of water. A flood succeedeth. The men that have revolted were our subjects, and I challenge all the world to deny what I am about to say: they were our subjects rightly. Whatever the inhabitants of India might be (and undoubtedly that people have grave faults to find with us), the Sepoys had voluntarily given themselves tip to our dominion, they had themselves taken oaths of fealty to Her Majesty, and their officers, and they have no cause to murmur if they are made to endure the sentence uttered by a government of which they were the sworn and willing supporters. They were always petted, always dandled upon the knee of favoritism. Their revolt is not the revolt of a nation. If India had revolted, history might perhaps have taught us that she had patriots in her midst, who were delivering her from a tyrannical nation; but in the present case it is only men who are impelled by a lust and ambition for empire, who have risen against us, And, ah! my friends, what crimes have they committed! Not to-day shall I detail, their acts of debauchery, bloodshed, and worse than bestiality—this tongue will not venture to utter what they have dared to do. Ye would rise from your seats and hiss me from the pulpit which I now occupy, if I should but dare to hint at the crimes which have been done of them, not in secret, but in the very streets of their cities.

And, again, equally as painful, we have now rebels to be executed. I look upon every gallows as a fearful chastisement. I regard every gibbet as being a dreadful visitation upon our land; and I think that whenever the arm of the ruler is outstretched for the punishment of death, it must always be looked upon by the country as a serious affliction to it. Just as the father thinks it a high affliction to chastise his child, so should a country ever esteem it to be a visitation when they have to punish, especially with the punishment of death. Now, these men must be punished; both heaven and earth demand it. I am no soldier, I love not war; I do not believe that this is a war at all, in the proper sense of the term. We are not fighting with enemies; our troops are going forth against revolted subjects—against men who, by their crimes, by their murder, and by other unmentionable sins, have incurred the punishment of death; and as the arrest of a murderer by authority of the law is not war, so the arrest of Indian Sepoys, and their utter destruction is not war—it is what earth demands, and what I believe God sanctions. But it is a horrible necessity. It is a dreadful tiling to think of taking away the lives of our fellow-subjects; we must look upon *it* as being an affliction: and, to-day, amongst the other evils that we bemoan, we must bemoan this—that the sword must be taken out of its sheath, to cut off our fellow-subjects by their thousands. The rod, *the rod*, THE ROD hath indeed fallen heavily; no mortal tongue can tell the anguish it hath caused, nor perhaps can we yet dream where its ill effects shall end.

Remember, however, the words of my text. It is a rod; but it is an *appointed* rod. Every deed that has been done against us has been appointed by God. God is most fully to be cleared from the sin of it, but it is undoubtedly true that he has overruled and permitted it. The rod was ordained of God. I myself see God everywhere. I believe that "the foreknown station of a rush by the river is as fixed as the station of a king, and the chaff from the hand of the winnower as steered as the stars in their courses." And I see God in this war. The wheels of providence may revolve in a mysterious manner, but I am certain that wisdom is the axle upon which they revolve, so that at last it shall be seen that God, who ordained the rod, only permitted it that greater good might follow, and that his name might be exalted through the earth. The sin is man's own deed, but the affliction that we suffer through it, God hath ordained. Let us bow before it, and let us now hearken to the exhortation of the text—"Hear ye the rod, and him that hath appointed it."

I shall have your attention whilst as briefly as I can I endeavour to bid you hear this rod of God.

First, let me remark, it would have been as well if we had heard this rod BEFORE IT FELL upon us. God's rod by the wise man may be heard before it smiteth. He that understandeth God's moral government, knows that sin carries punishment in its bowels. A wise man believing revelation, could have prophecied that God would visit us. The sins of the government of India have been black and deep. He who has heard the shrieks of tormented natives, who has heard the well-provoked cursing of dethroned princes, might have prophecied that it would not be long before God would unsheath his sword to avenge the oppressed. With regard to India itself, I am no apologist for our dominion there; with regard to the Sepoys, they are our voluntary subjects, they deserve the utmost rigour of the law. From their own oath they were our subjects; and if they have revolted let them suffer the punishment of their treason. But had it been the Indian nation that had revolted, I would have prayed God that they might have been brought under British rule again, for the sake of civilization, but I would not have preached a crusade against them, lest haply we should have been smiting patriots who were but delivering an oppressed country. My brethren, I say it would have been as well if the rod had been heard before it fell. If in the midst of sin the Indian government had paused, and endeavoured *to* undo the evil, it would have been well for them—if instead of following the policy of creed they had followed the policy of right, they might have looked for divine support. They never ought to have tolerated the religion of the Hindoos at all. I believe myself (for it in no way infringes the law of right), entitled to my religion; but if my religion consisted in bestiality, infanticide, and murder, I should have no right to my religion, unless, I were prepared to be hanged for it. Now, the religion of the Hindoos is neither more nor less, than a mass of the rankest filth that ever imagination could

have conceived. The gods they worship are not entitled to the least atom of respect. Had they given a decent character to their demons, we might, have tolerated their idolatry; but when their worship necessitates everything that is evil, not religion, but morality must put it down. I do not believe that in this land there ever ought to have been any toleration for the Agapemone. A place of lust and abomination, where sin is committed before which God's sun might blush, never ought to be tolerated. Any religion that does not infringe upon morality is beyond the force of legislature. But when once religious teachers teach immorality, and when once a religion compels men to sin, down with it; no toleration to it. It is impossible that there should be any quarter shewn to vice, even though embellished with the name of religion. If it be any man's religion to blow my brains out, I shall not tolerate it. If it be any man's religion to meet me as the Thugs do, and garotte me, and murder me, I shall not tolerate his Thugism. If it be a man's religion to commit bestial acts in public, I for one would touch his conscience, but believing that he has none, I would touch him somewhere else. Such a religion as the religion of the Hindoo, the Indian Government were bound, as in the sight of God, to put down with all the strength of their hand. Rut they have allowed it, in some cases they have even aided and abetted their filthy deeds; and now God visits them; and, I repeat, it would have been well if they had heard the rod before it fell; they might have perhaps avoided all this evil, and certainly they would have avoided the remorse which some of them must feel in having thus brought it upon themselves.

But it *has* fallen. The rod has smitten; the scourge has ploughed deep furrows upon India's back. What then? "Hear ye the rod" that has fallen. Now, it is an opinion published by authority—and who am I, that I should dispute the great authorities of England?—that one part of the reason for this dreadful visitation, is the sin of the people of England themselves. We are exhorted this day to humble ourselves for sin. Granting me that as being a truth—and mark, I am not the originator of it; it is in the Proclamation—who am I, that I should dispute such a high authority as that?—it is our sin that has brought it on us, so they say—what, then are our sins? Now, I will be honest with you—as honest as I can, and I will try and tell you. What are the most glaring sins for which, if it be true that God is now punishing us, are the most likely to have brought this visitation upon us?

First, there are sins in the community that never ought to have been allowed. O Britain, weep for deeds which thy governors have not yet strength of mind to stop. We have long been allowing the infamous nuisances of Holywell-street; bless God they are pretty well done for! But now what do I see every night? If I return from preaching in the country, in the Haymarket and in Regent-street, what stares me before my eyes If there be a crime for which God will visit England, it is the sin of allowing infamy to walk before our eyes thus publicly. I do not know whose fault it is—some say it is the fault of the police: it is somebody's fault, that I do know, and against that somebody I do now most solemnly protest. It is a most fearful thing that those who are honest and moral cannot walk the streets, without being insulted by sin in the robes of the harlot. My voice perhaps this day may reach some who have power to repeat this protest powerfully and successfully. I see before me gentlemen who are the representatives of the press. I believe they will do their duty in that matter; and if they will sting as some of them can sting, right sharply, they perhaps may be able to sting a little virtue into some of our governors, and that will be a good thing. But I do protest that this has been one of the causes why God has visited us, if indeed our sins have brought this evil upon us, as I verily believe. Look ye too, men and brethren, at some of those amusements of yours, in which ye are wont to indulge. God forbid I should deny you those of your amusements which are innocent, but I must maintain that they should be always moral; when we know that lords and ladies of the land, have sat in playhouses, and listened to plays that were a long way from decent, it is time that some voice should be lifted up against them. These are glaring sins. I am not raking now for private faults; we have had these things before our eyes, and there have been some that have dared to protest against them long ago. I say, these sins of the community, in part have brought the rod upon us.

But, my friends, I am inclined to think that our *class sins* are the most grievous. Behold this day the sins of the rich. How are the poor oppressed! How are the needy down-trodden! In many a place the average wage of men is far below their value to their masters. In this age there is many a great man who looks upon his fellows as only stepping-stones to wealth. He builds a factory as he would make a cauldron. He is about to make a brew for his own wealth. "Pitch him in! He is only a poor clerk, he can live on a hundred a year. *Put him in!* There is a poor time-keeper: he has a large family; it does not matter; a man can be had for less: *in with him!* Here are the tens, the hundreds, and the thousands that must do the work. *Put them in;* heap the fire; boil the cauldron; stir them up; never mind their cries. The hire of the labourers kept back may go up to heaven: it does not matter, the millions of gold are safe. The law of demand and supply is with us, who is he that would interfere. Who shall dare to prevent the grinding of the faces of the poor. Cotton-lords and great masters ought to have power to do what they like with the people: ought they not?" Ah! but ye great men of the earth, there is a God, and that God has said he executeth righteousness and judgment for all that are oppressed. And yet the sempstress in her garret, and yet the tailor in his den, and yet the artizan in his crowded factory, and yet the servants who earn your wealth, who have to groan under your oppression, shall get the car of God, and he will

visit you. "Hear ye the rod." It is for this the rod falleth on you.

Mark, again, the sins of merchants. Was there ever an age when the merchants of England had more fallen from their integrity? The mass of them, I believe, are honest to the core; but I do not know who among them are so. We can trust none in these times. Ye heap up your companies, and ye delude your myriads; ye gather the money of fools; ye scatter it to the winds of heaven, and when the poor call upon you ye tell them it is gone: but where? O England, thou wast once true, up-right, honest; men could not rightly call thee then Perfidious Albion;" but now, O Britain, alas! for thee! Unless thou dost recover thyself, who can trust thee? God will visit the nation for this, and it shall be seen that this alone is one of the things which God would have us hear, when we hear the rod.

There are many of you that are poor. I saw you smile when I spoke to the rich. I will have at you also. If we are to humble ourselves this day as a nation, ye have cause also to humble. Ah, my God, what multitudes there are of men who deserve but little of their employers, for they are eye-servers, men-pleasers, and do not with singleness of heart serve the Lord. Were men better workmen, their masters would be better. There are hundreds of you that are here to-day who are the best hands in all the world to prop up walls, when you ought to be busy at your own work—who, when your time is bought and paid for, steal it for something else. And how many there are in what are called the lower ranks—and God forgive the man that invented that word, for we are none of us lower than the other before the Judge of all the earth—how many are there that do not know what it is to look up to God, and say, "Though he has made me a servant, I will discharge my duty, and I will serve my master and serve my God with all my might." Many are the sins of the poor. Humble yourselves with the rich; bow your heads and weep for your iniquities; for these things God doth visit us, and ye should hear the rod.

It is impossible for me to-day to enter into all the sins of illiberality, of deceit, of bigotry, of lasciviousness, of carnality, of pride, of covetousness, and of laziness which infest this land. I have tried to indicate some of the chief; and I pray God humble us all for them.

And now "Hear ye the rod." O church of God the rod has fallen, and *the church* ought to hear it. I am afraid that it is the church that has been the greatest sinner. Do I mean by "the church" that established by law? No, I mean the Christian church as a body. *We*, I believe, have been remiss in our duty; for many and many a year pulpits never condescended to men of low estate. Our ministers were great and haughty; they understood the polish of rhetoric, they had all the grandeur of logic; to the people they were blind guides and dumb dogs, for the people knew not what they said, neither did they regard them. The churches themselves slumbered; they wrapped themselves in a shroud of orthodoxy, and they slept right on, and whilst Satan was devouring the world, and taking his prey, the church sat still, and said, "Who is my neighbour?" and did not arouse herself to serve her God. I do hope that we have already seen the beginning of a revival. The last year has seen more preaching than any year since the days of the apostles. We are stirring in Ragged Schools, and in various efforts for doing good; but still the church is only half awake; I fear she still slumbers. O church of God! awake! awake! for verily the rod has fallen for thy sake. "Hear thou the rod, and him that hath appointed it."

III. We have had many rods, friends; we have had many great afflictions, and we did bear them for a time; and now I close my sermon by saying, "Hear ye the rod, when the rod SHALL AGAIN BE STILL." we trust that in a little while our soldiers will carve us out peace and victory with their triumphant swords; we trust that, perhaps this very day, a great fight is being fought, and a great victory being won. I seem to hear to-day the shout of the triumphant warrior; I think I hear the trump of victory even now. The hour of prayer is often the hour of deliverance. At any rate, we hope that ere long this black cloud will be overblown: and then I fear you will all forget it. You will pray today: will you pray when victory comes? You will buy some fireworks, will you not? That is how you will thank God! You had a victory over a potent enemy, and peace was established: your votive offerings consisted of rockets and illuminations—grand offerings to the Dread Supreme! If a heathen were here he would say, "Their God is the God of humiliation, not the God of victory; their God is a God of trouble, certainly not the God of blessings, for they forget him when they receive deliverance." I remember, when last time the cholera swept through your streets ye hurried to your churches, and ye prayed; terror sat upon your countenances, and many of you cried aloud for deliverance. It came. What did you do? Alas! for your piety! It was as the morning cloud, and as the early dew it passed away. It will be so again. It is but as the lashing of the water; it is smitten, but it soon recovers itself, and all marks are effaced. It is so with this land; I fear it is so with each of us to a degree. How often have you and I been laid upon our beds with cholera, or with fever, or with some other disease which threatened to take us away! We prayed; we sent for the minister; we devoted ourselves to God; we vowed, if he would spare us, we would live better. Here thou art, my hearer, just what thou wast before thy sickness. Thou hast forgotten thy vow; *but God hath not forgotten it*. Thy resolutions were filed in heaven, and in the day of judgment, God shall take them forth, and say, "Here is one solemn covenant broken; here is another vow forgotten, another resolution made in sickness broken after recovery!" I do think that to-day will be a most solemn mockery, if our humiliation ends to-day. With some of

you it will not even begin to-day, and therefore it will not end, for it is not begun. But the mass who will pray to-day, will they pray in a week? Not they; they will go their way, to heap again the faggots of their sins upon the pile of vengeance, and still stand by and weep, because the fire is burning, the fire which they themselves have kindled. Oh! my hearers, permit me to charge home to your hearts; and would God that he would make the charge of my language against your consciences as heavy as the charge of British soldiery against the enemy! How many of you have been awakened, convinced of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment! How many times have you vowed you would repent! How many times have you declared that you did hear the rod, and that you would turn to God! And yet you have been liars to the Almighty; you have defrauded the Most High; and whilst the bill is due it still stands dishonored. Tremble! God may smite you yet; and if to-day you are despisers of Christ, remember, you have no guarantee that you will be in this world another hour. You may before this sun is set stand before your Maker's bar. What then? what then? what then? To perish for ever is no light matter; to be cast into the flames of hell is no little consideration. "Turn ye, turn ye, turn ye; why will ye die, O house of Israel!" Repent! "The times of your ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." And remember that when *he* gives repentance and faith, he has appended the blessing to them. "Jesus Christ of the seed of David" was nailed to a cross; he died that we might not die, and to every believer heaven's gate is open, to every penitent the path to paradise is free. Sinner! dost thou believe? If so, Christ hath blotted out thy sin. Be happy! Soul! dost thou repent? Thou art safe. God has helped thee to repent, and inasmuch as he hath done that he hath proved that he loves thee.

Oh! if I might but have some souls won to Christ to-day, what would I give? What is all this great gathering to me? It is an extra labour, that is all. For this I do not labour. God is my witness, I sought you not; never once have I said a thing to court a smile from any man. When God first sent me to the ministry he bade me fear no man, and I have not yet met the man to whom I have feared to tell of God's truth. Nor you have I sought to please, nor you have I sought to gather here. I would preach the gospel; may God give me some souls as my reward! And if but one poor sinner shall look to Jesus, clap your wings, ye angels! enough is done, for God is honored.

I have done my sermon, but I want to make an appeal to you to give liberally.

Lives there a man in England who will this day refuse his help to those of his countrymen who have suffered? No; there does not live such a man—not such a Briton. Is there a miserable miscreant without a heart, who will, when God has given him enough, shut up his bowels of compassion against those whose sons and daughters have been murdered, and who themselves have escaped as by the skin of their *teeth*. No I will not slander you by such a supposition. I cannot think that I have such a monster here. When the box shall pass round, give—give as you can afford; if it be a penny, let the working man give. You that are rich must not give pence, however. Many a man has said, "There is my mite." He was worth a hundred thousand pounds, and it was not a mite at all; if he had given a thousand it would only have been a mite to him. Give as ye can afford it; may God be pleased to grant a liberal spirit!

The following Chorus was then sung—

GLORY, honor, praise, and power,
Be unto the Lamb for ever;
Jesus Christ is our Redeemer,

Hallelujah, Amen.

After which, the benediction having been pronounced, the service terminated.

There were upwards of 24,000 persons present at this service; and the amount collected towards the Indian Relief Fund amounted to nearly £500, of which £25 was given by Miss Nightingale. The Crystal Palace Company contributed £200 in addition—making a total of nearly £700.

"To God be all the glory"

Copy of the Letter and Declaration

Issued by the

President of the Conference,

December 26TH, 1849:

With a List of the Wesleyan Ministers

Who have Affixed their Names to the Declaration.

London: Printed by James Nichols, Hoxton-Square.

The President's Letter.

Richmond, December 26th, 1849.

MY DEAR BROTHER,

THE subjoined Declaration has been drawn up at the suggestion of a number of our Brethren, and under a persuasion that a distinct and explicit avowal of our sentiments on the points which it embodies is imperatively called for at the present time, when strenuous attempts are made, by means of the press and of public meetings, under the name of Methodist Reform, to engage our Societies in schemes which, if carried into effect, would subvert the essential principles of our constitution as a religious community. If you approve of this Declaration, you are respectfully requested, without delay, to affix your name to it, and then return it, addressed to the Rev. Messrs. Holgate and Wilson, 24, City-Road, London, in order that it may, with the signatures of the Brethren, be forthwith published and circulated through the Connexion.

I am, my dear Brother,
Yours very sincerely,

Thomas Jackson,
PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE,
Rev.

Wesleyan Minister.

Declaration.

WE, the Undersigned Wesleyan Ministers, deem it a duty to make known our convictions and purposes in relation to the leading questions which are at present agitated in some parts of our Connexion. They who have voluntarily placed themselves under our pastoral care, that they may enjoy those religious advantages which the system handed down to us from our fathers affords, have a right to expect this from us; and, however painful may be the occasion which renders it necessary, we do not shrink from its fulfilment.

I.

- We cannot do this, however, without first pronouncing such an agitation as the present one to be altogether opposed to the spirit of our holy religion, and to the unequivocal dictates of the word of God. Slander and falsehood are distinctly forbidden. They are, with a plainness which admits no possibility of mistake, declared to be as contrary to the great law of love, as sins of the flesh are contrary to the great law of evangelical purity. In the sight of God they occasion the same guilt, and are equally destructive of the Christian character and position.
- The agitation is as un-Methodistical as it is un-Christian. There are provisions in our system for the redress of any real grievances, and for the suggestion of any practical improvements which circumstances may show to be safe and desirable. But, instead of taking this constitutional course, the appeal has been made to the public at large; not only to members of other churches, who cannot be supposed to have any sympathy with our peculiar principles and usages, and who in many instances do not even understand them; but also to what the agitators themselves would acknowledge to be "the world." And appeals are made to them on such principles only as worldly men can understand. The objects of ministerial discipline and of Christian communion are obviously beyond the reach of worldly appreciation; and therefore, by an assumed analogy of civil proceedings and social customs, has it been vainly sought to procure the condemnation of decisions founded on a higher law, and having respect to objects altogether different from those which worldly society contemplates.
- Nor is the manner in which this is clone by any means to be overlooked. It forms one of the darkest features of the case. It is, in the worst sense of the term, revolutionary. It tends directly to confusion and anarchy. It is the endeavour to procure the redress of alleged grievances in the church by popular clamour and excitement, superseding the investigation of the subject by the regularly constituted authorities,

overruling all order and law, and requiring the Ministers of Christ passively to receive as their rule of action the dictates of promiscuous and impassioned assemblies, avowedly hearing only one side of the case. This is not merely injurious to Christian discipline; it is absolutely destructive of it.

For such reasons, as well as for others that might be adduced, the Undersigned deeply deplore the agitation, decidedly protest against it, and affectionately warn all towards whom they sustain the pastoral relation to take heed that they give it no countenance.

II. The Undersigned will now refer to the Objects which this agitation seeks to obtain.

1. And they advert, in the first place, to those *Organic Changes* which are now so openly demanded. These, though not at the very first brought forward, yet were so soon proposed as to leave no doubt respecting the original views of some among the leading agitators, and their wishes to introduce into Methodism principles totally at variance with those which Mr. Wesley was led to adopt,—and which he not only committed to his successors in religious confidence that they would preserve them inviolate, but left binding on them by a legal instrument which they cannot nullify. By the Deed of Declaration enrolled in Chancery, the full validity of which has been acknowledged by the highest Courts in the land, Mr. Wesley has so fixed the constitution of the Conference that it must always consist, as he declares it had "always heretofore consisted," of the Ministers of the Connexion. On this foundation, that the Conference shall consist of Ministers alone, does Methodism, as a system acknowledged by law, completely rest. On this condition is the whole amount of Chapel property held. Departure from this would throw all into inextricable confusion. It is not in the power of the Conference, therefore, to alter this its exclusively ministerial character. Were the Conference to cease to be what the Deed of Declaration describes, all its rights to the sole use of the chapels, for the purpose of preserving them to the Connexion, would at once and absolutely cease. The admission of Lay Delegates, therefore, is legally impracticable.

But, further: Were the case in this respect otherwise, there are religious objections to the proposed scheme of Lay-Delegation; and these we cannot but feel to be of the gravest kind. For the full and fair exertion of Lay-Influence in all matters temporal and financial, we have cheerfully made provision by supplementary Regulations respecting the discussion of such matters in *Mixed Committees*;—and, as to New Legislation, there are important checks and securities provided by existing Rules. But there are *spiritual* and *ecclesiastical* duties, which are confided to us as men called of God to sustain the chief responsibility in His Church, and which we cannot share with others. Mr. Wesley had seen a great work arise by God's blessing on his labours. For the continuance and extension of that work he made provision, by committing the purity of the ministry in charge to the Conference. This sacred trust has descended to successive generations of Ministers. As such, the Undersigned now hold it. They did not frame Methodism. They received it, on the solemn pledge given to God and His Church that they would maintain it. They are not at liberty to change it, in any of its fundamental principles. On the system which they have thus received, the divine blessing has always rested. They are bound, therefore, by all obligations, human and divine, to be faithful to the pledges they have given, and to preserve their trust inviolate. If some additional regulations for the more effectual working of the system had been sought, consistent with the full and unweakened application of the principle laid down by Mr. Wesley, the case would have been different; but now that the principle itself is assailed, the Undersigned deem it their duty to renew the unequivocal declaration of their adherence to it, and their firm resolution, by the help and blessing of God, to maintain it themselves unimpaired, and to deliver it over unimpaired into the hands of their successors, requiring from them the same pledges of fidelity, that were given by the Undersigned themselves to their predecessors.

2. The Undersigned must also firmly adhere to the great principles involved in the Explanatory Declaration of 1835,—namely, that to the Conference alone belongs the determination of the conditions on which ministerial recognition and fraternity are to be accorded; and that, for the proper exercise and discharge of this important function, it must possess the right, which it has exercised from the very beginning, of Personal Examination, whenever it shall judge it to be called for by the circumstances of the case. This, also, they regard as a portion of that ancient trust which they are bound to maintain, and which, as a part of the system of Methodism, they believe to be just and necessary.

3. And, lastly, they feel now obliged to declare, that they believe the restoration of the persons whom the Conference was reduced to the painful necessity of excluding from ministerial communion and recognition, to be, under existing circumstances, impossible. The original act of discipline was righteous and necessary. It was performed with reluctance, and not until it had become evident that longer forbearance was inconsistent with the peace of the Societies, and with that discipline and good order which the Conference was bound to maintain. But the subsequent conduct of these individuals must now be also taken into the account. The original offences have been repeated and aggravated. A course of reckless agitation, for the purpose of revolutionizing the system, has been pursued. With men who avow such principles, who seek such objects, who employ such means, and who manifest such a spirit, the assailed body of Ministers cannot possibly have any communion.

The breach with *them* has become irreparable.

The Undersigned, having thus declared their deliberate opinion, cannot, however, conclude without thanking that great majority of the people of their pastoral charge who have remained tranquil, satisfied with the real benefits which they have derived from Methodism as at present constituted, and perfectly aware that the Ministers of the Connexion cannot possibly have any interest opposed to the spiritual prosperity of the church.

Nor must they omit to put the unwary on their guard. By plausible misrepresentations, these may be induced to join, for a time, in this unhappy course of agitation. What can they gain by it, but spiritual confusion and distress for themselves, with the certainty, if they persevere in the line of conduct on which they have been persuaded to enter, of their own SEPARATION from a system the spiritual advantages of which they and their families have so largely experienced,—and of a calamitous DIVISION in the Connexion, which Ministers, Trustees, and Leaders, as well as the people, must be anxious to avoid? Let them not expect that their Ministers will be led, through intimidation, to depart from the ground which in their conscience they believe to be right. Suspicions are plentifully expressed or insinuated, that many of them are adverse to the just rights and privileges of the people. They fearlessly deny it. They unequivocally declare that the privileges of the people are as sacred to them as the rights of the ministerial office; and that it is their determination to uphold both the one and the other in their mutual and corresponding relations. But, at the same time, they declare that, whatever may occur, they will not yield to menace. They have made their choice; and, by the help of God, they will abide by it. Never will they agree to mutilate or to alter the essential principles of that pure and simple constitution which, under God, was confided to them as a sacred deposit by Mr. Wesley.

It is in the hope that many will be encouraged, and some, at least, warned, that the Undersigned make this solemn Declaration.

Thomas Jackson, *President of the Conference.*

- Abbott, Alfred F.
- Abbott, George
- Abraham, Edward
- Addison, Edward
- Alder, Robert, D.D.
- Aldom, Isaac
- Aldom, William o.
- Alexander, John B.
- Allen, James (1st)
- Allen, James (2d)
- Allen, James (3d)
- Allen, Richard
- Allen, Samuel
- Allen, William (1st)
- Allen, William (3d)
- Allen, William (4th)
- Allin, John
- Alston, Nathaniel
- Anderson, John
- Andrew, Matthew
- Andrews, Benjamin, LL.D.
- Andrews, William
- Anwyl, Edward
- Appelbe, William P., LL.D.
- Appleby, William
- Arnett, Thomas
- Armson, Thomas
- Armstrong, John
- Armstrong, William
- Arthur, William
- Ash, William
- Ashton, Thomas
- Atherton, William

- Atkins, John H.
- Atkinson, Samuel
- Aubrey, Thomas
- Avery, John G.
- Bacon, William
- Badcock, Robert G.
- Baddiley, William
- Bagley, John
- Baiues, Thomas D.
- Baker, Thomas W.
- Baker, William, sen.
- Baker, William, jun.
- Bakewell, William H.
- Ball, Joseph L.
- Ballard, Thomas
- Ballingall, Thomas
- Balls, Henry
- Bambridge, William H.
- Bamford, Robert
- Banks, Edward M.
- Banks, Henry
- Banks, Matthew
- Banks, Robert
- Barber, Aquila
- Barker, Francis
- Barlow, Luke
- Barnley, George
- Barr, John T.
- Barr, Ninian
- Barrett, Alfred
- Barritt, John W.
- Barrowclough, Jonathan
- Bartholomew, James
- Bartley, John
- Barton, William
- Bass, James C.
- Bate, James
- Bate, Joseph
- Bates, Jonathan J.
- Batten, Thomas
- Batten, William
- Baylis, Edward
- Bayly, Benjamin
- Beale, H. M., A.B.
- Beamish, Thomas
- Beard, George
- Beard, Samuel
- Beauchamp, Robert
- Beckwith, James
- Bedford, John
- Beech, Hugh
- Beech, John H.
- Beecham, John, D.D.
- Bell, Alexander
- Bell, John
- Bell, Robert
- Bersey, Thomas
- Best, Edward

- Bestall, William S.
- Bicknell, John
- Binning, William
- Binns, Joseph
- Bird, William
- Birley, George
- Bissell, John
- Black, James
- Black, Robert
- Blackwell, John
- Bleby, Henry
- Blencowe, George
- Bolam, John
- Bond, Robert
- Bond, William
- Bonner, Richard
- Bonser, John
- Booth, Henry J.
- Booth, John
- Booth, William O.
- Botterell, Edmund
- Bowers, John
- Bowers, Thomas S., B.A.
- Bowman, John
- Bowman, Samuel
- Box, William
- Boyd, John
- Boyd, John H.
- Brailey, William
- Brailsford, Willson
- Bramford, Edward
- Bramford, William
- Bramley, John
- Bramwell, John
- Brandreth, John
- Branstone, Edward
- Brice, Edward
- Bridgnell, William
- Briggs, Frederick W.
- Britton, Maurice
- Broadbent, Samuel
- Brocklehurst, James D.
- Brocklehurst, Thomas H.
- Brocklehurst, William
- Brocksop, Samuel
- Brooke, James
- Brookes, Thomas
- Brookhouse, Joseph
- Broomfield, Robert W.
- Brothwood, Thomas
- Brown, Henry B.
- Brown, John (1st)
- Brown, John (2d)
- Brown, Richard
- Brown, Robert
- Brown, Samuel (1st)
- Brown, Samuel (2d)
- Brown, Thomas

- Browne, William
- Brownell, James
- Brownell, John B.
- Bruce, Robert
- Brumwell, Thomas
- Bryant, Robert
- Buckley, George
- Budd, Peter
- Bullivant, William J.
- Bumstead, James
- Bumstead, John
- Bunting, Jabez, D.D.
- Bunting, William M.
- Burgess, Abel
- Burgess, Joseph
- Burgess, William P.
- Burnside, William
- Burrows, George
- Burrows, Michael
- Burt, William
- Bustard, John
- Butler, William
- Butters, Uriah
- Button, John W.
- Bytheway, William
- Calder, Frederick
- Campbell, John
- Campbell, Robert H.
- Campbell, William G.
- Cannell, John
- Capp, Thomas
- Carey, James
- Carcy, John
- Carey, John D.
- Carlton, William
- Carr, James
- Carson, Robert
- Carter, Charles
- Carter, Hugh
- Carvosso, Benjamin
- Cass, Robert
- Casson, Hodgson
- Castle, Henry
- Cather, Robert G., A.M.
- Cather, William
- Catterick, Thomas
- Cattle, William
- Catton, James
- Chambers, George
- Chambers, John R.
- Chambers, William
- Chapman, Edward
- Chapman, Joseph
- Chapman, Richard
- Cheesewright, Joseph
- Cheesman, Jarvis
- Cheeswright, James
- Cheetham, Charles

- Chettle, Henry H.
- Chettle, John
- Cheverton, Henry Y.
- Chope, Thomas
- Christie, William
- Christophers, Samuel W.
- Church, Henry L.
- Clapham, James
- Clarke, Paul
- Clarke, Thomas P.
- Clarke, William F.
- Clarkson, William H.
- Clay, Charles
- Clayton, Benjamin
- Clegg, William
- Clement, George
- Clendinnen, John C.
- Close, John W.
- Clough, Benjamin
- Clulow, John
- Coates, John
- Coates, Walter
- Cobain, Edward
- Cock, Sampson
- Cocking, Thomas
- Colbron, William
- Coley, Samuel
- Collier, Francis
- Collier, James
- Collier, James
- Collier, John
- Collins, Thomas
- Colman, Robert
- Colwell, Charles
- Connon, John
- Cook, Charles
- Cook, Samuel
- Cooke, Corbett
- Cooke, James (2d)
- Cooke, James (3d)
- Cooke, John E.
- Cooke, Robert
- Cooper, Peter
- Cornforth, David
- Cornforth, William H.
- Cornwall, William
- Cotton, John W.
- Coulson, John E.
- Cousin, Michael
- Cowdy, Samuel
- Cox, Henry B.
- Cox, John G.
- Crabtree, Abraham
- Crankshaw, John W.
- Cranswick, Matthew
- Crawshaw, John
- Croft, George
- Crofts, Edward

- Crofts, John
- Croggon, Walter O.
- Crompton, Samuel
- Crook, William (1st)
- Crook, William (2d)
- Crookes, William
- Crosby, Thomas
- Crowe, John
- Crowther, Jonathan
- Crozier, Robert
- Crump, Joseph
- Cubitt, George
- Culcheth, William
- Cullen, John
- Curnock, George
- Curnock, Nehemiah
- Currelly, Charles
- Cusworth, Joseph
- Dalby, William
- Daniels, Henry
- Danks, John
- Davenport, William
- Davies, Evan
- Davies, Henry
- Davies, John W.
- Davies, Samuel (1st)
- Davies, Samuel (2d)
- Davies, William (1st)
- Davies, William (2d)
- Davies, William (3d)
- Davis, John
- Davison, William
- Dawson, John
- Dawson, John Wesley
- Dawson, Joseph B.
- Dawson, William
- Day, Robert
- Deakins, David
- Dean, Henry
- Deery, Henry
- Denham, Thomas
- Denison, Isaac
- Dennis, William B.
- Denton, John
- Dernaley, Abel
- Derry, Thomas
- Devers, Robert A.
- Dickin, Thomas
- Dickinson, George
- Dilks, Thomas T.
- Dixon, Myles C.
- Dixon, Seth
- Dixon, William
- Donald, James
- Donald, John
- Douglas, George
- Douglas, William
- Dove, Thomas

- Downing, Samuel
- Dowty, John
- Drake, John
- Dredge, John I.
- Drewitt, William
- Driver, George F.
- Dugdale, Robert
- Dunbar, James
- Duncan, John
- Duncan, Peter
- Duncan, William G.
- Dunn, James P.
- Dunn, Thomas
- Dwyer, John
- Dyson, John B.
- Dyson, Robert
- Eacott, James
- Earnshaw, Joseph
- Eastwood, Thomas
- Eaton, John
- Eckersley, Thomas
- Edgar, David
- Edgoose, Jesse
- Edmunds, Frederick F.
- Edney, James
- Edwards, Evan
- Edwards, Thomas
- Edwards, William (1st)
- Edwards, William (2d)
- Eglinton, John
- Elam, John
- Eland, Richard, sen,
- Eland, Richard, jun.
- Elliott, Frederick
- Ellis, Robert S.
- Elton, William
- Elvins, Benjamin
- England, John F.
- Eutwisle, Joseph
- Etchells, James
- Etheridge, John W., Ph.D.
- Evans, David
- Evans, John (1st)
- Evans, John (2d)
- Evans, Richard
- Evans, William
- Exell, Joseph
- Exley, William
- Exton, William
- Fairbourn, James P.
- Farquhar, Daniel
- Farrar, John
- Faull, John H.
- Featherstone, Peter
- Feeley, John
- Felvus, John
- Felvus, Richard
- Ferguson, Samuel

- Ferguson, William
- Ffrench, Patrick
- Fice, Edwin
- Fiddian, Samuel
- Findlay, James
- Finley, William
- Firth, Benjamin
- Fish, Henry, A.M.
- Fisher, James
- Fitzgerald, Thomas M.
- Fletcher, Adam
- Fletcher, John
- Fletcher, Joseph
- Fletcher, Thomas
- Flower, Thomas
- Floyd, Joseph
- Foote, William
- Ford, William
- Foster, John
- Foster, Thomas
- Foster, William
- Fowler, James
- Fowler, Joseph
- Fowler, Philip
- Fox, William (1st)
- Fox, William (2d)
- France, William
- Frank, Joseph
- Frankland, Benjamin, sen.
- Frankland, Benj., jun., B.A.
- Freeman, Ambrose
- Garbutt, Thomas (1st)
- Garbutt, Thomas (2d)
- Garrett, Joseph
- Gartside, Benjamin
- Geach, Hender
- Geake, Elias
- Geddes, Henry
- Geden, John
- Geden, John D.
- Gilbert, John
- Giles, Henry J.
- Giles, Matthew
- Gillman, James B.
- Godden, James
- Golding, James
- Goodwin, Josiah
- Goodwin, Thomas B,
- Gostick, John
- Cover, Robert
- Gov, William D.
- Graham, Henry
- Grant, Charles Lynn
- Gravel, David
- Green, Thomas
- Greenwood, George
- Greer, John
- Greeves, Francis W.

- Greeves, John W.
- Gregory, John
- Griffith, Frederick
- Griffith, Morgan
- Griffiths, David
- Guard, William
- Hagen, George
- Hague, John
- Haigh, James S.
- Haigh, John
- Haigh, Samuel
- Haime, Charles
- Hales, William
- Hall, John
- Hamilton, Robert
- Hannah, John, D.D.
- Hannah, John
- Hanwell, John
- Hardcastle, Philip
- Harding, Isaac
- Harding, John
- Harding, Richard
- Harding, Thomas
- Hardy, Richard
- Hardy, Robert S.
- Hardy, Thomas
- Hare, Robert H.
- Hargreaves, James
- Hargreaves, Joseph
- Harley, William
- Harman, Joshua
- Harrington, John
- Harris, James
- Harris, Thomas
- Harrop, John
- Hartle, James
- Hartley, John
- Harvard, George C.
- Harvard, Henry M.
- Harvard, John
- Harvard, Stephen P.
- Harvard, William M., A.M.
- Harvie, William
- Hastling, Henry
- Haswell, John P.
- Hateley, Daniel
- Hawksley, Robert J. T.
- Haworth, Benjamin
- Haworth, Robert
- Hawthorne, Charles
- Hay, David
- Hay, John
- Haydon, Charles
- Hayman, Henry
- Hazleton, Edward
- Hazleton, John
- Healey, Samuel
- Heape, John

- Heape, Richard
- Hearnshaw, John
- Heaton, James
- Heaton, Joseph
- Hebb, John
- Heeley, Thomas
- Hellier, Benjamin
- Henderson, Anketell M.
- Henley, William
- Henry, James
- Kenwood, Oliver
- Herbert, John
- Hesk, Thompson
- Hessel, William
- Hetherington, John P.
- Hewitt, Robert
- Heys, Robert
- Heywood, Luke
- Hickey, Thomas
- Hickling, John
- Hicks, Henry
- Hickson, Thomas
- Higgins, John
- Hill, John
- Hill, Thomas
- Hill, Thomas H.
- Hill, William
- Hindson, James C.
- Hine, Henry
- Hinson, William
- Hirst, John
- Hirst, Joseph
- Hirst, William
- Hobart, Nathaniel
- Hobill, George
- Hobkirk, John
- Hobson, John
- Hocort, James
- Hocken, Joshua
- Hodgson, John
- Hodson, Thomas
- Hoey, William (1st)
- Hoey, William (2d)
- Holgate, Israel
- Holland, Henry W.
- Hollis, Joseph
- Holmes, John
- Holroyd, James B.
- Hoole, Elijah
- Hooley, Samuel
- Hopewell, James
- Hopewell, William
- Horsfield, Robert W.
- Horton, Edward
- Horton, Peter C.
- Horton, William
- Horton, William L.
- Hoskins, Pascho

- Howe, Charles
- Huddleston, William
- Hudson, Benjamin
- Hudson, Josiah
- Hughes, Evan
- Hughes, George
- Hughes, Griffith
- Hughes, Hugh
- Hughes, James
- Hughes, James
- Hughes, John
- Hughes, John
- Hughes, Lot
- Hughes, Rowland
- Hughes, William
- Hugill, John
- Hulme, Thomas
- Hume, Alexander
- Hunt, Joseph
- Hurst, George
- Hurt, William
- Hussey, Walter
- Huston, Andrew
- Huston, Robert
- Hutchison, James
- Hutton, Joseph
- Hyde, James
- Illingworth, William
- Ingham, Jabez
- Ingham, John
- Ingle, Timothy C.
- Inglis, Robert
- Ingram, William
- Jackson, Elijah
- Jackson, George
- Jackson, John
- Jackson, Robert
- Jackson, Samuel
- Jackson, William (1st)
- Jackson, William (2d)
- Jackson, William (3d)
- James, Alexander T.
- James, John H.
- James, John P.
- James, Robert
- James, Thomas
- Janion, Charles
- Jarrett, James
- Jebb, John
- Jefferies, Thomas
- Jeffery, Thomas
- Jenkins, Isaac
- Jennings, Edward
- Jessop, William
- Jewell, Thomas
- Jewett, William
- Job, Zephaniah
- Jobson, Frederick J.

- John, Benjamin
- Johnson, Hugh
- Johnson, John P.
- Johnson, Michael
- Johnson, Robert
- Johnston, Edward (1st)
- Johnston, Edward (2d)
- Johnston, James
- Johnston, Joseph
- Johnston, Samuel
- Joll, John M.
- Jones, Daniel
- Jones, David (1st)
- Jones, Edward (1st)
- Jones, Edward (2d)
- Jones, Hugh
- Jones, Humphrey
- Jones, Isaac
- Jones, James (1st)
- Jones, James (2d)
- Jones, John (1st)
- Jones, John (2d)
- Jones, John (3d)
- Jones, John (4th)
- Jones, John Samuel
- Jones, John Spenser
- Jones, Joseph
- Jones, Lewis
- Jones, Robert (1st)
- Jones, Robert (2d)
- Jones, Robert G.
- Jones, Thomas (1st)
- Jones, Thomas (2d)
- Jones, Thomas R.
- Jones, William
- Jubb, Martin
- Julian, John D.
- Keeling, Francis S.
- Keeling, Isaac
- Keeling, Ralph R.
- Keet, Henry
- Keightley, John
- Kelk, William
- Kemp, John
- Kemshall, Thomas
- Kendall, James (1st)
- Kendall, James (2d)
- Kent, Thomas
- Kershaw, John
- Kessen, Andrew, LL.D.
- Kevern, George
- Key, Thomas
- Keys, James
- Keys, William
- Keysell, Thomas O.
- Key worth, Robert
- Killick, John
- Kilner, Thomas

- King, Edward
- Kipling, Joseph
- Kirk, John (1st)
- Kirk, John (2d)
- Kirk, John M.
- Kirkland, Henry
- Knaggs, Edmond
- Knowles, John (2d)
- Kyle, Samuel
- Lambert, John
- Lancaster, James
- Langley, Aaron
- Langridge, William
- Laughner, Henry
- Lawton, Joseph
- Laycock, James
- Leach, Thomas
- Jeake, Robert
- Leale, George
- Learoyd, Amos
- Lebert, William B.
- Lees, James
- Lees, William
- Leigh, Samuel
- Lemmon, James
- Jeppington, John C.
- Lesson, John
- Levell, William
- Lewis, Joseph
- Lewis, Robert
- Lewis, William H.
- Liddy, John
- Lightwood, Edward
- Lilly, Isaac
- Lindley, William
- Lindsay, Robert H.
- Little, James
- Livingston, John
- Llewellyn, Thomas
- Lloyd, John
- Locke, John
- Lockwood, John P.
- Lockyer, Alfred
- Lockyer, Edmund
- Lomas, John
- Long, Mortlock
- Lord, John H.
- Lord, Samuel
- Lord, William
- Lough, William
- Loutit, James
- Lowthian, Joseph
- Lucas, Samuel (1st)
- Lucas, Samuel (2d)
- Luddington, John
- Lupton, William
- Lynch, James
- Lyon, Robert.

- Lyth, John
- M'Afee, Daniel
- M'Aulay, Alexander
- Macaulay, Samuel
- MacBrair, Robert M.,M.A.
- M'Clintock, James
- M'Cormick, Charles
- M'Cullagh, Thomas
- Macdonald, George B.
- Macdonald, James A.
- M'Dowell, Samuel
- M'Elwain, George
- M'Garvey, William
- M'Kay, Colin
- M'Kay, Joseph W.
- M'Kenny, John
- Mackintosh, Andrew
- M'Kitrick, William
- M'Lean, John
- M'Lorinan, Thomas
- M'Millen, Gibson
- M'Mullen, Wallace
- M'Owan, John
- M'Owan, Peter
- Magee, George
- Mainwaring, Robert
- Male, Matthew T.
- Mallinson, Matthew
- Mann, John
- Mansie, Alexander
- Marsden, George
- Martin, John
- Martin, Richard
- Martin, Thomas
- Masaroon, Robert
- Mason, John
- Mather, George
- Matthews, John F.
- Maunder, George
- Maxwell, Richard
- Maxwell, Robert
- Mayer, James
- Meadmore, James
- Mearns, William, M.A.
- Mellor, George B.
- Meredith, Thomas
- Merrill, Samuel
- Methley, James
- Meyer, Robert J.
- Midgley, Joseph
- Millar, Joseph
- Miller, James
- Milner, Joseph T.
- Mitchell, Benjamin G.
- Mitchell, James
- Moister, William
- Mollard, John
- Monkhouse, Thomas S.

- Mood, Joseph
- Moody, John F.
- Moody, Richard
- Moone, George
- Moore, Hugh
- Moore, John
- Moore, Roger
- Moorhouse, Joseph
- Morgan, Ebenezer
- Morgan, Elijah
- Morgan, John
- Morley, John T.
- Morris, John
- Morris, Seth
- Morris, Thomas
- Morrison, George T.
- Morrow, Francis
- Mortimer, Joseph
- Morton, Jacob
- Morton, Robert
- Moss, Thomas
- Mottram, Joshua
- Moulton, Ebenezer
- Moulton, James E.
- Mowat, James
- Moxon, Thomas
- Moxon, Timothy R.
- Muff, John I.
- Mulloy, William
- Murdock, James
- Murray, Thomas
- Mycock, Josiah
- Nance, James
- Nash, John
- Naylor, Dixon
- Naylor, William
- Neale, Francis
- Needle, Henry
- Nelson, John (1st)
- Nelson, John
- Nelson, William T.
- Nesbitt, John
- Newstead, Robert
- Newton, Christopher
- Newton, John
- Newton, Robert, D.D.
- Newton, Thomas
- Nicholson, John
- Nicholson, Joseph
- Nicklin, John
- Nightingale, Charles
- Nightingale, Thomas
- Noall, Simeon
- Noble, Arthur
- North, Charles
- North, George
- Norton, John H.
- Nowell, John (1st)

- Nowell, John (2d)
- Nye, Edward
- Odgers, James
- Officer, Joseph
- Oldfield, Edmund
- Oliver, John
- Olivier, Amice
- Olver, Henry V.
- Orchard, Paul, sen.
- Orchard, Paul, jun.
- Osborn, George
- Osborn, James
- Osborne, Daniel
- Osborne, John
- Osborne, Thomas
- Overton, Jabez
- Owen, Henry
- Owen, Robert
- Owens, Owen
- Owens, William
- Padman, Thomas
- Palmer, Jabez
- Parker, William
- Parkes, James
- Parkes, John
- Parkinson, William
- Parry, Evan
- Parry, John
- Parsons, Humphrey
- Parsons, John
- Parsons, Peter
- Parsonson, William
- Partridge, Reuben
- Paterson, George
- Pattison, James
- Payne, Frederick
- Payne, Joseph
- Payne, Thomas
- Pearce, Benjamin
- Pearce, John
- Pearson, John M.
- Pearson, Josiah
- Pearson, Thomas (1st)
- Pechey, Joseph
- Peck, William P.
- Pedley, Harry
- Pemberton, William
- Pengelly, John Carey
- Pennington, Thomas
- Perks, George T.
- Petch, Richard
- Phenix, Isaac, sen.
- Phenix, Isaac, jun.
- Phillips, John
- Philp, John
- Pickworth, Felix H.
- Piggott, John
- Piggott, William

- Pilcher, Jesse
- Pilley, James
- Pollinger, Henry
- Pope, Henry (2d)
- Pope, William H.
- Portrey, Joseph
- Posnet, Leonard
- Potts, Charles D.
- Potts, Francis B.
- Povah, Charles
- Powell, William (1st)
- Powell, William (2d)
- Powis, Henry
- Pratten, Joseph
- Prescott, Peter, sen.
- Prescott, Peter, jun.
- Prest, Charles
- Pretty, Joseph
- Price, Henry
- Prichard, Richard
- Pridham, Nicholas C.
- Puddicombe, Alexander
- Pugh, Evan
- Pugh, Theophilus
- Punshon, William M.
- Quick, William A.
- Raby, John
- Radcliffe, Charles
- Radcliffe, William T.
- Railton, Lancelot
- Randerson, John
- Ranson, Henry
- Ranyell, George
- Rathbone, James
- Rattenbury, John
- Rawlings, Charles
- Rawson, John
- Ray, James
- Ray, Richard
- Raynar, Joseph
- Rayner, Moses
- Rayner, Thomas A.
- Reece, Richard
- Rees, John
- Rees, Robert
- Reilly, William
- Relph, John
- Renier, John
- Rennard, Andrew
- Rennison, William
- Reynolds, John (1st)
- Reynolds, John (2d)
- Richards, Evan
- Richards, John (1st)
- Richards, John (2d)
- Richards, John L.
- Richardson, Henry
- Richardson, Thomas

- Ricketts, William,
- Ridgeway, Thomas
- Ridler, Christopher
- Ridsdale, John S.
- Rigby, Thomas
- Rigg, James H.
- Rigg, John
- Riley, Calverley
- Ritchie, Charles B.
- Roadhouse, John
- Roberts, Benjamin
- Roberts, James
- Roberts, John (1st)
- Roberts, John (2d)
- Roberts, John W.
- Roberts, Joseph
- Roberts, Richard
- Robin, Daniel
- Robinson, George
- Robinson, John
- Robinson, John H.
- Robinson, Samuel W.
- Robinson, Thomas
- Robson, William
- Robson, William H.
- Rodham, Thomas M.
- Rodman, William
- Roebuck, George
- Rogers, John
- Rogers, Thomas
- Rogers, William R.
- Rogerson, Thomas
- Rossell, John
- Rosser, James
- Rouch, William W.
- Ronght, Jabez
- Rouse, Nathan
- Rowe, George
- Rowe, George H.
- Rowe, Samuel
- Rowe, Thomas
- Rowland, Thomas
- Rowlands, William
- Rule, William H.
- Russell, Edward
- Russell, George
- Ryan, John (1st)
- Ryan, John (2d)
- Sackett, Edward
- Salt, Matthew
- Samuel, Peter
- Sanders, John L.
- Sanders, William
- Sanger, Joseph T.
- Sargent, William H.
- Saul, John
- Saunders, John
- Savage, Thomas

- Scholes, James
- Scott, George (1st)
- Scott, George (2d)
- Scott, John
- Scott, Robinson
- Scott, Uriah
- Scurrah, Ralph
- Seccombe, William
- Sedgwick, John
- Sergeant, Richard
- Shackleton, William
- Sharland, Peter
- Sharman, John
- Sharpe, William
- Shaw, James
- Shaw, Thomas
- Shaw, William (2d)
- Shearman, William
- Sheers, Thomas
- Sheldon, Thomas
- Shelton, Edward
- Sherwell, Robert
- Shipham, John
- Shipman, John
- Shoar, James
- Short, Thomas
- Shovelton, Wright
- Shrewsbury, William J.
- Sibley, Nicholas
- Simmons, John
- Simmons, Samuel
- Simon, John
- Simpson, Joseph
- Simpson, Samuel
- Simpson, William
- Skidmore, John
- Skidmore, William J.
- Slack, Benjamin
- Slater, Barnard
- Slater, William P.
- Sleep, William
- Sleigh, William
- Slight, Frederick
- Slugg, Thomas
- Smailes, Richard
- Small wood, Henry
- Smart, John
- Smedley, John
- Smeeth, James
- Smetham, Richard
- Smith, Benjamin
- Smith, George (1st)
- Smith, George (3d)
- Smith, Gervase
- Smith, John (1st)
- Smith, John (2d)
- Smith, Thomas W.
- Smith, Thornley

- Smith, William (1st)
- Smithson, John
- Spencer, Joseph
- Spencer, William
- Spenseley, Calvert
- Squance, Thomas H.
- Staley, Henry J.
- Stamp, William W.
- Stanley, Jacob, sen.
- Stanley, Jacob, jun.
- Staton, Thomas
- Stead, Thomas
- Stephens, Francis
- Stephens, Frederick
- Stephenson, John
- Stephenson, Thomas
- Stephenson, William B.
- Stepney, Richard
- Stevens, John
- Stevenson, Humphrey
- Stevinson, William
- Steward, George
- Stewart, William
- Stinson, Joseph
- Stirzaker, John
- Stokes, Edward
- Stokes, William
- Stokoe, Thomas
- Storey, John C.
- Stott, James
- Stott, Ralph
- Strachan, Alexander
- Sturges, Edwin J.
- Sugden, James
- Sugden, William
- Sullivan, James
- Sumner, Edward
- Sumner, John P.
- Sutch, James
- Sutcliffe, Joseph, A.M.
- Sutton, Joseph
- Swallow, William
- Sykes, Joseph
- Symons, Mark
- Tabraham, Richard
- Talbot, Ebenezer R., A.M.
- Talbot, John
- Talbot, Theophilus
- Talboys, Thomas
- Tatham, Daniel S.
- Taylor, George
- Taylor, George C.
- Taylor, James (1st)
- Taylor, Michael C.
- Taylor, Samuel
- Taylor, William
- Taylor, William H.
- Telfer, Edward A.

- Thomas, Henry J.
- Thomas, James S.
- Thomas, John (3d)
- Thomas, John W.
- Thomas, Methuselah
- Thomas, William
- Thompson, Robert
- Thompson, Thomas, A.M.
- Thorley, Edwin
- Thorneloe, William B.
- Thornton, William L., M.A.
- Timms, Samuel
- Timms, Thomas
- Tindall, John
- Tindall, Samuel
- Toase, William
- Tobias, James
- Topham, James J.
- Totherick, Robert
- Turgis, Philip
- Tovey, Ebenezer
- Toyne, Elijah
- Tracy, Richard T.
- Tranmer, Francis T.
- Trethewey, Humphrey P.
- Triffitt, Anthony
- Trueman, Samuel
- Tucker, Charles
- Tucker, John
- Tucker, Joseph K.
- Turner, George (2d)
- Turner, Thomas
- Turton, Charles G.
- Turton, Isaac
- Turvey, Jacob
- Twiss, Alexander
- Tyack, William D.
- Tyerman, Luke
- Vance, George
- Vanes, John
- Vasey, Thomas
- Vercocoe, Walter
- Ververs, William
- Vibert, Charles W.
- Vigis, Everit
- Vine, John
- Waddy, Benjamin B.
- Waddy, Richard
- Waddy, Samuel D.
- Wade, Joshua
- Walker, Edward
- Walker, John
- Walker, John
- Walker, Joseph
- Walker, Samuel
- Walker, Thomas H.
- Walker, Thomas J.
- Wallace, Robert

- Waller, James
- Walsh, John
- Walter, John
- Walton, James
- Ward, Anthony
- Ward, John (1st)
- Wardley, Samuel H.
- Waiters, Edmund B.
- Waterhouse, Levi
- Waterhouse, William
- Watmough, Abraham
- Watson, Edward
- Watson, John
- Watson, Joseph
- Waugh, James S.
- Waugh, John
- Waugh, Thomas
- Weatherstone, John
- Webb, Thomas
- Webb, William (1st)
- Wedlock, William
- Weir, Alexander T.
- Welborne, William
- Wesley, Samuel
- West, Daniel
- West, Francis A.
- West, Joseph B.
- Westlake, Charles
- Wetherell, John
- Wevill, John
- Wheeler, James
- White, George F.
- Whitehead, Joseph
- Whittingham, John B.
- Wilcox, Henry
- Wilde, Samuel
- Wilkinson, Henry
- Wilkinson, Joseph T.
- Wilkinson, Peter
- Wilkinson, Samuel (2d)
- Wilkinson, Thomas
- Wilkinson, William
- Willan, William
- Willcox, Robert M.
- Williams, Charles
- Williams, Charles J.
- Williams, David
- Williams, Henry W.
- Williams, John
- Williams, John
- Williams, Lewis
- Williams, Robert
- Williams, Thomas (1st)
- Williams, William (1st)
- Williams, William (2d)
- Williams, William R.
- Willis, Charles
- Willis, John

- Wilson, James
- Wilson, J. Gilchrist
- Wilson, Jeremiah
- Wilson, John (1st)
- Wilson, John G.
- Wilson, John W.
- Wilson, Joseph
- Wilson, Maximilian
- Wilson, Stephen
- Wilson, William (2d)
- Wilson, William (3d)
- Wilson, William (4th)
- Winterburn, William
- Wiseman, Luke H.
- Withington, Thomas
- Womersley, Joseph
- Wood, Benjamin
- Wood, John (1st)
- Wood, John (2d)
- Wood, Joseph
- Wood, Robert
- Wood, Thomas
- Wood, Thomas S.
- Woodcock, Isaac
- Woodfin, Richard
- Woodrow, John
- Woolley, Frederick F.
- Woolmer, Charles E.
- Woolmer, Theophilus
- Worker, William
- Workman, John S.
- Worth, William
- Yardley, Jabez
- Yeates, John T.
- Young, Henry
- Young, Robert
- Young, Samuel

The End.

London:-Printed by James Nichols, Hoxton-Squarf.

Protestant Crisis-Prize Essay, No. II. Ireland: the True Source of its Evils. The True Remedy. By Edward Taylor Dartnell, Esq.

Being the Essay

Selected

By Rev. T. R. Birrs and Rev. J. E. Cox, Referees,

For the Premium Given by the Committee of the Protestant Association for the Best Essay on the Above Subject.

London: Published for the Protestant Association, by Hatchards, Rivingtons, Seeleys, Shaw, Dalton, and Jackson. 1850.

Price Sixpence.

Alexander Macintosh. Printer, Great New-Street, London.

Ireland: the True Source of its Evils. The True Remedy.

Prize Essay on the Following Subject:—

The Manifold Evils which this Nation Suffers from the Demoralized and Distressed Condition of Ireland,

which cannot but Continue so Long as Popery is Upheld; and Thence the Duty and Wisdom of Government, to Encourage all Wise and Proper Measures for Affectionately Leading the Irish Roman Catholics to the Knowledge of Divine Truth, as Maintained by our Reformed and Protesting Church.

THERE never was a period in which the condition of the Irish people appears to have attracted more general attention, or to have more completely baffled the skill of British statesmen than in that of these latter years. Every measure intended for her amelioration seems to have failed in the object, if it did not aggravate pre-existing evils. But it is not to be wondered that such is the case, for in most instances they have been applicable only to superficial symptoms of social disorganization, whilst the undercurrent that influences so much the tide of events in Ireland is altogether unobserved amid the turmoil of parties. For a period of nearly seventy years the Irish agitators of the day have from time to time put forward grievance after grievance, complaint after complaint, in rapid succession, and as the former has been removed and the latter redressed, as each successive head of the hydra has been lopped off, another has presented itself, more formidable than any that preceded it. In vain has concession followed concession, until there remains nothing further to concede without subverting all the established institutions of the country, even the Monarchy itself,—Ireland still remains as distracted as ever,—her population in a perpetual state of smouldering rebellion,—her natural resources undeveloped,—her trade paralyzed,—life and property lamentably insecure, and every *bonâ fide* effort that modern legislators have made to rescue her from this deplorable condition has only increased the demands of her demagogues, and added fuel to the flame of discontent. Well would it be if the evil were confined to Ireland, but such is not the case; its emissaries have migrated from her shores to England, there to spread the leprosy. Irish demoralization and Irish distress stalk through the English counties. Millions have been freely lavished, but in vain. Foul disease, gaunt famine, gross superstition and intellectual debasement assail the doors of many an English home. These are beyond the power of pecuniary remedies, and though England groans beneath the burden thus cast upon her, those groans are not so much at the amount of her pecuniary sacrifices as at their utter inapplicability to existing evils—evils which, if unchecked any longer, must be subversive alike of the social happiness and the national welfare of England.

It is not to be wondered then that all eyes are turned to Ireland's present state—all ears awake to the wailing of distress which every breeze now wafts from her shores,—and all hands ready to aid in relieving her real wants and improving her condition. Each, however, would effect this desideratum in his own peculiar way, and we believe there never was a disease, social, political, or bodily, to cure which so many charlatans have come upon the stage and propounded each his nostrum. The state of Ireland has been too long a question of party, and in the political *melee*, the real measures for her amelioration have been neglected. But the time has now arrived when this should cease to be the case. The Sister Isle must be rescued from her degraded state, and in time, we trust, brought to a full participation in the prosperity and happiness of England.

But Roman Catholic Ireland is a strange anomaly amongst nations. Providence has blessed her with a fertile soil, a genial climate, and inexhaustible resources of undeveloped wealth, but her people know not how to appreciate those blessings, or make them available for the public good. During the last century, whilst England has made rapid strides to the highest point of civilization, science, literature, and social prosperity, Ireland has been the seat of anarchy and crime—destitution and misery—ignorance and superstition—disaffection and rebellion. These have impeded every effort for the improvement of the country, or the welfare and happiness of her people. Sad as this state of things undoubtedly is—following as it does the career of legislative concessions which began in 1784 and reached their climax with the Roman Catholic Relief Bill of 1829;—and increasing as it does with every fresh sacrifice to Romanism, we must cease to attribute those dire results to the hitherto supposed inciting causes, and seek for others. These we shall find in *the blighting influence exercised upon her people by the Romish priesthood and the Romish faith*, which is there inculcated in all its hideous deformity, stripped of that superficial gloss which it assumes in enlightened and Protestant England.

From its earliest dawn to the present time, wherever Christianity has been truly preached, it wins upon and humanizes even the savage breast, and develops all the better feelings of our nature. Christian man ceases to live in a state of perpetual warfare with his fellow-man. He learns to love his neighbour as himself. He learns mutual forbearance and forgiveness, and a hope arises within his breast, that when he shall be called from this his earthly pilgrimage it may be to a life of immortality and bliss. True Christianity is a religion of peace, and wherever it flourishes happiness and prosperity will abide. These are blessings which are unknown to Roman Catholic Ireland, for there, alas! true Christianity is a stranger to the bulk of her population, and its place is usurped by a religion, the tenets of which, wherever it prevails, are the parents of barbarism, and must in time debase the most civilized of nations. There is not, we believe, any other land, Christian even in name, in which demoralization and distress so fearfully prevail. There every evil passion that can influence the breast of man rules uncontrolled. The figure of distress rocks upon her seat and wrings her lank and withered hands, which she *will not* stretch forth to gather the gifts that God has scattered around with lavish bounty; and there is not another country in Europe in which life is valued less, and crime reduced to a regular system.

It shall be our duty in the first place to expose that system and to trace its bitter fruits, the prevailing demoralization and crime, to *the moral and religious instruction received by the Irish Roman Catholics at the hands of their Church*, and we trust we shall prove that whilst this is the case the regeneration of Ireland is hopeless, and that it can only be attainable by other and better measures than those hitherto pursued, and a line of policy hitherto unattempted.

In every country where social disorganization and popular ignorance prevail, designing men are always found to avail themselves of every element of discord and discontent for the furtherance of their own ambitious ends. So has it been in Ireland. At the time that the Roman Catholic clergy were permitted the free exercise of their religion, political Associations had their birth, and have continued to agitate the public mind, whilst the ignorant peasantry have banded together to destroy the peace of the country. At divers times and in divers places such Associations have been known by different names, but their objects were ever the same,—now springing into active life, the next moment apparently extinct, as circumstances or prudence suggested to their guiding powers. From time to time these Associations have been known by the several designations of Whiteboys, Rightboys, Levellers, Hearts of Oak, Hearts of Steel, Defenders and Threshers. For some years previous to 1795 these organizations of the Roman Catholic peasantry rapidly progressed, and were for a time open to the disaffected of every creed, but the objects of the overwhelming majority being decidedly and undisguisedly hostile to British connexion, and to everything bearing the name of Protestantism, the members of this faith abandoned the Union and rallied in defence of the laws and constitution. Thenceforward the Society of United Irishmen was *exclusively Roman Catholic*; its organization increased, it was thoroughly remodelled, and its name was changed to that of the Riband Association, *alias* the Sons of the Shamrock, the sons of St. Patrick, or the Religious Liberty Society.

That these several and successive Associations were for political and sectarian purposes there cannot be a doubt, and though such objects have been for long intervals kept in the back-ground, yet when time and opportunity seemed favourable, its guiding powers, quickly availing themselves of local causes, have never failed to bring them to bear in aid of political and religious objects. Every opportunity was seized to foster discontent, encourage disloyalty, and swell the numbers of the Society by voluntary enlistment or even by intimidation. Thus it has steadily progressed, until we believe that in history no record can be found of the existence of an Association so completely affiliated, so well organized, and at the same time in respect of which so much ignorance generally prevails, not only as to its nature and objects, but also as to *the power by which its mysterious and formidable movements are regulated*. We daily witness its destructive effects, but we cannot tell the quarter from which that destruction emanates.

The objects of the Society may be learned in part from the documents occasionally discovered, in part from the disclosures made by individuals who have belonged to it, and in part from the atrocities perpetrated by its instrumentality. We have frequently seen copies of its Rules and Regulations, and of the oaths taken by its members, and though they occasionally vary from each other in the wording, their essence is the same, religious, political, and agrarian. Religious, as against everything pertaining to Protestantism,—political, as against the Institutions and Government of this Protestant State,—and agrarian, for the purpose of drawing within its ranks every man whose personal wrongs, whether real or imaginary, require redress, knowing, as he does, that its organization will supply him with ample means to gratify "the wild justice of revenge."

In order to accomplish these its ulterior views, it is essential to command political power, whether Parliamentary or otherwise; to have a perfect control of that power *without any seeming connexion with it*; to defeat the ends of justice by the intimidation of both witnesses and jurors, whenever it was inimical to the political or religious views of Romanism; and, when necessary, to control the Legislature by physical intimidation. The members of this Association are sworn, and though the oath varies in some districts, yet the substance of all that have been discovered is much the same. Their oaths are of two kinds, the initiatory oath of secrecy, and the subsequent oath of full profession. The following is an authentic specimen of the latter:—

"I, A. B., with the sign of the cross, do declare that I come here, and promise of my own free-will and accord to join my R. C. Bn. (Roman Catholic Brethren) the Knights of St. Patrick, or Sons of the Shamrock, in all things appertaining thereto. 2. That I will not buy or purchase any article or commodity from an O. M., B., or P., (Orangeman, Brunswicker, or Protestant,) if a Brother or R. C. (Roman Catholic), disposes of the same article as good and as cheap as they do. 3. That I will be ready at two hours' warning to aid and assist "any true and loyal Br. (Brothers) when they or any loyal Brother calls upon me, if I am not prevented by sickness or business of distress. 4. That I will not knowingly or willingly provoke, challenge, or fight with any of my true and loyal Bn. (Brethren), if I know them to be such; and if a Br. (Brother) be unjustly treated or ill spoken of, I will espouse his cause if it be just: but if a Br. (Brother) be in fault I will advise and save him if possible I can do so. 5. That I will not allow any person of ill-fame, or evil character into this Bond of Eternal Trust, and that I will propagate brotherly love and friendship to all such of my acquaintances as may be thought worthy of our Trust. 6. That in town or country I will give the preference of my dealings to my true and loyal Bn. (Brethren)

as reasonable as to any other, if I know them to be attached to our national interest. 7. That I will never see a Br. (Brother) short-taken or in distress for the amount of a shilling or sixpence, a meal's meat, or a night's lodging if possible I can relieve him. 8. That at the place of our meetings I never will drink to intoxication, so that any person might know my mind, or for fear of disobedience, or mentioning the name of any regular member. 9. *That I never will discover of any true and loyal Br. (Brother) if I were hanged, beheaded, and quartered.* 10. That I will never injure a true and loyal Br., his wife, sister, daughter, or mother, except in the lawful bonds of marriage. 11. *That I will be true and loyal to our holy the R. C. (Roman Catholic) Church* dedicated to God by St. P—k (Saint Patrick), our holy Apostle and Patron of Ireland in all things lawful, but not otherwise. 12. That I never will discover of any of my true and loyal Brs. or of any of my Comrs., (Committees) names, or any one here present except on certain or lawful occasions, if I were hanged up in chains to dry before the sun. 13. That I will attend all meetings and all proceedings when duly noticed by my true and loyal Brs. or any Comts., or thereunto pay any fine that may be struck against me. 14. That I will be ready at two hours' warning to stand till death to my true and loyal Brs. or any Comts. cause, if I be not prevented by sickness or death."

From this oath the religious and political nature of the Society may be clearly seen; and although there is much in the oath, there is far more in *the interpretation* put upon it by the members, who consider that thereby they undertake an obligation to subvert all our Protestant Institutions; to effect a separation of the two countries, and establish an independent Government in Ireland; to root out the Protestant faith, and restore the forfeited estates to the Roman Catholic descendants of their original possessors; to effect a transfer of the revenues of the Protestant Church to the Roman Catholic priesthood, and the establishment of their long-sought temporal power in Ireland.

The constitution of the Society is peculiar. It is unlimited in numbers, and its members believe it to comprise nearly every male Roman Catholic in Ireland from sixteen to fifty years of age. It is *apparently* governed by a body of persons in Dublin, called The Grand Riband Lodge of Ireland, in which is an individual appointed to regulate its proceedings in each county of Ireland; to communicate with the baronial delegates therein, and to transmit to them the orders and regulations promulgated therefrom for the general government of the Society. To this "Grand Lodge" quarterly returns are made of the number of members in each parish, but no list or roll is kept for fear of detection, the only register being that of the names of the baronial delegates throughout the kingdom, which is sufficient for all working purposes. This so-called "Grand Lodge" in reality consists only of the *confidential correspondents* of each county, and is again controlled, and all its important proceedings regulated by some agency, invisible to the members at large, but *believed by them to be the Roman Catholic hierarchy and clergy*. Beyond these corresponding members, who are mostly men in humble life, selected for their acuteness and intelligence, nothing has been as yet discovered, and on this point Major Warburton, one of the most active and intelligent of the Irish Stipendiary Magistrates, has declared

The statements as to the constitution and objects of this Society are in part based on the evidence taken before the Committee of the House of Lords in 1839, and partly on documents in the writer's possession.

that "the Grand Riband Lodge" and its system was so mysteriously conducted that "the members themselves *know* nothing of the source from which its orders emanate; but *that from the ability with which it was conducted it must have some very able directing power, and persons of decided ability and talent must be concerned in its organization.*" Ere we close we trust to establish *what* constitutes that directing power. Next in descent are the county or district lodges, composed of baronial delegates, who regulate the proceedings of the baronial lodges, and each baronial lodge is composed of a delegate from each parish lodge by which he is selected for the purpose. From this Baronial lodge the parish delegate takes the instructions and orders to the parochial lodge, from the committeeman or master of which, such instructions are again communicated by the parish Master or Secretary to the different members of the lodges. The Society is, in the first instance, introduced in a parish by the formation of a Committee, varying from twelve to twenty in number, to whom is confided the organization and extension of a Riband Lodge in that parish. Such parochial lodge must consist of at least thirty-six members before it is considered to be fully formed, but it may then extend to any practicable number, the individuals composing it being first approved, (if admitted,) and then sworn by the parochial Committee. No candidate is admitted until the most careful scrutiny is instituted to ascertain whether he is connected by blood or marriage with any Protestant; if he be, he is rejected, unless the connexion be so slight or remote as not to endanger by his admission the discovery of the secrets of the Society. The initiatory oath of secrecy only, is then administered, and his final admission does not take place until the next meeting of the Committee, when, if there be no further objection made, he is received; if there be he is rejected. Should he pass this second ordeal he is then placed on his knees, in which position he takes the final oath, which is administered by the parish Master; and the signs and pass-words by which the members know each other are communicated to him. These are changed every quarter, and even more frequently if by any chance they have been discovered. They are of three kinds, 1stly. The pass-words known to the members at large. 2dly. Those known only to the officers. And 3dly. The quarrelling and night-words. The following is an authentic sample:—

Q. Ireland is much distressed? *A.* Yes; for the want of her rights.
Q. What rights does she want? *A.* Equal share as England and Scotland.

Old Erin's son once was free,
May she obtain her liberty.

Night-word.—Q. The moon is pleasant? *A.* So is fine weather.
Quarrelling-word.—Q. Do not offend me. *A.* You seem provoking.
Or thus:—
Q. Who comes there? *A.* The lamb of God without spot.
Q. Who comes there? *A.* A true loyal *Defender*.
Q. Who comes there? *A.* One of the *Sons of Liberty*.
Q. Who comes there? *A.* A friend to God and my Brothers.
Q. How would you brighten a dark night? *A.* By *flint, steel, powder and ball*.
Q. How would you straighten a crooked stick? *A.* As well as I would brighten a dark night.
Q. How is that? *A.* With the help of God, and all good Christians.

These signs and pass-words emanate from the head lodge in Dublin, and are sent quarterly in a printed form to the baronial delegate, who writes out as many copies as he finds necessary for the parish Master or secretary, who again makes as many copies of the same as he thinks may be required for his branch of the Society, and they are then communicated to the members. The expenses of each lodge are defrayed by subscription, regulated in a great measure by local circumstances, and varying in amount; besides which there are occasional subscriptions to meet particular expenses and demands, and there are fines for breach of the rules, which go to the same purpose. There is also a fund for the purchase of arms, which are raffled for by the members. The arms thus purchased appear to be the property of the lodge, and are transferred from the custody of one member to another, the better to guard against their being discovered. In addition to this, they assemble at night in numbers varying from one hundred to four hundred or more, for the purpose of drill and instruction in military evolutions, embracing even the very latest improvements in that department.

The extent to which the Society has spread is incredible. It exists in every county in Ireland. *It has its ramifications in the manufacturing districts of England and Scotland*, and even in the Canadas and United States it has its corresponding branches and sympathizers. But the most extraordinary feature is the baneful influence it exercises on the social state of Ireland, there being no relation of life that is not affected by it. In the absence of more general or public duties being imposed upon its members, it is made available by individuals for the purpose of redressing or revenging their personal injuries or quarrels, and no man dare discharge a labourer or farm servant, however improper his conduct,—no landlord dare remove a defaulting tenant,—introduce a new plough or any agricultural improvement, or attempt in any way to ameliorate the condition of his tenantry or estate, by agrarian improvements, or the diffusion of religious or moral instruction, *save as the guiding powers of the Association may will*,—no witness dare give evidence,—no juror dare convict,—no elector dare vote as he might wish, unless in accordance with the views of this formidable Association. Disobedience or resistance is certain of punishment, too often of death. If the elector come up to the hustings to vote with his landlord against the popular (?) candidate, a Riband sign is made to him, and he gives a reluctant vote the other way. We have often witnessed its effect upon the frightened elector. We have also known it fail of its intended effect, and before the vote was well recorded we have seen the elector felled to the earth, and treated in the most savage manner. We have known many instances of vengeance being carried farther, and the shades of night have scarcely fallen ere the cottage of the victim has been in flames, or levelled to the ground, or, if the case be strongly marked, *he is reserved for the denunciation of his priest from, the altar of the chapel on the following Sabbath*, and it may be that he pays the penalty of his disobedience even with his life.

In the administration of the laws, its effects upon jurors and witnesses are equally visible. Intimidation operates upon each alike. Informations are sworn against a party for some heinous crime, the witnesses are visited by night and required to abandon the prosecution; if they refuse they are beaten, if they appear and give evidence they are waylaid and perhaps murdered on their return to their homes; and so frequently is this the case, it is an undoubted fact, that *the Crown cannot reckon at any time on a conviction, unless the principal witnesses to sustain the case belong to the better classes, or be members of the police force*. At times also such witnesses are met by perjury, and a host of individuals come forward to establish "alibis," or give other evidence tending to an acquittal. Thus, in every possible way, laws which were intended for the protection of the peaceable and the punishment of the evil-doer, are rendered inoperative.

Another singular feature of the Society is the rapidity with which its orders are transmitted and carried into

execution. If the object be the plunder of arms, they are previously "set" by some one of the Society. Information is at once given to the Committeeman or Master of a lodge in *some parish distant ten or twelve miles from the spot*, and the duty being taken by the members in *rotation*, the number next for duty are warned to assemble at a certain time and place. Arms are there distributed by the Master to such as are not provided with them, and they receive their orders. The individual who has given the information then *guides the strangers to the spot, and leaves them to commit the outrage*. Whatever be the offence against the laws of the Society, the mode of dealing with it is the same. A Committee, consisting of the parish Masters, sits to try the offender, and decide upon the measure of punishment. If the man is to be beaten only, the party are selected and brought in the manner already stated. If the individual is to be shot, one or more, if necessary, is appointed to do the deed; but whoever is ordered must obey, *or his own life is sure to be forfeited*. So immediate, too, are the party in assembling and executing their orders, that it is almost impossible (if any one should by chance be so disposed) to give information to the intended victim. If intelligence or orders are to be made known to the members, they are communicated from one to the other by "threes," that is, each member is bound to communicate it forthwith to *three* other members, and those three each to other three, thus multiplying the messengers by *three* each time. As the circle extends, intelligence flies like magic, and by this means every member might be in possession of the same intelligence within a few hours from its first promulgation.

Thus it will be seen that, although this Society is formed of the rudest materials, its organization is almost perfect. It combines secrecy with the greatest possible security against detection, there being little committed to writing; and although documents have been from time to time discovered, and the authorities have come upon the assembled lodge and seized both papers and parties, they have during a long lapse of years been able to ensure a conviction only *in one or two cases*. It may be supposed that in so numerous a body individuals must be found willing to give information to the Government of their proceedings. No doubt there have been such, but pecuniary temptation fails to induce parties who have given private information to come forward *publicly* as witnesses, it being a universal stipulation in such cases that, under no circumstances, should their names be divulged, as then the vengeance of the Society would be certain to overtake them even in a foreign land. Indeed, it is an undoubted fact that parties who have been suspected of being in communication with the Government have been murdered, or have suddenly and mysteriously disappeared, being compelled by the Society to quit the country altogether; and the system of terror which it enforces is such that many thousands are known to have joined it *for the sole purpose of ensuring their personal safety*.

Sobriety and temperance amongst its members were all that its secret movers desired to add to it, and that has been done. The founder of the Temperance movement, we are sure, never contemplated its application to politics or crime; but as it progressed it was evident to every reflecting mind that it must, without doubt, be made ancillary to such purposes. At first, the Roman Catholic priesthood either ridiculed the Temperance movement or gave it the most strenuous opposition. But as the benefits which it conferred upon the people became apparent, it found favour with *them* in defiance of the priesthood, and much social good was arising. Then, and not until then, did the Roman Catholic parochial clergy become enthusiastic converts to the system. *They suddenly assumed its direction*, and parochial Temperance Associations, with the priest as the president, were universally formed. *From that hour its course was changed*. Social amelioration was sacrificed to clerical power. The Temperance Clubs became debating societies for religion and politics. Musical bands were formed; banners procured; processions followed; and at last came monster meetings of the physical force of "regenerated and temperate Ireland."

It was on the 17th of March, 1840, that the first simultaneous display of Temperance physical force took place. At that time Lord Stanley's Irish Registration Bill was before Parliament; and as it struck at the root of the political power of the priests and demagogues, every effort was being made to get up a popular agitation against it. Several meetings consequently took place, and at one held in Dublin, on the 4th of April, 1840, the well-known Father Maguire pledged himself "to have three million of Teetotallers before three months expired, and he would unfurl the flag of Repeal," if Lord Stanley's Bill were carried.

From this time the members of the Temperance Society caught at every pretext for display. Marching in military array, exhibiting party flags, and playing party tunes, *until they gradually merged into the Ribbon Association*: and the pass-words of the United Societies, subsequently discovered, give clear evidence of the fact. The repeal agitation then commenced. The first public meeting for that purpose took place at Rathmines, near Dublin, on the 12th of July, 1840. It was followed by many others, at which (to use the language of Father Hughes of Clare Morris) "the people exhibited themselves in the determined attitude of millions of sober, *cool, and UNITED Irishmen*." *This repeal movement was checked for a time by the change of Government in 1841*, and as agitation then ceased there was a visible and rapid improvement in the general prosperity of the country, and the return of the people to more settled habits of industry, there being a general belief that the laws would be vigorously administered and agitation and agitators discouraged. *But after a time, the policy of Sir R. Peel, so fatal to Ireland*, by which he repudiated the services of the loyal, or made those services a disqualification

for Government countenance and support, whilst the agitators and disturbers of the public peace mere the objects of favour, *had its natural effect. The loyal were disgusted and the traitors elated, and although from March, 1841, to March, 1843, only three repeal meetings took place, from the latter date to the ensuing October, nearly forty monster meetings were held*, at all of which the Temperance Societies assembled in military array, and the political and treasonable designs of the controlling powers of the Riband Association—the Irish priests—were openly avowed. Indeed, the Rev. Thomas Maguire, in a letter of his extant, says, "*I can state it as a fact, that there are not six parish priests in Ireland who could not rouse the people to resist the violent and monstrous encroachments of a bully and depopulating Tory confederacy;*" and that "*should this (Lord Stanley's) Bill pass, the troops must return to Ireland, then shall agitation strive with railroad speed, and then shall the people of Ireland join the moral force Chartists of England.*" Thus, in the hands of these Reverend agitators, that *Temperance movement*, which was hailed as a blessing to the country, *was converted into an additional source of demoralization and distress.*

The secret intelligence existing between the Romish priest and the Irish Ribandman was no longer concealed, and the Association progressed rapidly. Day by day the victim continued to be marked out, his death-warrant signed, and the executioner named to do the deed of death, sometimes for reward, at other times under the influence of intimidation. The order to assassinate is received, no question is asked as to the source from which the order emanates; the assassin is intuitively aware of the authority under which it is given, and it is invariably obeyed. There is no offence against the public weal or private rights which cannot thus be perpetrated with impunity. The assassin courts the bright sunshine and openly glories in his crime. He has no dread of apprehension; he knows that *he will be sheltered by the peasantry*, and that no reward, however great, can induce his betrayal. A striking instance of this will be found in the case of the late Lord Norbury, for the conviction of whose murderer a reward of several thousand pounds, and a life annuity of 200*l.* to the informer, was offered but never claimed, for *money had lost all influence when weighed against the sense of terror.* We have now before us a return of the rewards offered by the Lord-Lieutenant from June 3 to December 1, 1840, or by officers of the police, from January 1 to March 10, 1840, and thence to December 31, 1840, by Stipendiary Magistrates. The sum thus *offered was 38,876*l.**, of which *only 492*l.** was claimed, and that *chiefly in the more tranquil counties. The disturbed districts presented a different result.* In Limerick, 3,380*l.* was offered and *none* claimed; in Tipperary 6,818*l.* was offered, and *only 33*l.** claimed.

No wonder then that witnesses come forward with great reluctance, and that when they do, unless protected by the Government, their lives are unsafe. This system of intimidation is, in fact, one of the greatest misfortunes of the country, and, coupled with the existing sympathy for crime, renders it very difficult to get evidence to convict the offender. Hence it is that the number of cases brought to justice bears but a small proportion to the number of crimes. This system of terror works upon the jurors as well as witnesses, and instances are of common occurrence in which it seems to paralyze the country, and men summoned upon the panel risk the infliction of heavy fines for non-attendance rather than serve, with the knowledge that the conscientious discharge of their duty is often the sentence of death upon themselves. *Ireland, indeed, is not a country like England, where every man aids in the administration of justice;* there, under the influence of the Riband Association, almost every Roman Catholic among the lower classes, and even some above them, avoid assisting, *their sympathy being in favour of the criminal.* Indeed, great endeavours have been made of late years to procure, by any means, the acquittal of persons charged with crime, by the subornation of false evidence, the suppression of truth, and the removal or intimidation of witnesses; and so effectually is this done, that *the existing laws are in general paralyzed by the system of intimidation* thus brought to bear upon the witnesses, who know that if they give honest testimony they must inevitably suffer. Perjury, of course, is a principal auxiliary. It prevails in all the courts in Ireland to an awful extent; so frequently does it present itself to notice, so prevalent is it among the lower classes, that *the direct truth can scarcely ever be expected from any witness;* and such is their ingenuity, that almost any case can be met, and witnesses can be at once procured to meet each changing feature; indeed, the facility of procuring witnesses is so great that the application of money is not at all necessary for the purpose. Well would it be that the effects of perjury were confined to the escape of the guilty, but there is no safety for him who in any way has become obnoxious; and cases do occur in which innocent persons have suffered in consequence of the perjury plausibly sustained against them. *Much of this is done in pursuance of the denunciations, more with the connivance of the Roman Catholic priests.* Nothing can occur in the country in respect of the Riband Association that they are not acquainted with. True it is they sometimes speak against it in the chapels, but *"the people consider any such condemnation of the system as superficial, and merely intended to lull the suspicions of the Government, and the people say they do not believe the priests to be sincere therein"* No wonder this should be their belief when they see the same priests, it may be the next moment, avail themselves of its organization for political or religious (?) purposes, affording them peculiar facilities for a large assembly being got together at any time, it being merely for the officers of the Society to give their directions, and the members *must* attend, and "if the priests direct that there shall be a

large meeting at any particular point, of course the officers of the Society will give their directions accordingly, and this is done without any *special* directions from the altar."

All the statements made in this paragraph are on the authority of the evidence given before the "Lords' Committee on the State of Crime in Ireland," and are made almost in the words of the respective witnesses.

It will be evident to any one that a system so totally demoralizing in its effects, so incompatible with national prosperity, and so evidently the parent of misery and crime, *cannot exist except in a country where religion is corrupted, morality low, and ignorance almost universal*; and such, alas! is the case amongst the Roman Catholic population of Ireland, for there ignorance and crime are encouraged, whilst religion and morality (save in such sort as the Roman Catholic Church inculcates them) are ecclesiastical sins. Nay, we have it on the authority of Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, "*that the Roman Catholic clergy have always been unwilling to allow their flocks to receive any moral and religious instruction except such as may be strictly in accordance with the views of the Romish Church.*" Acting on this principle it is that they forbid the reading of the Scriptures, and where the parents have still wished that they should read them (for, mark well, he admits *they do wish it*) "*the clergy have used spiritual authority to prevent it, even to the refusal of the Sacrament to the parents*"

See his evidence before the Lords' Committee in 1839.

When such are the recorded sentiments of so high a dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, *are we not justified in holding the Roman Catholic hierarchy and clergy responsible for the religious and moral education which they DO permit, nay, COMPEL their flocks to receive?* Have we not a right to know in what their *approved* instruction consists? Undoubtedly we have, and though they have ever made, and will continue to make, every effort to disguise and conceal the tenets they inculcate, we still may know them by their bitter fruits. But the time is rapidly coming when they must be generally known, and it shall now be our duty to exhibit the Romish Church, not with the smooth and painted face which it has hitherto worn in Protestant England, but such as she may be found in Ireland; and when we have done so we feel confident that few can doubt *that in the religion and, morality taught by the Irish Roman Catholic priests to an ignorant people, will be found the main cause of the demoralization and consequent distress which prevail in the Roman Catholic districts of the country*, for we are happy to say the *Protestant* districts are exceptions. There scriptural education and true Christianity will be found, and if we contrast their state in point of education with the Roman Catholic provinces, the results are startling. We have before us the Report of the Committee of National Education for the year 1844, (the latest we can at the moment refer to,) and from it we learn that on the 30th of September of that year there were 3,153 schools in operation under the National system, attended by 387,935 children; 1,337 of which, attended by 128,244 children, were in *Protestant* Ulster, leaving the residue to be divided among the *three Roman Catholic provinces*: and thus it will be seen that, objectionable as the National system is to the Irish Protestants, on account of its rejection of scriptural instruction as an *essential* part of education, the number of schools in Ulster far *exceeds*, and the number of children in attendance is nearly *double*, that in any other province: and if the proportion otherwise receiving scriptural education were added, we have not the slightest doubt that the number both of schools and scholars there would far exceed the aggregate of the three Roman Catholic provinces.

Having made these preliminary observations we shall now proceed to expose the system of religious and moral education, for which we must hold the Irish Roman Catholic clergy responsible, and we shall develop the means by which the minds of their flocks are prepared for the discipline of the Riband Association, and *a misled and ignorant people are worked upon in furtherance of Romish power, and Romish hostility to Protestantism in both Church and State.*

It is one of the boasts of the Roman Catholic Church, that her doctrines are unchangeable—her power universal, and that in every quarter of the globe *the former are taught, and the latter felt*. She knows that the spread of her doctrine and the increase of her power must ever be greatest where the greatest extent of popular ignorance exists, for *it is on the ignorance of the people that Romanism is enthroned*. No wonder, then, that she restricts education and forbids the Scripture, whilst, through the agency of her priesthood and the confessional, she disseminates principles not only subversive, but destructive of the prosperity and happiness of the people, who are recklessly sacrificed to ecclesiastical aggrandizement.

We shall best ascertain the most demoralizing tenets of the Roman Catholic Church from the works of her eminent theologians, and by reference to them we shall trace the path to crime so characteristic of Romish Ireland. "Knowledge is power," and in the opinion of the Romish Church *both are, or ought to be, its exclusive attributes, Hence popular ignorance is desirable*; nay, if we believe the Church of Rome, it is *the true path to heaven*. "It is sufficient," (says Vincent Filliucius

Vincent Filliucius, *Moralium Quæstionum de Christianis Officiis et Casibus Conscientiæ, ad formam cursûs qui prælegi solet in Coil. Rom. Soc. Jes., Lugduni, 1633, Ursellis 1625. Ed. Coll. Sion., tom, ii., Tr. 21, c. 4, de Conscientiâ, n. 126-8.*

) "for unlearned men to act rightly *that they follow the opinion* of a learned man. . . . Learned men may follow the less *probable and less safe opinion, rejecting the more probable and more safe*. The reason is, that a man acts prudently in believing those that are experienced in the art, submitting himself to the judgment of the wise. *Neither is it necessary to be certain of acting rightly*, for then it would not be lawful to follow the more probable but less safe opinion." Hence it will be seen that when the unlearned and illiterate Roman Catholic consults the "wise" priest, *he will act prudently and rightly even should he, under his direction, do that which his own breast must tell him is wrong*.

If this doctrine be true, how happy must the Irish people be in their ignorance, for what says another theologian, George de Rhodes?

George de Rhodes. Disputationum Theologiæ Scholasticæ, tomus prior, Lugduni 1671. De Actibus Humanis, Disp. 2, Quæst 2, sect. 1, § 2.

"*Wherever there is no knowledge of wickedness there is also of necessity no sin*. It is sufficient to have at least a confused knowledge of the heinousness of a sin, *without which knowledge there never would be a flagrant crime*. For instance, one man *kills* another, believing it indeed to be wrong, but conceiving it to be nothing more than a trifling fault: *such a man does not greatly sin, because it is a knowledge only which points out the wickedness or the grossness of it to the will*. Therefore, *criminality is only imputed according to the measure of knowledge; . . . as a knowledge of the wickedness is necessary to constitute the sin, so is a full, clear knowledge and reflection necessary to constitute a heinous sin*."

The obvious effect of this doctrine is, that the *priest is made the keeper of the Romanist's conscience*, that *he may call evil good and good evil*, and so reconcile the ignorant layman to any act conducive to his personal or ecclesiastical interest. But he is more than the keeper of his conscience, he is "*in loco Dei*;"—in the place of Him of whom another theologian, John Marin,

John Marin, Theologiæ Speculativæ et Moralis. Venetiis, 1720; tom. ii. Tr. 14; De Fide Divinâ, Disp. 5. sect. 1, n. 9.

thus impiously expresses himself:—"God can speak equivocally for a righteous purpose, and a righteous purpose is often found;" and Peter Alagona says, "*By the command of God it is lawful to kill an innocent person, to steal, or to commit fornication*, because he is the Lord of life and death and all things, and it is due to him thus to fulfil his command."

Peter Alagona, S. Thomæ Aquinatis, Summæ Theologiæ Compendium; Lucetiæ Parisiorum, 1620. Ex primâ Secundæ, Quæst. 94.

Well and truly has it been recorded by several high-minded Roman Catholics examined before the Lords' Committee on the state of crime in Ireland, in 1839, that *the lower class of Roman Catholics "take their opinions on both politics and religion very much from what the priests tell them"* that "they are mere puppets in their hands," and that, in fact, "the Roman Catholic clergy have the complete control and power of the whole country." Their influence will admit of no control and their dicta of no question; "and instances are frequent where Roman Catholic gentlemen have been totally destroyed in consequence of having had the manliness to think for themselves." "The priests are deeply committed in every political agitation," in it "their activity is general." They admit of no countervailing influence, and though in former days the Protestant landlord and his Roman Catholic tenant had one common interest, yet in later times, (we may date from the fatal concession of 1829,) *when the mask which concealed the real features of Romanism ceased to be worn in unhappy Ireland*, "it was the object of the Roman Catholic priesthood *to disunite the landlord and tenant* for all purposes." That was chiefly effected by interference with the exercise of the elective franchise, and "not a rational doubt can exist but that the Roman Catholic tenantry would at all times vote with their landlords were it not for the interference of the priests."

The interference of these pastors poisons every relation of life, and blights the happiness of the domestic circle. But with the licentiousness of Romanism we shall not pollute our pages. Emmanuel Sa

Aphorismi Confessoriorum Coloniae 1590. Coloniae 1615, Ed. Coll. Sion. Aphorismi, verbo *fur/urn*, n. 7.

declares, "if you have taken anything that you doubt to be your own, some say that you ought to restore it, *others deny it, because in the doubt the condition of the possessor is the better*." The son may rob his father after this manner, according to Stephen Facundez:—"An *useful* doubt arises in the case of a son who transacts at a distance his father's business, or always remains with him in the house to sell the goods of his father who is a merchant, whether he may take secretly as much of his father's property in return for his labour and industry, as his father would have given to an hired servant for the same labour and occupation, and that too in addition to his father's expense in maintaining him? *The reply must be made in the affirmative*." "Servants, also, are not bound to restore to their masters whatever they have taken beyond their wages and proper food, if that their masters have compelled them to fulfil duties over and above those for which they have agreed, for *then they may take something more*, (provided it be just) *for the duty and service which they are compelled to discharge beyond their agreement*,"

Stephen Fagundez, In quinque posteriora Præcepta Decalogi, Lugduni, 1640, (Ed. Coll. Sion) tom, ii., lib. vii., c. 3, n. 11, and Ibid. c. 11, n. 4.

and Valerius Reginald

Praxis Fori Pænientialis, Lugduni, 1620. Coloniae, 1622, Ed. Coll. Sion. tom, i., Praxis, lib. x., c. 18, n. 258; tom. ii. Muguntiae, 1622, lib. xxv., c. 44, n. 555.

says, "servants may not take the property of their masters secretly and by way of compensation in pretence that their wages are not equitable, *unless it should in reality appear to be the case in the opinion of an experienced man,*" and "servants are excused both from sin and, restitution if they only take in equitable compensation; that is, *when they are not furnished with such things necessary for food and clothing as are usual in other houses, and which ought to be provided for similar servants, they only take so much of their master's property as will compensate for such an injustice and no more.* . . . Among the conditions of a lawful compensation is *that the debt cannot be obtained by any other means.*" We next come to another point: Tamburin

Explicatio Decalogi. Lugduni, 1655; lib. viii., Trac. 2, c. 3, § 1, n. 3, et ibidem, de Compensat occult, c. 5, § 5, n. 1.

asks, "*May servants requite themselves clandestinely* when their masters deny them a just remuneration? *They certainly may* if they refuse them equitable recompense, but only on the conditions described." And Bussenbaum and Lacroix

Theologia Moralis, nunc pluribus partibus aucta à R. P. Claudio Lacroix, Societatis Jesu. Colonise, 1757, tom, ii., lib. 3, Pars 1, Tr. 5, c. 1. Dub. n. 935, resol. 3; Ibid. c. 1, Quæst. 211, § 2, n. 950.

declare, that "*He does not steal who takes in just compensation* if he cannot obtain what is due to him by any other means. For instance, if a servant cannot otherwise obtain his lawful wages, or is unjustly compelled to serve for an unjust remuneration;" and again, "an extremely poor man *may steal what is necessary for the relief of his want,* . . . and what any one may steal for himself *he may also steal for another whose indigence is extreme;*" and Lessius, Dicastelle, and Tamburin add, "that he who should prevent another from stealing what he thus required *might be killed by such a poor man,* as the thief who steals or forcibly retains valuable or at least necessary things, might be killed, according to what has been said before."

From the Romish tenets in respect of theft, we come to other crimes which strike at the root of the social system, the due administration of justice, and are destructive of all confidence between man and man,—equivocation, lying, perjury. The Church that asserts "God can speak equivocally for a righteous purpose," will not fail to claim the privilege for all within its fold, and so it does. Reginald

Valerius Reginald. Ante, tom, ii., lib. 18, c. 7, sect. 1, n. 90. Ibid. lib. 24, c. 1, sect. 4, n. 9. Ibid. n. 10.

says, "If there is a lawful cause for using equivocation in swearing, even although he to whom the oath is sworn should understand it in a sense different from that in which it is understood by him who swears it, and would thus be deceived, *a mortal sin is not committed, and sometimes it does not amount even to one which is venial.*" From thence the question comes, "Whether it is lawful to conceal the truth by speaking ambiguously?" and it is answered thus: "*It is lawful;*" and the ambiguity by which the truth may be concealed without a falsehood is such, that *what a man utters shall be true according to his own meaning, although it may be false according to the sense of his hearer and the common acceptation.* The equivocation which is here spoken of is not only that which arises from the *different signification of words*, but that which happens when words are pronounced which are indeed *false when uttered aside and taken separately, but are true with certain additions which are understood by the speaker,* and, says Sanchez,

Thomas Sanchez, Opus Morale in Præcepta Decalogi. Venetiis, 1614. Pars 2, lib. 3, c. 7, n. 2.

"*he would not sin mortally who, without deception, but influenced by his reverence for an oath, and from scruple, should feign to swear, so that the by-standers and the notary might think that he did swear*" Vincent Filliucius asks

Vincent Filliucius, ante; tom, ii., Trac. 25, c. 11, de Juram., n. 321—326.

also, "Whether it is wrong to use equivocation in swearing? It must be premised that equivocation is nothing more than this, *that the swearer understands the words in a sense different from that in which another person receives them.* I answer, firstly, that *it is not in itself a sin* to use equivocation in swearing. *This is the common doctrine,* after Suarez. Secondly, that *it may often be a sin* to use equivocation, as when it is done without a reasonable cause, or in order to deceive, in which sense some holy fathers are to be understood. . . . Is it perjury or sin to equivocate in a *just cause?* *It is not perjury;* as, for instance, in the case of a man who has outwardly made *a promise without the intention* of promising. If he is asked whether he has promised, *he may deny it,* meaning that *he has not promised with a binding promise, and thus he may swear;* otherwise he might be compelled to pay a debt which he did not owe." Again, "if the equivocation be only mental is the oath lawful? I answer, first, that it is a probable opinion that it is not lawful to swear in such a case. . . . I answer, secondly, that *it is more probable that it is lawful* But Suarez is referred to, and here are his words:

Francis Suarez, Operis de Virtute et Statu Religionis. Lugduni, 1614. Lib. iii., de Juram. Præcept. et Peccat.

eis cont. c. 9. Assert. 1, n. 2.

"It is not intrinsically wrong to use equivocation even in making oath, whence it is not always perjury." *This is the sure and common opinion, . . . for to speak with such equivocation is not always a lie, neither is it therefore intrinsically wrong, and therefore to confirm it by an oath is neither perjury nor intrinsically a sin.* The reason is that a lie is a declaration contrary to the sense of the speaker, for *it is he who is bound to adapt his words to his own meaning, and he is not always bound to adapt them to the understanding of his hearers*; but he who uses ambiguous words in a sense which is agreeable to his own meaning cannot be said to speak against his meaning, therefore he does not lie, he *does not utter a lie*; therefore thus to speak is not intrinsically wrong, for *there can only be such wickedness in consequence of the lie. Whence it is inferred that to confirm such an expression with an oath is not perjury, because by that oath God is not called to witness a lie, since that is not a lie.*"

But this wholesale system of lying, equivocation, and perjury, must be *discreetly* used, and therefore it is asked by Vincent Filliucius,

Ante, tom. ii. Tr. 25, c. 11, de Juram., n. 328.

"*with what precaution* is equivocation to be used? When we begin, for instance, to say 'I swear,' *we must insert in a subdued tone the mental restriction* 'that to-day,' and *then continue aloud*, 'I have not eaten such a thing;' or 'I swear,' then insert 'I say,' then *conclude in the same loud voice*, 'that I have not done this or that thing, *for thus the whole speech is very true*'"

When such are the tenets inculcated by the Romish Church, is it to be wondered that the ends of justice are so completely and so often frustrated, and so little reliance to be placed upon the good faith of the people? Most assuredly not; nor will it be a matter of surprise that Valerius Reginald says,

Ante, tom. ii. lib. 21, c. 5, n. 57.

"if you are preparing to give false evidence against me by which I should receive sentence of death, and I have no other means of escape, *it is lawful for me to kill you*, since I should otherwise be killed myself." No wonder then that witnesses *are* murdered. But Romanism is no respecter of persons. The judge is equally marked out, for Fagundez says,

Ante, tom. ii. lib. 8, c. 32, n. 5. Ibid., tom. i. lib. 5, c. 6, n. 11.

"if a judge had been unjust and had proceeded (in trial) without adhering to the course of the law, then certainly *the accused might defend himself by assaulting and even killing the judge*, because in that case he *cannot be called a judge; but an unjust aggressor and a tyrant*;" and this theologian further adds, "*it is lawful for us to kill a man when, if we kill him not another will kill us.*" That this abominable doctrine prevails in Ireland is beyond a doubt, and is frequently illustrated in the practice of the Riband Association. It has even been publicly proclaimed by Mr. O'Connell, in his celebrated speech at a public dinner at Carlow in the year 1837, when he said "We have no course left us now but that which I have hitherto deprecated—the shedding of blood.—Blood must be shed. My *reason for now saying that blood must be shed is, to prevent the shedding of blood, for if your enemies again get into power your blood will be shed.*"

We have shewn how the Romish Church teaches the son to rob the parent without the imputation of sin; it also teaches him the way to a harmless, nay, a commendable parricide. "A son," says Anthony Escobar,

Anthony Escobar. Theologia Moralis. Lugduni, 1663, tom. iv., lib. 31, sect. 2, de Præcept. iv., probl. 5, n. 55, 56, 57.

"either is obliged or is not obliged to support an Infidel father, who is in extreme necessity, if he endeavour to turn him from the faith. . . . I conceive *the latter opinion must be certainly maintained*, for Catholic sons may accuse their parents of the crime of heresy, although they may know that their parents would be committed to the flames for it, as Tolet teaches. . . . They might also refuse them sustenance, although they should perish for want of food; and Fagundez adds, that *they might even kill them with the moderation of a blameless defence*, as enemies who violate the rights of human nature, if they forcibly compel their children to desert the faith: but still that they are not to force them into imprisonment so that they die of hunger."

Would to God that these were the worst specimens of the moral and religious doctrines of the Church of Rome; but when equivocation, lying, perjury, theft, parricide, are not only justified, but inculcated as meritorious under certain circumstances, need we be surprised at the crime of murder being placed on the same footing, whether it be perpetrated by the "wise" priest or the ignorant peasant? We shall proceed with our authorities.

Henry Henriquez teaches,

Summæ Theologiæ Moralis. Venetiis. 1600. Tom. i., lib. 14, de Irregularitate c. 10, § 3.

"if an adulterer, even although he should be an ecclesiastic, reflecting on the danger, has entered the house of an adulteress, and being attacked by her husband, kills his aggressor in the necessary defence of his life or limbs, *he is not considered irregular.*" And Francis Amicus

Cursûs Theologici Duaci. 1642. Tom. v. Disp. 36, sect. 5, n. 118.

says, "it will be lawful for an ecclesiastic, or one of a religious order, *to kill a calumniator who threatens to spread atrocious accusations against himself or his religion when other means of defence are wanting.*" And Airault discussing the same subject, says,

Airault, Propositions dictées au Collège de Clémont à Paris de la Société de ceux qui se disent Jésuites. Collation fait à la requête de l'Université du Paris. 1643, 1614. Paris, 1720. Cens. pp. 319, 320.

"If you endeavour to ruin my reputation by false impeachment, before a prince, a judge, or men of distinguished rank, and I cannot by any means avert this injury of character *unless I kill you secretly*, may I lawfully do it? Bannez asserts *that I may*. The right of defence extends itself to everything which is necessary for ensuring protection from every injury. Still the calumniator should first be warned that he desist from his slander; and *if he will not, he SHOULD be killed, not openly on account of the scandal, but secretly.*"

Yes; the man who dares to raise his voice against either priest or Papacy *may be murdered without the slightest sin attaching to the act*, the only thing essential is, that it be not done "openly, *on account of the scandal*, but secretly." Thousands have fallen victims to this doctrine whose blood is still unavenged, so secretly has the deed been done; and thousands more must fall unless preserved by the timely exhaustion of the spring from which such evils flow.

We have now traced upwards, from the minor to the greater crimes, those tenets of Romanism which, however she may repudiate, *are in full operation in Ireland*, where they cannot but seriously affect the social system and the relations between man and man. We shall now enter upon the tenets of that Church, as they relate to the allegiance of the Roman Catholic clergy to the State, and of the people to a Protestant sovereign, and the modes by which they are brought into combined operation; from which it will be seen that thereby the field of blood is widely extended. It may be said by some that these are questions of politics totally apart from our subject; but without steady loyalty to the sovereign and respectful obedience to the laws of the land, no people can be prosperous or happy. Nay, more, we shall show that where the majority of the people and their clergy are of the Roman Catholic faith, whilst the institutions of the country are Protestant, the minority of the people Protestant, and the sovereign Protestant, those elements of social order cannot be found; in fact, *their existence is incompatible with Romanism*, whose allegiance, under such circumstances, is but a mask to be cast aside at the fitting moment. A country so situated must suffer perpetually from the efforts of the Church of Rome to bring what she calls "her erring sons" within her power, and to prostrate the heretic sovereign at her feet; and however much loyalty may be professed we fearlessly assert that *their real and only allegiance is given to the Sovereign Pontiff, whose commands at all times override the foreign state, whether it be Roman Catholic or heretic.*

"The rebellion of an ecclesiastic," teaches Emanuel Sa, Ante, Aphorismi, verbo *Clericus*. Ed. Coloniae, 1590.

"is not a crime of high treason, *because he is not subject to the king.*" And Francis Tolet declares,

Francis Tolet, Commentarii et Annotationes in Epis. B. Pauli, Apost. ad Romanos. Lugduni, 1603. Annot. 2 in cap. 13, Ep. ad Rom).

"Since *the spiritual power*, for the better and more effectual fulfilment of its office, *has thought fit to separate certain classes of persons from the secular power*, it is indeed rightly done; and the language of Saint Paul is not opposed to it, who means that "all men should be subject to the higher powers, *but not to the secular powers*," for he does not deny to spiritual ministers the power of exempting all as many as they shall choose from the secular power, *whenever they may deem it expedient.*" And John De Dicastille writes,

De Justitiâ et Jure cæterisque Virtutibus Cardinalibus. Antverpiæ, 1641. Lib. ii. Tr. 1, disp. 4. Dub. 8, de Judicio prout Actus Justitiæ, n. 126.

that "*the clergy are exempt from lay power even in temporal things* is thus proved. No man is directly subject to one who has not any jurisdiction over him, but *the lay prince has no jurisdiction over clergy or ecclesiastics*. It is proved, secondly, in this manner: He to whom another is subject can punish him when his authority seems useless without the exercise of restraint. But a secular prince cannot punish ecclesiastics, *therefore ecclesiastics are not subject to lay princes*. . . . The clergy are exempt from lay power, not only by human, civil, and canonical law, but also by the Divine law." And James Platel declares,

Synopsis Cursûs Theologici Duaci, 1679. Pars. 2, c. 5, sect. 5, n. 466.

"since secular princes, without the privilege or consent of the sovereign Pontiff, have no power over the persons of the clergy, the latter cannot be punished by them." John Baptist Taberna says,

Synopsis Theologiæ Practicæ, 1736. Tom. i., Tr. 4, c. 5.

"as to the directive power ecclesiastics are bound, indirectly, at least, by the common laws of the state in which they live, if their substance relate to them and does not contain anything unsuited to their state, to the sacred canons, or to the immunity of the Church. I have said as to the directive power; because *secular princes* upon their own authority, and *without any privilege or consent ceded by the sovereign Pontiff*, have no compulsive power over the clergy; but when the latter do anything wrong they ought to be punished by their

own superiors." Cornelius Lapide declares,

Commentaria in Acta Apostolorum et in Epistolas Canonicas. Lugduni, 1627. In 1 Epis. S. Petri, c. ii., v. 9. "The priestly kingdom of the Church is apparent, first in bishops and Episcopacy, but chiefly is it apparent in Papacy and in the sovereign Pontiff, *a vast and ample power extending itself over the whole world*, by which he commands kings, (whence suppliant princes prostrate themselves before him, and place their sceptres at his feet.) and can deprive of their dominions kings who have rebelled against the Church, as he often has deprived them." James Gretser

Opera Omnia. Defensio Romanorum Pontificum, tom. vii. lib. 1. Con. 3. p. 468. H. C. D. & E. teaches, it is meet that "the clergy ought indeed to be subject to the higher powers, *but to their own*, and to those which are suited to their state, that is, the ecclesiastical powers. . . . *The clergy should also be obedient to the laws of princes which they enact with the assent and concurrence of the ecclesiastical magistrate. And all men who are under the jurisdiction of the king should know that they will be punished by the king, if they commit a punishable offence. But the clergy do not belong to the king's jurisdiction.* Therefore, the exhortation of the Synod has no reference to them."

Here, then, is an *imperium in imperio*, even though that State be of the Roman Catholic faith. What then are we to expect in a Protestant country? We fear, but little mercy at the hands of the Papacy. "Does a prince, by reason of his apostasy, lose his sovereignty over his subjects, so that they are no longer bound to obey him?" demands Peter Alagona. He answers,

Sancti Thomæ Aquinatis Summæ Theologiæ Compendium. Lutetiæ Parisiorum, 1620. Ex Secundâ Secundæ, Quæst. 12.

"No; because sovereignty and infidelity are not incompatible, and may subsist together; *but the Church can deprive him of his sovereignty by a decree.* Wherefore as soon as he is declared excommunicate on account of his apostasy from the faith *his subjects are absolved from the oath of allegiance.*" "Hence the whole school of theologians and ecclesiastical lawyers (says Andrew Philopater)

Andrew Philopater. Elizabethæ Angliæ Reginæ, hæresim Calvinianam propugnantis sævissimum in Catholicos sui regni Edictum, quod in alios quoque Reipublicæ Christianæ principes contumelias continet indignissimas. Lugduni, 1593. Responsio ad Edictum, see. 2, n. 157, and n. 158. This Andrew Philopater is better known as the Jesuit Cresswell, in connexion with the plots for the murder of Queen Elizabeth.

maintain (and *it is a thing both certain and* MATTER OF FAITH) that every Christian prince, if he has manifestly departed from the Catholic religion, and has wished to turn others from it, is immediately divested of all power and dignity, whether of Divine or human right, and that, too, even before the sentence pronounced against him by the supreme pastor and judge; and that *all his subjects are free from every obligation of the oath of allegiance* which they had sworn to him as their lawful prince; and that *they may and MUST* (if they have the power) *drive such a man from the sovereignty* of Christian men as an apostate, a heretic, and a deserter of Christ the Lord, and as an alien and enemy to his country, lest he corrupt others, and turn them from the faith by his example or command. This true, determined, and undoubted opinion of very learned men is perfectly confirmed, and agreeable to the apostolic doctrine."

Here, then, we see that the Roman Catholic has no option left him. He could not be loyal if he would, for "it is a thing both *certain and matter of faith*," that he "MUST, if he have the power," drive the heretic prince from the throne, and should he not, if required by his Church so to do, he becomes excommunicate and subject to all the penalties of such a state. But Romanism can be at times pliant and accommodating; thus Bellarmine teaches,

Disputationes de controversiis Christianæ Fidei adversus hujus temporis Hæreticos. Ingolstadii, 1596, lib. v. c. 6, de Romano Pontifice, pp. 888, 891.

"the spiritual power does not blend itself with temporal affairs, but it suffers all things to proceed as they did before they were united, *provided they are not opposed to any spiritual object*, or are not necessary to obtain it. But if any such thing should occur the spiritual power *may and must restrain the temporal power by every mean and expedient which may be considered necessary.* It may change kingdoms and take them from one to transfer them to another as a spiritual prince, if it should be necessary for the salvation of souls. Christians may not tolerate an infidel or heretic king, if he endeavour to draw his subjects to his heresy or infidelity, but it is the province of the sovereign Pontiff to whom the care of religion has been intrusted to decide whether the king draws them to heresy or not. It is therefore for the Pontiff to decide whether the king must be deposed or not." "Therefore," writes Alphonso Salmeron,

Commentarii in Evangelicam Historiam, et in Acta Apostolorum. Colonia Agrippinæ, 1612. Tom. iv. pars 3, Tr. iv. p. 410.

"if they undertake anything against the Church and the glory of Christ, he (the Pontiff) may deprive them of their empire and kingdom, or he may transfer their dominions to another prince, and absolve their subjects from their allegiance which they owe to them, and from the oath which they have sworn;" or even without any such

cause, according to John Ozorius,

Concionum Joannis Ozorii. Societatis Jesu, de Sanctis Parisiis, 607. Tom. iii. Conc, in Cathedrâ, S. Petri, p. 70.

for "*when it is expedient* for the spiritual welfare, the Pope can remove rulers, kings, and emperors, and can take away their dominions from wicked and disobedient kings, who impede the promulgation of the Gospel;" that is, as taught by the Papacy.

Now this has been done in the case of Ireland, even without the pretence of heresy, when one Pope deprived a native Irish sovereign of his kingdom, and transferred it to an English king, and another Pope confirmed the act; at a subsequent period, as far as bulls could do it, Henry VIII. and Elizabeth were deprived of the sovereignty of these realms. But Roman Catholic theologians are not unmindful of the position of the Romish Church in England, and Paul Layman teaches,

Theologia Moralis, Wirceburgi, 1748. Lib. i., Tr. 4, c, 13, n. 1.—Ibid, n. 6.

that "the Church does not receive but reproves those laws of secular princes, which affect by command or prohibition the possessions, and particularly the persons of ecclesiastics, although they should seem to conduce to the interest or protection of the Church. The reason is, that in such laws the direct jurisdiction of lay princes overrules the ecclesiastical, (for to legislate is an act of jurisdiction,) but such *an usurpation of power* is opposed to ecclesiastical immunity, and therefore an injury rather than a benefit is brought upon the Church;" and it is the opinion "of Azor and Suarez, of Bellarmine, in his Apology for the Kings of England, and of Adam Tanner, that the clergy are not directly and specially bound by the civil laws, either by virtue of the laws themselves, or of the civil legislative power; for *they are entirely exempt from such authority by every kind of right*:" and Bussenbaum and Lacroix go so far as to say, that, "to strike one of the clergy or to bring him before a secular tribunal is *personal profanation*. The Pope has at least *an indirect jurisdiction over the whole world*, even in temporal things, as far as may be necessary for the administration of spiritual affairs, as all the Catholics maintain, and, as Saurez proves, against the kings of England."

Probably it may be said that all these are obsolete doctrines, long since repudiated, or fallen into desuetude. But such is not the fact, they are in full force and exercise to the present day. No one now attempts to deny that "Dens' Theology" is the class-book of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and there we find these doctrines reiterated and enjoined in his treatise, "De Potestate Temporalis," vol. ii., p. 164

Ante; tom, ii., lib. 3, pars 1, Tr. 1, c. 2. Dub. 2, n. 48. Resol. 1.—Ibid, Tr. 4, c. 1. Dub. 2. Quæst. 178, § 4, n. 795.

, and subsequently. There are, alas! too many instances in the present day of these obnoxious doctrines being in force in Ireland, and too much evidence of priestly disrespect and disregard of the laws of the land to need our dwelling upon it. The claim of the Church to power over heretics cannot be altogether unnoticed. It is stated by Dens, vol. ii., p. 78, "that Protestants are heretics, and as such worse than Jews or Pagans; that they are made by baptism subject to the Church, and are thus bound by the laws of the Church (p. 289), and though the rites of the Jews may be tolerated, the rites of heretics are not to be tolerated because they are so bad that no truth or utility can thence be derived to the good of the Church (pp. 82, 83), and their heresy is to be extirpated unless there be some prudential reasons which may induce us to tolerate it," otherwise "it is the duty of the Roman Catholic Church to compel heretics by corporeal punishment to submit to the faith, but it is not always expedient that the Church should use this right. The punishments against heretics are confiscation of property, exile, imprisonment, and death," and these penalties are incurred by the *fact* of heresy without any judicial investigation, "the notoriety of the heresy is sufficient." Thus far the power of the Church is clearly defined, and Bellarmine tells us,

Bellarmino. Tractatus de Potestate Summi Pontificis in Temporalibus adversus Gulielmum Barclaium. Romæ, 1610. Operum, tom. vii., Truc. c. 7, p. 876. Some of Bellarmine's Works are amongst the Maynooth Studies.

that "it is not for monks or ecclesiastics to take away life, but it is customary to divest them (heretic sovereigns) of their royal dignity and authority if the case require it. *The execution belongs to others* and, as regards this kingdom, those *others* are at all times to be found in the Riband Association of Ireland.

Alas I how often in later years have these principles been acted upon by the Romish hierarchy and clergy in Ireland! How often have the altar-denunciations of the heretic, whether lay or clerical, been uttered! How often have we known their property to be confiscated, and they themselves driven into exile, immured in prisons, the victims of conspiracies, or sacrificed beneath the weapons of the assassin! No wonder then that the fields of Ireland have been steeped with the blood of her Protestant inhabitants, and that the Roman Catholic peasantry have been so familiarized with scenes of rapine and bloodshed, disgraceful to a barbarous, much more to a civilized nation.

These are startling principles and tenets which we charge as held by the Church of Rome, and we have no doubt that both clergy and laity will disown them now as they have done before. We care not if they do. We

care not if they say, these are the tenets of individuals, not the doctrines of the Church, and are all long since obsolete or condemned. We reply that they are in full force, and, in the words of Andrew Philopater, already quoted, "*are both certain and a matter of faith,*" which Roman Catholics "*may and must maintain.*" No one can now deny that on the 14th Sept., 1808, the Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland unanimously agreed that "Dens' Complete Body of Theology" was "*the best work on the subject that could be republished as containing the most secure guidance for those ecclesiastics who could not have access to libraries,*" (for the works of those Roman Catholic theologians from which we have quoted are only to be had in libraries,) and it was not without reason that they thus adopted Dens as a substitute, for *whoever will take the trouble to turn over the pages of his Theology will find in almost every chapter ample quotations from, or reference to, the writers from whom we have quoted, and he evidently so refers to them as unquestioned authorities in matters of Romish faith.*

We have shown that, in the eye of the Church of Rome, the *greater the ignorance of the individual, the greater his freedom from sin*, and the fitter instrument is he for the advancement of the Papal power; moulded as his every thought, and directed as his every act will be by the "learned" priest, the keeper of his conscience. No system can be better calculated to place an unlimited power in priestly hands, and we have shown on the testimony of Roman Catholics that "*the complete control and power of the whole country is at their disposal, and that the people are mere puppets in their hands, taking their opinions on both religious and political matters very much from what the priests tell them.*" Here then are men who, if they would, might long ago have regenerated Ireland, and yet, what is their conduct? It has been proved over and over again, and is plain to the most superficial observer, "*that all great excitement of the people in Ireland causes crime,*" and in particular "*political agitation which acts upon its social state,*"—"crime generally increasing with political agitation." Yet do the priests promote tranquillity? No. "*They are at the head of every agitation in Ireland.*" The kindly relations of landlord and tenant are essential to the tranquillity of the country and the welfare of both: do the priests promote those kindly relations? No. "*It is the object of the Roman Catholic priest to disunite the landlord and tenant for all purposes.*" Respect for the laws and the free exercise of even-handed justice are essential to the tranquillity of the country and the prosperity of the people: do the priests respect the one or promote the other? No, not they. *The laws of a Protestant state do not bind Popish ecclesiastics*, and are not respected by them. "There are many instances of a witness giving obnoxious information being denounced from the altar." They interfere in every case, and in open court have "thrown the (Riband) sign" to the witness on the table, which has sealed his lips and enabled the guilty culprit to escape. They will even go farther and get up false evidence to ruin an innocent person, if he in any way have become obnoxious to them. Of this there are many cases on record, but the case of Archibald Slye will sufficiently illustrate the statement. A priest named Walsh, in the county of Carlow, was killed by a fall from his horse at night, near the house of Slye, who was a respectable Protestant farmer. It was said by some that he was murdered by this man, who was tried on the charge and acquitted. The witnesses against him were placed in the dock charged with perjury, and some were convicted. "One of them made a full confession, naming the individuals by whom he was instigated to the crime, and stating that *he was assured by his priests that a person giving false testimony against a Protestant was doing rather a praise-worthy than a criminal act.*" This man, on being arraigned, was about to plead guilty to the charge, when a priest under him looked up significantly at him, and he pleaded differently, was tried, and convicted. He then denied his confession, and subsequently admitted it, stating that *he denied it at the instigation of others, one of whom was a priest.*"

There is another essential to the prosperity of a country—security to life and property. Is this promoted or even permitted by the Irish priesthood? Take an instance or two. Lords Norbury and Charleville were both denounced by the priest from the altar, not by name certainly, but by unmistakeable description, coupled with the observation that as long as they were in the country, they (the priests) could expect no good. The words were, in fact, considered a "*sort of suggestion by the priest to do some mischief.*" The hint was taken, and shortly after Lord Norbury was assassinated. Another case was even stronger. "Mr. Brabazon was murdered in Westmeath. He was previously denounced from the altar, and so notorious was the cause and result, that a Roman Catholic farmer declared *he could not acquit the priest of the parish of being concerned in some way with the transaction, inasmuch as he had spoken against him from the altar.*"

But we have had quite enough of these horrors, of the tenets of Romanism as taught in Ireland, and the ready instrument of her power and vengeance—the Riband Association, which, like the burning torrent from a volcano, pour over the land and destroy everything in their course. There is, in fact, a double process of demoralization going on in Ireland. Blood is shed without remorse, and perjury committed without compunction. Every oath tending to the ends of justice may be violated with impunity, whilst the oaths which bind together the members of that blood-stained instrument of Papal power—the Riband Association, can only be violated with the certain penalty of death, and *it is in vain the Roman Catholic pledges himself by oath to support a Protestant State whilst he is bound by prior and paramount obligations to the Papal Church, and in obedience to its orders may be, and has been, often driven into rebellion against his lawful sovereign.*

In Ireland, too, national prejudices and religious hostility tend to increase the evils of Popery. *In England, Popery by its contact with Protestantism, or by policy, is mitigated; but in Ireland its contact with Protestantism but drags out its horrors*; and should Romanism unfortunately triumph in Ireland, from that moment the glory of Great Britain must decline, and Irish misery and Irish distress be indigenous to England; on the other hand, if Protestantism increase, as a natural consequence the social blessings and prosperity that follow in its train, and are enjoyed in England, must become of native growth in Ireland. We ask, then, has England nothing to fear from Popery? Has she not got a footing in the land? Nay, is she not suffering at this moment from her presence? And is it not an undeniable fact that *in all those districts in England where Romanism prevails there the greatest amount of demoralization and distress are to be found*.

Yet such is the religion taught to millions of the Irish people, and what is the result? The population are in the lowest state of ignorance and superstition, in turn the dupes and the victims of designing men, both lay and ecclesiastical. Literature and science are almost unknown, industry is paralyzed, improvement of every kind is prohibited, life and property are lamentably insecure, and tranquillity is so alien to the land, that those who seek it search for it in another clime. The country has vast resources, but they remain altogether undeveloped; manufactures are scarcely known but in the Protestant districts of the North, where the productions of the country rival if they do not excel any in Europe. There is vast water power unemployed in every quarter of the country, so much so that we believe on about twelve miles of the Shannon, from Killaloe to Limerick, it exceeds the whole water power of England. Yet there *it is, unprofitable and waste*. The mineral resources are equally great: the beds of coal, chiefly of the anthracite, (now discovered to be the most valuable for manufacturing purposes,) are of vast extent, yet lying idle; industry is paralyzed, capital is either altogether absent or locked up, property is deteriorated in value, and life but little esteemed; plague, pestilence, and famine, in turns or together devastate the land; and every feeling of self-respect, self-reliance, and self-exertion has been sacrificed beneath the debasing and soul-destroying influence of Romanism.

What, then, are the remedies for this sad state of social demoralization and distress? Is it beyond the reach of any? Is the case hopeless? No: we believe there is much for hope, as the remedies are in our power, if we will but apply them slowly, steadily, systematically, simultaneously, and perseveringly. Such evils cannot be cured by superficial or temporary expedients. We must get to the root and eradicate it from the soil. We must have an immediate change of treatment and of policy. No direct means can put an end to the existing evils, they must be assailed through many breaches and with many weapons. The majesty of the law and its paramount power over priestly and other evil influence must be vindicated, and life and property must be made secure. Then capital will be diffused, the energy of her people will be brought into action, industry will have free scope, improvement will be unchecked, and the landlord and the tenant, the peer and the peasant, will be found once more united in the glorious labour of the regeneration of their country. It is by such means that the obstacles which have hitherto impeded her progress in social improvement can alone be removed. Ecclesiastical despotism, that greatest of all enemies to social enterprise and individual exertion, must be shaken off, and whatever can encourage labour by ensuring its due reward must be promoted. Employment, permanent employment, is an essential, and that can only be provided by private enterprise, without which no country can ever flourish. Let her agricultural interests and her agricultural improvement be subjects of special care, and in proportion as they prosper, manufactures will infallibly have birth and will increase, and prosper also. We must enter upon whatever will encourage industry, diffuse capital, bring the landlord and the occupier in friendly contact, and introduce the manufactures of the North to the other districts of the country; and these combined will be powerful auxiliaries to the regeneration of Ireland. True it is that in many cases the landlords have not discharged their social duties; in some few instances the will was wanting; whilst in others, borne down by a heavy accumulation of encumbrances upon the estate, which absorbed the greater part, in some the whole, of its revenue, they were utterly powerless for good; but by far the larger portion were always willing, and, were it not for priestly influence, would have zealously and faithfully discharged the duties, and mildly exercised the rights of property. By such men we have no doubt the means of improvement now opened to them will be generally turned to good account, and where this is the case, let those who, to the best of their ability, *have* discharged the landlords' duties, be cherished and sustained, but where the landlord has forgotten or neglected those duties, or where his embarrassments or other causes rendered him unable to discharge them let every facility be given to remove him from that post, and so make way for other, and better men,

Since this was written "The Encumbered Estates Act" passed, under which this principle is now being carried out.

who will join heart and hand with those who "have been tried in the balance and not found wanting," and together let them re-conquer the affections of the Irish people. The vast mass, who are superabundant and unemployed in many districts, must, for a time, impede their efforts, but that portion which cannot be advantageously employed in reproductive labour must be provided for, and that speedily, by an extensive system of emigration, so as to relieve the pressure upon those who remain, as quickly as circumstances will

admit.

It has long been the custom to smile at the pedantry and folly of our first King James, but with all his royal absurdities we must allow that *he* adopted one of the most rational courses, so far as human means were concerned, for the amelioration of Ireland; and his plantation of Ulster remains to this day a growing and imperishable monument of his social wisdom, a beacon-light which ought to, *but did not*, guide subsequent sovereigns and statesmen. They have, to the present day, despised the measures of that king,—they have disregarded that light,—they have successively adopted another course, and have successively been wrecked on the stormy sea of Irish politics, *whilst the country of their experiments has been their reproach as well as their punishment.*

In every way have they varied from the course of James and his wise minister, Cecil, but *in none more so than their religious policy, and by none more so than by the legislators of the last twenty years.* James encouraged the spread of the Protestant faith in Ireland, but *they have discouraged, nay laboured to extinguish it, in order to conciliate Popery.* James, whilst he disclaimed and condemned all idea of religious coercion, discountenanced Romanism in every way; *but they have upheld, encouraged, promoted, and rewarded it*, so much so that Popish principles and the patrons of them were, and still are, the favoured and exclusive objects of official countenance, whilst Protestant principles and Protestant loyalty are only recognised in the hour of need and danger. It was in 1829 that the Roman Catholic disabilities were removed, and the bulwarks of Protestantism torn down. It was then that Popery and *quasi-liberal* Protestantism concluded their unholy league; it was then that "the false prophets in sheep's clothing" entered into the fold, and our Protestant Church, our Protestant municipalities, our scriptural education, and our social and political welfare, were, as far as the Executive could do so, sacrificed, not for the amelioration of the Irish people, but for the aggrandizement of the Romish Church.

Now, what have been the fruits of this fatal policy? The events of the last twenty years must long stand prominently forward in the history of this country as a warning to future statesmen. Our blessed Saviour tells us, "Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, but a corrupt tree evil fruit;" and let us ask, what have been the fruits of this sacrifice to Belial? The increase of irreligion and ignorance, and the perpetuation of a career of rapine, bloodshed, and murder. Every social tie has been severed, and the last links of better feeling that held man and man together have been everywhere rudely broken. Political agitation has been fostered; a crusade has been preached against Protestant doctrines, Protestant principles, Protestant property and Protestant lives, and their fearless advocates and defenders have been repudiated and trampled upon, or, in many cases, driven into voluntary exile by the so-called Protestant Ministers of this Protestant State, whilst Popery is sheltered beneath their wings, and from thence looks exultingly around on the wreck she has made. What a contrast does the scene present to the pictures of prosperity and happiness which were promised as the results of this fatal policy! We behold misery unparalleled, aggravated by rebellion scarce crushed; whilst plague, pestilence, and famine, year after year devastate the land, rendering what might be the seat of happy homes and smiling prosperity, *a desert, houseless, lifeless waste.*

But what else could be expected from any attempted union between Protestantism and Popery for political ends? *For religious purposes they never can combine.* We believe that in the history of Europe there is but one other instance on record, and that instance ought to have been a warning to our erring and guilty statesmen. Bohemia was the cradle of the Reformation on the Continent of Europe, and it was there that, led on by the martyrs Huss and Jerome of Prague, the blow was first successfully struck at Papal power. It was there that the Reformed doctrines were so widely, so rapidly diffused, that when the Reformers were driven to arms in their defence, the Emperor Sigismund with a vast army was unable to stand before them, and when the Papacy took the field, a further triumph was obtained over Cardinal Julien at the head of an army of 100,000 men. But in after-times, when the Protestant population of Bohemia revolted against their sovereign, and invited the Elector Palatinate to accept their throne, their treason was severely punished, though not suppressed. This treason led to the subsequent league of Bohemia, the Palatinate, and other German States with France and Sweden against the House of Austria, in the affairs of which the French openly sought to interfere, and subsequently, in the person of Louis XIV., even aimed at the Imperial sceptre. The French availed themselves of Protestant aid during the wars that followed, but on the conclusion of peace, the Protestants were sacrificed by their Roman Catholic ally. From the first exhibition of the treason of the Bohemians, their religious privileges were rapidly torn from them, until at length the very name of Protestantism was almost extinguished in a country in which, not long before, three-fourths of the population professed that faith. The most Christian King Louis XIV. repaid these Protestant allies of his country with the most determined hostility to French Protestantism. He revoked the Edict of Nantes, refused toleration to his Protestant subjects, banished them from France, and then marched his armies into the states of his recent allies, where the atrocities perpetrated upon the inhabitants were generally viewed as the fruits of this alliance, and brought the very name of Protestant into disfavour. The exploits of the French on that occasion have branded them with eternal disgrace. Rapine, murder, and the flames were the fate

of young and old, whilst high and noble ladies, as well as the lowly peasants were alike abandoned to the indiscriminate, brutal, and uncontrolled lust of the French soldiers; so complete was the ruin, that Protestantism has since been almost extinct in the Palatinate. The results are well described by a modern historian: "Every possible favour was shown to the Catholic, while simple justice was denied to the Protestant, who was held in almost the same estimation as the Jew, to whom the honourable offices of the State and the magistracy were inaccessible, and who was ground to the earth by harassing and vexatious regulations. The consequent emigration of many thousands to other parts of Germany, and of a still greater number to the United States of America, did not add much to the prosperity of the Reformation in this part of Germany. *Such is a forcible illustration of the benefits which that Reformation derived from its friendly league with Catholic France.*"

How applicable is this passage to the results arising from the modern union of our Protestant rulers with the apostate Church in Ireland! There, too, the same policy has been since pursued, and the same results, in some respects, have followed; and it is a singular circumstance, that many thousands of these expatriated Germans of the Palatinate took refuge in the south and west of Ireland, where their descendants continue to the present day, and are known by the name of "Palatines," maintaining there the Protestant faith, and living as patterns of loyalty, industry, and happiness, to the Romish population around them, until latterly, when the same policy that expatriated their ancestors two hundred years ago is now rapidly driving them from the country of their adoption to another land.

But in the steps to regenerate Ireland there is, above all, "one thing needful,"—*Popery must not be any longer encouraged, but met with "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God."* It is in vain that the impediments to social improvement are removed, and it is in vain we look for such improvement unless we lay for its basis religious instruction. Whilst Popery is fostered as it has been, demoralization and distress must exist, and all remedial measures be vain. It is in Ireland the battle of Protestantism is to be fought. It is there, too, the death blow must be dealt to Popery, both religious and political. It is there that Popery has been most awake and rampant; but, thank God, the Irish Protestant clergy are vigilant, energetic, and fearless. To them it has been no cause of dismay that the State has abandoned the scriptural instruction of the people, and surrendered them to the religious and moral training of the Irish priests, as embodied in the Romish theologians from whose works we have been quoting. The Protestant clergy of Ireland have not overlooked what the priests have seen with dismay, that the Irish Roman Catholics *panted for scriptural education, and would have it in defiance of the priests and the treason of the Government.* In the year 1831 there were no less than 372,000 children of all denominations receiving scriptural education at the hands of the several religious associations in Ireland, and of that number not less than 175,000 *were Roman Catholics*, and should not this have been a strong inducement to have made a system so well received one of National Education? If that had been done (and the country had every right to expect it) we should in time have seen scriptural education penetrate into the most remote districts of Ireland, spreading its benign and peaceable influence over every relation of life, and diffusing its glorious light where all now is night.

But a different course was adopted: religious education was sacrificed to the Moloch of Popery, and the National System of *Education without religion* was supported by liberal grants from the State, *and forced upon the people.* Yet, at the end of twelve years from its origin, the number of children receiving *education without morality, and doctrine without religion, barely exceed the number who were receiving religious instruction on the rejected system.* But, however the State may have deserted its duty and betrayed the outposts of Protestantism to the enemy, the Irish Protestant clergy and the Irish Protestants were true to theirs. The Church Education Society was immediately formed for providing scriptural education to the Irish; and, with even the limited means supplied by private benevolence, it had, in the year 1844, 1,812 schools in operation, educating 104,968 children, *of whom 32,834 were Roman Catholics.*

We care not what may be the opinions of the priests, or their educational supporters, as to religious education; we have daily evidence of those of the poor ignorant people themselves. Three hundred years ago their prayer to England was, that there should be some learned Irishmen brought up, *not being infected with the poison of the Bishop of Rome*, who should be sent to preach the Word of God in Ireland. Their prayer is still the same, but *the means are totally inadequate to the necessity of the case.* Let the numbers and efficiency of the Irish Church be increased in every way. Let the zealous, hardworking minister of the Gospel be encouraged, and let *him* remember that his labours should be missionary, that all within his parish should be his peculiar care, and that, although they may be without the fold, they are still his sheep, though under another name, and professing a different faith. Let him remember that they are within his mission, and that it is his bounden duty to preach to those stray sheep the "glad tidings of salvation," and "so bring them back to the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls." In many parts of Ireland there is no obstacle to the zealous and faithful discharge of these duties, save the discountenance shown to it by a Protestant Government, and the inadequacy of the means to the wants and wishes of the people themselves. Yes, in the English districts more aid is, we repeat it, needed than the Established Church with her untiring zeal can supply. In defiance of Popery and the religious treason

of the rulers of this Protestant land, *the Protestant faith is silently and steadily increasing*. During the recent visitations of pestilence and famine, the Protestant clergyman, regardless of priestly denunciations, acted the good Samaritan to the suffering Romanist, who failed not to contrast his conduct and language with that of the priest, and the Protestant clergy did not lose by the comparison. Their worth, their utility, and their Christian charity were appreciated, and in the breasts of the people there is now a growing desire to know more of men whom, though reviled, persecuted, and condemned by them in former times, they found by their side, in the midst of pestilence and famine, dispensing food to the fainting body and comfort to the departing spirit.

The Roman Catholic clergy know and feel that *their influence is shaken, if not lost*, and that among their nominal flock many an anxious wish and look are given to the clergy of another faith; they know, too, that if this moment be seized upon by Protestantism, and religious instruction imparted, the reign of Popery in Ireland must come to a close; and demoralization and distress be succeeded by social happiness and national prosperity. We say, then, the time is come, and it is for Protestant England to guide her erring but repentant sister to the way of truth. Her past policy must be abandoned. She has tried for three hundred years to promulgate the Reformed faith in Ireland by means of the universal adoption of the English tongue, and she has failed. In one half of Ireland the native tongue alone is spoken, or English at best so imperfectly understood as to be useless as a means of religious instruction. There the people would hear the Word of God preached in their native tongue, as it was in the days of their great Apostle, St. Patrick. When that is once more universally the case then will primitive Christianity (identical with Protestantism of the present day) be restored to her, and then peace and plenty, happiness and prosperity, will once more bless the land. A few short years, and a few humble individuals have already shown how much may be done in this way. To several of the remote districts of the south and west of Ireland, ministers acquainted with the Irish tongue have found their way, and commenced their humble missionary labours, and what has been the result? At the first sound of the Gospel in their native tongue, the people have fled from their faithless shepherds, and at strangers' hands have joyfully received the cup of life, and now these humble converts on the Sabbath-day repair in hundreds to the modest temple which they have raised, from which the sound of the church-going bell invites them to the worship of their Maker, there to hear the simple truths of the Gospel preached to them in their native tongue. This has not been done without contests with the priests, whose craft was endangered. Altar-denunciations and brute-force have alike been tried to drive the missionaries from the scene of their labours, and the people from the word of life, but in vain. *The Irish church is filled, whilst the Romish chapel is deserted*.

But the individuals thus competent by a knowledge of the Irish language to carry on this work are few indeed contrasted with the want. This missionary labour is new to the Irish Church, and altogether unprovided for by the State. A little has been done by individual exertions to meet the want. Some Irish scholarships have been lately founded in the University of Dublin for the cultivation of a knowledge of the Irish language there, and a public and collegiate school has been founded at Stackallan in the county of Meath, for the purpose of training up a body of clergy for the Irish Mission. This institution is still in its infancy, and years must elapse before the labours of those trained within its walls can be entered upon; but even were it in full operation to-morrow, it would be totally inadequate to meet the wants of the people.

Ample provision must, therefore, be made for training up a host of men qualified for the Christian Mission among the native Irish, to whom they may go and preach the Gospel of Christ, and for whom they may perform the ministerial office, and discharge their pastoral duties *in the language of the people*. Every facility for the education of such men should be afforded, every encouragement given to those who may be disposed to enter on the labours of such a Mission. Ample means for the religious and moral education of the people through the native tongue should also be supplied; *plant the standard of the faith, erect the humble house of prayer, and many a straggling sheep will seek its shelter and there abide*.

In the foregoing observations we have painted the state of Papal Ireland, and the miseries which Romanism has brought upon it; and, ere we close, we would ask, Are not these, too, sometimes reflected upon England? Do we not occasionally witness extensive outbreaks in the manufacturing districts, and then feel that probably one-half of the demoralization and misery by which they have been aggravated, if not caused, is of Irish growth? Do we not see increasing pauperism in the agricultural districts of England, in part arising from a vast immigration of Irish labour? Do we not also see the dreaded power of the Papacy, the parent of all these evils, rapidly spreading over the land? And can Englishmen hesitate for a moment in adopting such a course as, by regenerating Ireland, cannot fail to eradicate them? We have hitherto seen the Irish people prostrated under the debasing influence of Romanism, from the hour that Henry II. as the Papal champion, *forced* it upon them, but we must recollect that a brighter side of the picture is yet to be seen. Nature has been lavish of her bounty upon the Emerald Isle. It possesses a most fertile soil, a genial climate, and vast internal resources; whilst her people are endowed with latent talent and high intellect, which we see occasionally bursting the chains that bind them down, astonishing and delighting us by their brilliancy, and shedding an honourable lustre on the sister country. We must recollect, too, what Ireland once was, when *true Christianity flourished there*, and literature and

science flowed from thence all over Europe. *We should also recollect that it was from Irish missionaries England first received the words of everlasting life; and a sense of gratitude for this, the greatest of all blessings, should, and we doubt not will, weigh with the English people to repay that debt.* The contrast between ancient and modern Ireland is great indeed, and can only be owing to some fatal error of her English rulers—the neglect, of religion in the pursuit of power, and the enslavement of the people to the Romish faith. Yes, this is the blot upon the Saxon rule in Ireland. Millions' have been spent in the conversion of the heathen in distant lands, whilst Ireland is altogether neglected, or even worse, the mass of Protestantism that remained has, *by a fold compromise with Popery, been nearly sacrificed to obtain an imaginary peace with Rome.* England, however, must know that *Irish Protestantism is her greatest bulwark;* and instead of compromising with the foe, she should remember, that, *as long as Popery is upheld, Ireland cannot prosper.* Let Protestant England, therefore, now strike at the root of this evil; *let her be the bearer of God's message to her Irish fellow-subjects; let her do to Ireland as she does so liberally to heathen lands, and instead of that country being one of the foulest stains upon the nation, and Us most vulnerable point to the foe, it will soon become her impregnable bulwark and the brightest jewel in the British Crown.*

Macintosh, Printer, Great New-street, London.

Standard Protestant Works,

By Popular Writers,

In a Cheap and Attractive Form.

18mo., bound in cloth and gilt lettered.

The Set of Twelve Volumes for One Pound.

Published at 1l. 16s.; or taken separately, at the prices affixed to each.

- History of the Great Reformation. By D'Aubigne. Abridged, Vols. I., II., and III., by Rev. E. DALTON. Pp. 507, 4s.
- The Divine Warning to the Church. By Rev. E. Bickersteth. Pp. 333, price 3s.
- The Jesuits; their Principles and Acts. By Rev. E. Dalton. Pp. 290, price 3s.
- Thoughts on Popery. By Rev. Dr. Nevins. Pp. 212, price 2s.
- Life of Edward VI. By Rev. R. W. Dibdin. Pp. 148, price 1s. 6d.
- Serious Dissuasives from Popery. By Archbishop Tillotson, Bishops Hall and Taylor. Pp. 296, price 3s.
- On the Idolatry of the Church of Rome. By Rev. A. S. Thelwall. Pp. 552, price 5s.
- No Peace with Rome. By Bishop Hall. Pp. 288, price 3s.
- Accusations of History Against Rome. By Rev. Prebendary Townsend. Revised by Rev. J. E. Cox. Pp. 456, 4s.
- Mede's Apostasy. Edited by Rev. T. R. BIRKS. Pp. 332, 3s.
- The Hidden Works of Darkness. By Mr. Osburn. Pp. 214, price 1s. 6d.
- Letters on Tractarian Secession. By Rev. G. S. Faber. Pp. 272, price 3s.

Any of the above volumes will be forwarded, post free, on receiving postage stamps, or other payment, for the price of each book as above; or the entire set may be had at the office for 1l., and will be forwarded, carriage free, when so directed.

The usual allowance on the set, as well as on each work, is made to the trade.

Letters and orders to be addressed to "The Assistant Secretary," Protestant Association, 11, Exeter Hall, Strand, London.

The Denominational

(So Called, Though Improperly),

The System of National Education

Best Adapted to the Needs and Circumstances of this Colony.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR BAKER, M.A.,

Wadham College, Oxford;

Resident Pastor of St. Paul's Church, Wellington.

"It would be difficult to conceive that any man of parliamentary experience could gravely propose that local municipal boards should be invested with power to establish rate-supported schools in every parish, with whatever constitution, to the inevitable destruction of the schools of religious communions." Sir J. K. Shuttleworth.

Wellington, New Zealand: Printed at the Office of the "New Zealand Spectator and Cook's Strait Guardian." 1856.

To his Excellency

Colonel Thomas Gore Browne,
Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and Over the Islands of New Zealand, &c., &c., &c.
As to one who has manifested special interest in the Schools of the Church of England Educational Society, and
in matters of Local Education generally in Wellington,
This Pamphlet,
Written, with Necessary Haste, on Occasion of his Temporary Visit to this Settlement, is Very Respectfully and
Gratefully Inscribed.
Wellington, New Zealand, Christmas, 1855.

"Let none think or maintain that a man can search too far, or be too well studied in the Book of God's Word
or God's works; but rather let men endeavour an endless progress and proficiency in both; only let them beware
that they apply both to charity." *Lord Bacon*.

"A little thing will fill a child's head: Teach them to say their prayers, tell them stories of the life and death
of Christ; cause them to love the Holy Jesus with their first love; make them afraid of sin; let the principle
which God hath planted in their very creation—the natural principles of justice and truth, of honesty and
thankfulness, of simplicity and obedience—be brought into act and habit and confirmation, by the holy sermons
of the Gospel. If the guides of souls would have their people holy, let them teach holiness to their children, and
then they will, at least, leave a new generation unto God, better than this wherein we now live."—*Bishop
Jeremy Taylor*.

The Denominational, &c.

It will be in the recollection, probably, of some who read this pamphlet, that at the commencement of the
present year, (1850) during the public discussion of the Education question, I undertook to draw up and publish
some reasons in proof of the Denominational system (so called, though I dislike the term, and accept it only
with such meaning as I understand it to express) being the most equitable, the most effectual, and the one best
adapted to the circumstances of this colony, for the administration of public funds for educational purposes.

I proceed, at what seems to me a favorable juncture in the progress of the question, to redeem my pledge.

The question divides itself into two distinct subjects of consideration:—I, one, relative to the nature of the
funds for the establishment and maintenance of common schools; II, the other, as to the management of schools
so established or supported.

I. Three measures have been suggested in the course of the late discussion, and have each their advocates,
for the supply of public funds for Educational purposes, viz:—(1), a local rate, at the option of a majority of the
inhabitants of certain districts; (2), grants in aid from the Provincial Revenue; and (3), the purely voluntary
system.

1. With regard to a compulsory rate for Educational purposes, *compulsory* as regards perhaps a very large
minority, it is open to precisely the same objections on religious and conscientious grounds, as in England have
practically led to the abandonment of church rates I cannot perceive any material difference, moral or political,
between the two cases, on principles of reason. There is no matter on which persons naturally are more
sensitive than systems of education, except religion, which they include; for it is absurd to argue as if any
system, *whether prescribing or excluding distinct religious teaching*, did not interfere with the religious
education of the children at the school. No dissenter from the Established Church in England could more
vehemently resent being compelled to pay his quota towards the maintenance of a form of religion to which in
his conscience he objected, than one in this land of liberty or elsewhere would feel the intolerable grievance of
being subsidized for the support of a system of education, which, rightly or wrongly, he entertained a deep
conviction was highly injurious to the interests of religion. Surely *such a measure is essentially at variance
with religious liberty*; and if it ever took effect, would prove a continual source of political ferment, party strife,
and bitter personal acrimony. But I am persuaded that for all practical purposes it would remain *inoperative*;
that if the extension of education depended on a local rate, a measure limited to this method would continue a
dead letter—a mere theory and paper scheme;—it would almost nowhere be acted on.

I had written this, which is, in fact, merely a repetition of my argument at the beginning of the year, before
reading Mr. Henley's admirable speech in opposition to Sir John Pakington's Bill, in May last,—a speech which
the framer of the Bill allowed, "had created and deserved to have created a very great impression upon the
House and country," which in short seems to have made the most able and experienced statesmen (not
excepting Lord John Russell) converts to the Denominational system. Mr. Henley, on the question of a rate,
observes, "He believed that it would just bring into existence a second—he was going to say curse, but he
would not use that term—but a second evil of the same nature as that for which they all, for so many years,
have been trying to find a remedy, viz the evil of the Church rates. It would indeed be unfortunate if they

should create another such element of intolerable vexation and heartburning in every parish. Indeed he believed that this proposed burden would give rise to an aggravated feeling of dissatisfaction in consequence of its being a new burden. Many persons would bear a burden long established by usage, who would nevertheless resist it as unjust if it were newly put on. He thought he could show to the House that the working of this measure in places where there were to be found persons of different religious persuasions, must be to affect the conscience of people at least just as much as the question of Church-rates did at present; and if that were the case, the Bill would give rise to the same opposition and heart-burning, and even to more, on account of the newness of the imposition. He believed that the Bill would be either wholly inoperative—and he was inclined to think that that would be the result—or that it would operate unjustly.—Did they think that anyone living in a parish where a school under this Bill was set up, and being taxed for an establishment from which his children derived no benefit, would pay the tax with pleasure? He repeated, that in his opinion, this would be just as great a source of heartburning as the Church-rate now was."—(*Guardian*, May 9, 1855.)

2. Still more politically unjust would be the appropriation *in aid of voluntary efforts*, of a portion of the public revenue, in which every citizen claims an equal share, to any *uniform* system of education. This, if we come to examine into principles, is so far more iniquitous and inequitable than a rate imposed by the votes of a majority, that it is in effect, the *tyranny of a very small minority over the community*. One or two inhabitants, backed by the Executive, might override the decision of a district!

Again, it would be intolerable, of course, in a community such as ours, to prescribe Roman Catholic or Church of England teaching, as a condition of Government aid. But it is surprising that any one can see any difference from this, on principles of reasoning, in prescribing, for example, the British-and-Foreign, or the purely secular, or in short, any single uniform system. This were, in truth, *to set up the Denominational system, limited to a single denomination* from the benefit of which, all opposed to that favored denomination, however small, would be excluded; for the Secularists—those in favour of purely secular education—are a small denomination in themselves; and the British-and-Foreign system would exclude Roman Catholics, Unitarians, Jews, to say nothing of the Church of England.

Vide Debate in House of Commons on Education Grant, July 27, 1855—"Mr. Heywood said, that the British-and Foreign School Society had been formed and supported by Protestants of all denominations, including Unitarians; and he complained that Unitarians had gradually been excluded from the governing body, and that Unitarian doctrines were taught to all the scholars; so that Unitarians were prevented from sending their children to schools in the foundation of which members of that religious body had taken a leading part. Lord R. Cecil said the observation of the hon. member for North Lancashire (Mr. Heywood) with respect to the British-and-Foreign School Society proved the difficulty of establishing schools in which would be taught only those doctrines which all Christians were supposed to hold in common."—(*Guardian*, August 1, 1855.)

It would save much false reasoning to remember that *all negative teaching in religion*, (such as that of the British-and-Foreign system) *is positive and antagonistic in effect*. Its tendency is to produce indifferentism and infidelity.

I am at a loss, though in my own mind I have sincerely tried every way, to think of any fairer plan for the administration of public money for educational purposes, than that which wholly disregards the religious teaching of the school, and comes in aid of *every* really good school, irrespective of its denomination. This is the only plan consistent with the toleration of all religious differences in a State, and with *private judgment*, which is the birthright of British subjects. The prescription of any *uniform* system of religious teaching, whether in a school room or a church, is in fact establishing a State religion, practically endowing it, and giving a bias to the public mind towards a particular form of doctrine. *It is incompatible with the religious liberty of the subject!*

I, however, shall have occasion presently to revert to this view, and to answer some apparent objections to it: for this disregard of denominational differences in the allotment; of the public money for educational purposes, is what I understand by the Denominational system, which I presently mean to advocate.

3. I am inclined to agree with those who have ventured an opinion that, at this early stage of a newly settled colony, all the available funds were better administered, *even for educational purposes*, by appropriation to public works, such as means and facilities for colonial inter-communication, than directly, by the establishment and support of schools. Beyond this, I am honestly of opinion that the late Provincial measure on the subject, will tend rather to retard than promote the establishment of schools; for, so far as it operates at all, its tendency must be to discourage voluntary efforts, and it is inadequate to supply their work. The creation of an adequate educational establishment is beyond its present means. Even if the necessary funds were forthcoming, there still remain the real difficulties of (providing school-masters, and securing the attendance of children at the school.

Among other points cleared up by the late debates in England, is this, that it is not the badness of the present system, but the apathy of parents that affords the chief obstacle to the progress of education in that country, though, after all, it was clearly shown by Mr. Henley, "that the compulsory and free school system (of

Austria and other countries) had not succeeded in bringing as large a number of the population into elementary schools, as the voluntary system adopted in England." From an abundance of evidence on the subject, I quote the following from the letter of "a Country Curate," in the *Guardian* newspaper of June 6th last:—"Our parish in Lancashire contains 4 000 souls. There are three schools in it—two belonging to the Church, one to the Independents—yet jointly, only 300 children are taught in them, It is not the *system*, nor the masters, nor the expense, nor anything of that, sort, which produces this thinness of attendance, but the parents' apathy. This is the point on which legislation should be directed, if indeed it be practicable. Why not establish an educational test for all trades and professions? in many cases it might easily be established, and the parents would soon find education for their children. The will, not the way, is the thing at fault."—In spite of this obstacle, it is very remarkable that in Austria, the proportion of the whole population educated under the compulsory system, is one in ten and a fraction; in England, under the voluntary and denominational system, one in eight and a fraction!

It were far wiser, surely, to come in aid of the voluntary system, than to attempt as a rival to supersede it. It is a further question how to do so most consistently with sound principles of politics and morals.

This branch of the inquiry brings us to the second head of consideration; that relative to the management of common schools, conditional to their receiving grants in aid.

II. Four systems have been suggested for the purpose, and partially discussed; 1. The Irish; 2. The British and Foreign; 3. The Secular; and 4. The Denominational.

1. The Irish was the only one brought under immediate prominent notice at the public discussion of the Provincial measure, and was almost unanimously exploded. The exposure of its demerits and impracticability was still more completely carried out at a meeting since held in Auckland for a similar purpose, in an able speech of one well qualified by personal knowledge and experience of the working of the National system in Ireland, to give authentic information on the subject,—the Rev. J. Lloyd, one of the resident clergy.

Reported in the *New Zealand Spectator*, of September 22, 1855.

But as this system, so far as we in this Province are concerned, has been absolutely abandoned, it is not necessary for me now to go into it afresh.

2. By the British and Foreign, I understand, without being exact, any system which allows the free use of the Bible as a class book, but prohibits other religious formularies, and the teaching of distinctive doctrines in the school.

I believe the system to be *impossible in fact*, because under it the Scriptural instruction will take its specific tone, as it ought to do, from the particular religious persuasion of the school-master, who, with perfect honesty, and unconsciously, will add a running commentary to the text, by his very selection of the passages to be read, and in his exposition, if he be allowed to make any. A Roman Catholic, a Church of England, or an ultra-Protestant schoolmaster, would necessarily give a distinctive colouring to the Scripture readings. But even if it were a possibility, there are religious bodies which believe the Bible to have a *single* and *specific* meaning, declarative of the Revealed Word of God, which must be One only; and that if this single meaning is missed, its use is not only valueless, but conducive to error. It is of course only the Bible *rightly interpreted* that is of real value as a class book. And since there are religious sects (the Church of England is one such) which believe that they possess in their distinctive doctrine the right interpretation and that all discordant doctrine must be erroneous, *to them Scripture otherwise interpreted would cease to be the Word of God*. Therefore, the distinctive teaching which is excluded by this system, is really that which gives Scriptural instruction its real value.

The Church of England and other Communions, as such, would never rest satisfied with any system which restricted distinctive religious teaching in the schools. Whatever sects of religion in this colony were included under its benefits, a very considerable portion of the community must be excluded. Its adoption would therefore be politically unjust.

The census lately taken in this Province unfortunately omits the usual specification of religious differences in the population, which is a useful return on many accounts, and would enable one to form a calculation, more or less exact, of the proportionate number of the several denominations.

I will add my own sincere conviction, grounded on experience and observation, that these comprehensive systems, intended to amalgamate and neutralize religious differences in a community, do practically issue for the most part in the aggravation of sectarian suspicion, jealousy and strife. Comparisons are always odious; a maxim especially applicable to the *odium theologicum*. The attempt to bring together in the same school-room, and under the same system of education, the children of parents who differ in religious creed, only serves to draw out the differences into broader contrast, and necessarily introducing distinctions and restrictions in *the* religious teaching of the several children, gives to the very idea of religion in their minds a controversial air. It is far wiser, surely, to recognize the differences which unhappily exist, and provide for their separate and harmonious action by an impartial distribution of the public grants in proportion to the claim of each religious

body or each separate school, *irrespective of religious differences*, upon the common fund.

3. The purely Secular (or exclusion of religion) system, though apparently impartial, seems to give satisfaction to very few. The truth is, it does not answer the purpose of education according to almost any one's idea. The great need of a newly established colony is *religious* education. It is all very well to say that religious education can be given by the clergy of the several denominations out of school hours; but in point of fact there are no clergy perhaps of any denomination in certain districts; certainly not of all; so that the school may be the only source of religion in a district. If secular schools could be established all over the Province, they would do very little towards civilizing the population, unless a commensurate extension of religious [*unclear*: ministrations] were established; and schools on the Denominational system, at least to a certain extent, supply that need. In the lack of clergy, they become the evangelists of the country. The school-masters become the ministry of a district. The school is the best substitute for pastoral visitations and the pulpit.

I repeat, the argument that children can be taught religion at home, or by ministers of religion elsewhere, always appears to me to betray a singular ignorance of the real need to be supplied. It is chiefly because there is so little religion at home, and such a total lack of religious ministrations almost universally in the country districts, that religious schools ought to be established, if only as a method of police, to counteract the influence of vicious parents and elders, and, if possible, to carry through the children into families some partial religious restraint.

I have said that the Church of England in particular never would rest satisfied with any measure which precluded the use of her own religious formularies in the education of her children. The school has become an essential and integral part of her system. "To instruct the youth in the catechism" is a special charge imposed upon her clergy at the time of their ordination; and her practice has long been established of using the school for this purpose in preference to the church, as better enabling the continual inculcation of her received truths and principles, in combination with other subjects—"line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little." *Under any system*, she would have her schools as she has her churches and clergy—*where she can*. The only difference would be that under the Denominational System she would come in for her share—that is to say, the members of the community belonging to her would come in for *their* share, which surely they have a perfect right to—in the distribution of public money for educational purposes, and her schools might be proportionably more efficient; under the Secular, or British-and-Foreign system, her schools must be in direct rivalry to those established by Government, which would stand in the way of voluntary efforts, and divert her resources; and thus again, a fresh element of discord and hostility would be introduced into the State, the avoidance of which, I repeat, is one professed benefit in the theory of these comprehensive systems.

4. The *Denominational System* is not a popular description of the plan I advocate, and but ill expresses its real meaning. I have already pointed out a common fallacy on the meaning of the term. The prescription of *any uniform* plan of religious teaching is *really* the selection of a particular denomination, and invests it with privileges as a State religion; the plan I advocate provides equally for all religious denominations, irrespective of denominational differences. *Its excellence consists in its lack of uniformity, and therefore its congruity with the religious character of the people*. It covers the whole platform of society, which unhappily is broken up into numerous religious sects. Religious predilections and prejudices are hereditary. Parents naturally and properly wish their children to be indoctrinated into those particular religious truths which they themselves have been taught to believe the exponent of Divine Revelation. I advocate the only system which provides for this natural and proper feeling on the part of individual citizens. Some portion or other of the community would be excluded by the adoption of any other system that I know of; in this, every citizen would have his fair and just proportion of the public funds for educational purposes. Why should he not have? *I cannot find any good reason for the establishment of an Act of Uniformity in regard to schools, more than in regard to public worship or other religious ministrations*.

It is sometimes objected that by granting in aid of *all* religious denominations, since all cannot be true, the State lends its countenance to religious error. This plausible objection is a mere fallacy. Who or what is the State? Surely it is the collective will of the people; and the people will that all possible religious differences should exist without detriment to the equal civil rights of individuals. What authority has the State to decide which is right and which is wrong among the different religious denominations? If it has such authority, let it boldly choose out the right one and discard all the wrong! If it has not, the objection has no force on principles of reasoning. The State is not a *person*, that it can have any moral responsibility on the subject. It is simply the voice and executive of the people; and the people are some of one religious denomination, and some of another; therefore let each have its share! otherwise it will be the voice of a section, and not of the whole people. *The responsibility of choice between the several denominations rests, not with the State, but with individual citizens, each for himself*. The State is bound to provide for all alike, irrespective of religious differences. I see no reason why any denominational school should, as such, be debarred from its share of an Educational grant more than an individual citizen from any other civil privilege or right. The State has nothing whatever to do with its

religion; that is a matter of *private* judgment.

The truth is, when it is said that the State makes grants for Educational purposes, it is simply meant that the people agree to divide their own money among themselves. It is not the *gift* of any other party *to* them; *it is their own*. And if it is to be applied to education on religious principles, since some are of one form of religion, and some of another, the only plan on which it can be fairly and equitably so applied, is by apportionment to the several Denominations.

This is equally the case, whether the revenue so divided accrue from internal or external sources; from taxation or custom duties, or reserves of public lands. If all the people are taxed, they are only taking back their own money, and have a right to apply it, each to his own Denomination. If it accrue from external sources, each has a right to his own share.

I mean, for instance, if so many Roman Catholics were taxed, they would get their share in proportion; if so many of the Church of England, they would get theirs; so many Protestant Dissenting bodies, they would, either collectively or separately each get its share; they would be supporting, not each other, but themselves.

If it be objected that under this system, some one predominant sect would come in for the largest share; this would only be the case, supposing that it included the greater number of the population, or were more forward and zealous in the work of education, and then it would be *op-time merit us de republican* deserve best of the State. I cannot see upon any sound political principle, that the State has anything to do with the matter beyond considering the educational merits of the particular school, as regards its work *in civilizing the people*. This work is not affected by peculiarity of religious creed.

I am not saying in *what* proportion public grants should be appropriated to the different denominations. I am only arguing for the general principle. I sincerely believe it to be the only just one on political and moral grounds. The proportion would in some measure be determined by a periodical census, describing the religion of individual citizens. Or, as was just now argued, grants might be made in aid simply with regard to the merit, irrespective of the religious character, of the school. *Such a system would lead to a wholesome rivalry among the sects, with a view to educational pre-eminence, and thus great practical benefit would redound to the State in the improvement of the common schools.*

An objection has curiously been made to the Denominational system, that it multiplies inferior schools. It appears to me one strong argument in its favor.

"Instead of one large and good State school in each district, you have probably at least six small and indifferent ones. In 1840, in the districts of Sydney and Paramatta, with a population of not more than from fifty to sixty thousand, there were 200 schools, many of them not numbering more than 10 or 12 pupils."—(Report of Commissioners in this Province.) Surely a number of these little schools is the only practicable remedy for our present need! Of what possible use would "one large and good State school" be, in such districts *e. g.*, as Rangitikei or Wairarapa, with settlers' stations four or five miles apart? The idea of "concentrating the young in sufficient numbers in such school, particularly in the country," (*Ibid*) is most unpractical.

The only practiceble way of educating a newly settled district is multiplying little schools. Our object is to educate the people; our complaint, at present, that we can get *no* schools of any sort. Surely, any system which would tend to *multiply* however inferior schools, is a vast improvement in that respect. I should rather urge, as a serious objection to the establishment of large central schools, under any system, that they would discourage and swallow up the little private denominational schools distributed through the country districts, and at the same time, owing to their distance from the homes of a scattered population, would fail in the contemplated purpose.

Once introduce the Denominational system, schools would spring up in every neighbourhood. *The ministers of religion would become agitators in the cause of education.* They would be forward in the collection of voluntary contributions, would beat up children, and remonstrate with neglectful parents. Wherever any particular form of religion should prevail, a school in connection with it would be started. This would probably lead to the establishment of others. If not, the particular school in question would be doing its scholastic work, and would deserve support and encouragement as such.

Under any other system, the ministers of religion, speaking generally, are rendered indifferent and inactive, or antagonistic to general education. They will have no special motive to interest them in the progress of a work which would afford no co-operative assistance in their field of religious teaching; or, regarding it as directly prejudicial and injurious to the success of their own religious teaching, they would exert all their personal influence in active opposition.

Where only one school in connection with any religious body were established in a neighbourhood, it might fairly be made a condition of a public grant in aid, that children attending the school, at the option of their parents, be exempted from the necessity of special religious teaching.

Experience has proved, what common sense and an ordinary knowledge of human nature would have led

one to anticipate, that whatever general system of education be established, the particular schools in operation under it, acquire *in fact*, a Denominational character. In Ireland the National schools are either Protestant or Roman Catholic, according to the accidental circumstances of each locality. The British-and-Foreign schools in England, though in theory unsectarian and comprehensive, universally possess a distinct Dissenting character. The mixed and comprehensive systems adopted in some of the Australian settlements, have practically lapsed into the purely Denominational. It is far wiser and juster to recognize this practical necessity, and to deal with it on liberal and equitable grounds.

Nothing is more conspicuous and remarkable in the many interesting Parliamentary debates on Educational measures in England during the present year than the increasing conviction on the part of able and experienced statesmen, that the Denominational, after all, is the most popular and successful system. It is a very significant circumstance in the history of this question, that the pet scheme and intended fountain-head of the comprehensive and latitudinarian system, *Kneller Hall, has been abandoned as a failure!* Nay, Lord John Russell, whose name (with the exception of Lord Brougham's—himself a convert to religious education) has been, as long as most of us can remember, more than others identified with the mixed and comprehensive system, is reported to have said in the late debate on Sir J. Pakington's Education Bill, "he considered the education given in this country (England) as superior in its quality to that given in most of the Continental States of Europe; what he proposed therefore was, *to diffuse and render universal their present system of education, rather than to adopt a wholly new system*"

Home News, July 4, 1855. In the Guardian of the same date, I find a fuller version: "When the Right hon. gentleman compared the extent of education given in this country with that on the Continent, he (Lord John Russell) was apt to think that there was a greater value in the education given in this country than that given on the Continent. Let us, at all events, preserve that religious liberty which we at present observe. He thought that a system of education without such excessive care, would be far better than one in which the Government laid down these rules (as to the exact method and subject-matter of religious teaching). What he would wish, therefore, was rather to extend and make universal that system of education which at present existed, than to go entirely in a new direction, and attempt a new kind of education. He was convinced likewise, that the common schools which were suited to the social state of the United States, were not suited to this country. He therefore thought that they must conform to the disposition of our own people, and not imitate the system of America, His view was to extend and improve education rather than to attempt a new system." According to the same report, "Mr. Wigram expressed his gratification at the statement made by the noble Lord. The value of the existing system (the Denominational) could not be overrated. Mr. Mann said that within five or six years from the present time, there would be, according to the past progress of the existing system, full one in every six of the population receiving all the advantages of it." Mr. Henley's admirable speech in the same debate, is full of arguments and statistics, illustrative of the superiority of the system, as proved by practical moral results, over those of Continental countries, not excepting Austria, which had been said to be the best educated State in Europe, where the returns showed, e. g., a remarkable disproportionate number of illegitimate children compared with England. He concludes on this point, "Humble as might have been the means by which they had endeavoured to obtain this end, he believed that among the people of England compared with the population of any other country, a state of things had been brought about, which, if it might not be all that could be desired, showed at all events, in comparison with other places, that the system which had existed could not be so very faulty (cheers). A very large proportion of the favorable result that had been brought about, must necessarily be attributed to this school system—the Denominational)."—Guardian, May 9.

I sincerely wish that any statement of facts or argument adduced in this brief and necessarily hurried pamphlet, may avail to lead others to the same conclusion. I believe from the bottom of my heart, that, while anxious of course to protect Church-of-England Education from the indirect injurious consequences of ill-adapted and partially working legislation on this subject, I am quite as ready as any conscientious dissenter from her communion, to deny (as I now emphatically disclaim) her light to any exclusive or exceptional prerogative or privilege in the distribution of the public revenue. I am confident that I am standing up for the common civil and religious rights of individual citizens of every possible political and denominational persuasion, in advocating a system which adapts itself to the manifold developments of private judgment and national character, and to the existing agencies for popular education, irrespective of religious creed. I am convinced,—and I think all thoughtful and candid persons who fairly and fully investigate the matter in all its bearings, political and moral, with unprejudiced minds, will inevitably arrive at the conviction—that no other system would operate so impartially and effectively in the society of this colony, as that which I have advocated under the term Denominational. "I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say."

The Impeachment of Christianity.

The Index Tracts. No. 10.

[From THE INDEX of Jan. 6, 1872.]

Christianity is the great system of faith and practice which is organized in the Christian Church; and its history is the history of the Christian Church. Such, I believe, is the definition which it has made for itself; and such is substantially the only definition of it which will abide the test of time.

Thus defined, I recognize with gratitude the great good which Christianity has done in the past, and is to some extent doing in the present. Nothing can long endure which has not struck root into the true, the admirable, the everlasting; and Christianity has endured for nearly two thousand years. But it is a product of humanity, and everything human is born to die. Today Christianity is dying a lingering death—to be prolonged until its usefulness to the world shall have been wholly exhausted. To many it is dead already, and the number of these is increasing day by day. For these I speak.

Together with great good, Christianity has wrought great evil in the world. The good is daily lessening, and the evil becoming daily more marked and more pernicious. It is time that some should with sincerity and openness utter aloud what great multitudes are thinking in the silence of their own souls, even though they may be only half conscious of the real drift of their own thought. The taught are in advance of their teachers. Christianity no longer proclaims the highest truth, inculcates the purest ethics, breathes the noblest spirit, stimulates to the grandest life, holds up to the soul and to society the loftiest ideal of that which ought to be. It has stood still while the race has moved on. It has become the chief hindrance in the path of man to the destiny marked out for him in the very laws of his own being—the chief obstacle to the realization of those magnificent dreams which are the inspiration of his sublimest endeavor. Thousands are becoming aware of this. For these I speak.

With all seriousness, then, and with intense conviction of the truth and urgent necessity of what I say, I IMPEACH CHRISTIANITY BEFORE THE BAR OF CIVILIZED MANKIND. In the name of all that is best, noblest and divinest in human nature, I impeach it of high crimes and misdemeanors against the peace of the world and the progress of the race towards a freer and holier future. And I summon it to appear before this high tribunal of Humanity, to show good cause why it shall not stand condemned and sentenced by its judge. For it is not I that speak, but the largest mind, the purest conscience, the tenderest heart, and the most earnest spirit of the nineteenth century. They bring no flippant or idle charge, but utter the world's grave declaration of independence of the Power that has become a Tyranny.

These are the leading counts of my indictment.

1. I IMPEACH CHRISTIANITY IN THE NAME OF HUMAN INTELLIGENCE—

Because it is the great organized Superstition of the Western world, perpetuating in modern times the false beliefs, the degrading fears, and the benumbing influences of the Dark Ages—in proportion to its power over men paralyzing their intellectual faculties, keeping them in the bondage of childish fancies, and governing them by means of an utterly irrational religious terrorism.

Because it is the great enemy of science, retarding the spread of natural knowledge, opposing new truths and discoveries as irreligious, perpetuating popular ignorance on all but permitted subjects in order that its own empire may be unshaken, and making blind faith in impossible doctrines the highest virtue of the human soul and the only protection against terrible yet purely imaginary dangers.

Because it is the greatest stumbling-block in the pathway of civilization, inasmuch as it withdraws attention from the natural affairs of this life, concentrates all its earnest thought on a future life that is to be eternal bliss or eternal misery, makes a merit of neglect of this world's riches in order "to lay up treasures in heaven," frowns on active enterprise as a dangerous devotion to "carnal things," and thus unfits men for attention to all those objects of honorable ambition on which the progress of civilization so largely depends.

2. I IMPEACH CHRISTIANITY IN THE NAME OF HUMAN VIRTUE—

Because it appeals to hope and fear as the supreme motives of human conduct, holds out promises of an eternal heaven as the reward of obedience to its commands, utters threats of an eternal hell as the punishment of disobedience to them, makes its appeal to human selfishness as the proper spring of human action, and consequently undermines and destroys the disinterestedness of all high morality, which commands the right because it is right and forbids the wrong because it is wrong, regardless alike of punishment and of reward.

Because it teaches that the virtue of the "Savior" can be a substitute for the virtue of the "saved,"—that the "sinner" can be made pure by the righteousness of another,—that merit and demerit do not belong to the individual, but can be transferred like a garment from back to back. Its great doctrines of "Depravity" and the "Atonement" are a blank denial of the very possibility of personal virtue.

Because it teaches that the natural penalties of wrongdoing can be escaped by "faith in Christ,"—that the consequences of moral evil are neither necessary nor universal,—that the law of cause and effect does not hold in the moral world; and thus weakens the natural auxiliaries of imperfect virtue by fostering the delusion that men can do evil without suffering for it.

Because it enjoins self-aborrence as the first condition of the "salvation" it offers,—makes the denial of all "worth or worthiness" in mankind the first step in the Christian life, and teaches that Christ will save those alone who have lost all faith in themselves and in their own power to escape the just wrath of God. It thus strikes a deadly blow at the dignity of human nature, extinguishes that noble sentiment of self-respect without which all high virtue is impossible, and smites men with the leprosy of self-contempt. It makes them crawl like reptiles before Christ—"their hands on their mouths, and their mouths in the dust." It is the very abolition of true manliness among men.

Because, by this extinction of self respect, it enfeebles the consciousness of human rights, and thus blights the very idea of natural justice, which is the practical recognition of these rights. No man who despises himself can respect his fellows or reverence the rights inherent in their very humanity. Whatever extinguishes human rights before God will extinguish human rights among men. For this reason Christianity has always been blind to justice.

Because, finally, it recognizes no higher law for man than the "revealed will of God." It thus bases all morality on will alone, and says nothing of that necessary Nature of Things which determines all moral relations. It thus confuses men's ideas of right and wrong, and renders impossible that knowledge of true ethical principles which is essential to all enlightened virtue.

3. I IMPEACH CHRISTIANITY IN THE NAME OF THE HUMAN HEART—

Because it recognizes no sanctity in natural human affections, but requires that all these shall be subordinated to an unnatural love of Christ as the Savior of souls. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me." "If any man hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life, he cannot be my disciple."

Because it extends over myriads of sensitive minds the blackness and gloom of a horrible theology, tortures them with a morbid self-reproach for unreal transgressions, and fills them with excruciating doubts of their final escape from hell,—thus destroying their happiness, and robbing their life of its natural beauty and charm.

Because it commands supreme love to a God whose character is utterly unlovely—a God whose wrath against his own children is a "consuming fire," and who plunges the vast majority of them into eternal agony. It thus degrades the very idea of fatherhood, by teaching the "Fatherhood" of a God whose character and acts are as unfatherly as they are incredible.

Because it proclaims a "Brotherhood of Man" which denies the natural equality essential to all genuine brotherhood—which perverts the natural sentiment of good-will towards all men into an artificial and exclusive bond among Christians themselves, and into a thoroughly unnatural condescension or pity towards all others—which is in fact consistent with the harshest injustice and the most frightful cruelty towards those who reject the Christian creed. It thus degrades and lowers the very idea of brotherhood, by calling that the "Brotherhood of Man" which is simply a fellowship of Christian believers, and which has been too often in history a fellowship of thieves and murderers.

4. I IMPEACH CHRISTIANITY IN THE NAME OF HUMAN FREEDOM—

Because it sets up a despotic authority which, whether as Church, as Bible, or as Christ, makes man a slave in his very soul—an authority which shuts up the human intellect within arbitrarily prescribed bounds, hands over the human conscience to the custody of clerical keepers, and rules all human life, individual or social, with an iron rod.

Because it has always allied itself with despotism in civil government, joined with the oppressor in keeping the oppressed under foot, and sought to maintain its own supremacy on the ruins of all human liberty.

Because, as Catholicism, It has been an unmitigated spiritual and temporal tyranny, from which many centuries of constant struggle have today only partially emancipated the world.

Because, as Protestantism, it has been an unmitigated spiritual tyranny, and is even now plotting in this free republic to re-establish itself as a temporal tyranny also.

Because it is the true heir of the ancient Roman Imperialism, seeking now as ever to establish and maintain an absolute empire over the whole world, and to bind the entire human race not only in political, but also in religious bondage. Wherever Christianity lives, Freedom dies. They cannot both long breathe the same atmosphere.

5. Lastly, I IMPEACH CHRISTIANITY IN THE NAME OF HUMANITARIAN RELIGION—

Because it stands stubbornly in the path of all human progress, blocking the way of every movement, which aims at the enlargement of human life,—opposes, and has always opposed, every genuine reform in human affairs,—consults only the interests of its own creed, and sets its face like a flint against the purely secular education in which, by a quick instinct, it recognizes the most dangerous enemy of this creed.

Because it teaches the impossibility of Humanity's advance through its own natural exertions, and insists that it should rely on supernatural assistance alone—thus extinguishing aspiration and drying up the fountain-head of all progress.

Because it teaches despair of human nature, as ruined, lost, and depraved—incapable of all salvation but that which comes from without, and subject to no law of natural development but that of degeneration, carrying it from bad to worse and from worse to worst. It thus denies the great, hopeful doctrine of humanitarian religion, that Humanity tends by its own free efforts to grow better as it grows older, and to emerge from a lower into a higher state in accordance with natural laws.

Because it proclaims ideas of God which would drive every reflective mind acquainted with modern knowledge into absolute atheism, were it not that modern knowledge itself furnishes the elements of a far higher idea of God in universal Nature. It thus appears as the most insidious enemy of the religious sentiment—the destroyer of that pure and ennobling worship which recognizes the Divine throughout all Time and Space, and creates in the soul of man a consciousness of profound spiritual oneness with the vast Whole of which he is a part.

In the name, therefore, of Human Intelligence, of Human Virtue, of the Human Heart, of Human Freedom, of Humanitarian Religion, I seriously and earnestly impeach Christianity before the tribunal of the Humanity it still continues to outrage and enslave. I impeach it in the name of that which is higher than itself, not lower—in the name of Truth, of Morality, of Love, of Liberty, of God; and I summon it to answer at the bar of Humanity, its rightful judge, that it may clear itself of the high crimes and misdemeanors of which I accuse it, or else submit to the sentence of just condemnation pronounced against it by the public opinion of civilized mankind.

Francis E. Abbot.

Free Religious Index, A Weekly Journal Devoted to Free Religion Published by The Free Religious Association, No. 3 Tremont Place, Boston. EDITOR: William J. Potter.

Editorial Contributors:

Among the regular or occasional contributors are: FELIX ADLER, FRANCIS E. ABBOT, JOHN ALBEE, JOHN W. CHADWICK, Mrs. E. D. CHENEY, ROWLAND CONNOR, GEORGE W. COOKE, GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE (England), FREDERICK MAY HOLLAND, C. D. B. MILLS, MINOT J. SAVAGE, WILLIAM H. SPENCER, Mrs. ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, BENJAMIN F. UNDERWOOD, and Mrs. SARA A. UNDERWOOD.

The FREE RELIGIOUS INDEX is the continuation of THE INDEX, which was founded and has been for ten years edited by Francis Ellingwood Abbot. Efforts will be made to keep the same high standard, and merit the same honorable distinction. As the late editor expressed it, the paper will still aim:—

- To increase general intelligence with respect to religion;
- To foster a nobler spirit and quicken a higher purpose, both in society and in the individual;
- To substitute knowledge for ignorance, right for wrong, truth for superstition, freedom for slavery, character for creed, catholicity for bigotry, love for hate, humanitarianism for sectarianism, devotion to universal ends for absorption in selfish schemes;
- In brief, to hasten the day when Free Religion shall take the place of dogmatism and ecclesiasticism throughout the world, and when the welfare of humanity here and now shall be the aim of all private and public activities.

It may be further stated that, as voice of the Free Religious Association, the FREE RELIGIOUS INDEX will endeavor fairly to represent all the phases of the movement, in all their breadth, for which that Association stands. Whatever pertains to its threefold object—"the practical interests of pure religion, the increase of fellowship in the spirit, and the encouragement of the scientific study of man's religious nature and history"—will here find a fitting place. The relations of Religion to Modern Science and to Social Science and Philanthropy, the relations of Universal Religion to the Special Religions and the relations of Religion to the

State, will receive particular attention. Book Notices and Correspondence will be secured from competent writers. As a

Special Feature,

which will commend the paper to many new subscribers, the FREE RELIGIOUS INDEX is to publish a lecture by Dr. FELIX ADLER, before his society in New York, once a month during the season of his society labors. The Editor will also print within the year several of his discourses.

Terms.

The price of the FREE RELIGIOUS INDEX is Three Dollars a year, payable in advance, which includes postage, and at the same rate for shorter periods. All remittances of money must be at the sender's risk, unless forwarded by check, registered letter, or post-office money order. The name, with address in full, must be accompanied with the money in each case. Address

Free Religious Association, No. 3 Tremont Place, Boston, Mass.

Crimes of Preachers In the UNITED STATES AND CANADA,

From May, 1876, to May, 1883.

Third Edition.

Translated Out of the Original Newspapers, and with Previous Translations Diligently Compared and Revised.

By M. E. Billings,

Author of "Prevention of Crime," Etc.. "Unholy Bible," "Holy Men and Women of the Bible," "Holy Cross," and Many Other Liberal Works.

"By their fruits shall ye know them! Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"

Issued Yearly.

New York: The Truth Seeker Publishing Company. 1883.

Preface by the Author to First Edition.

So long as fear rules the heart; so long as superstition controls men's actions; so long as imagination creates a god of horror who rules with despotic tyranny; so long as ignorance can be made to believe that the preacher or priest is in some way a go-between or agent between man and the powers in the clouds, that he is a sky pilot, directly commissioned by deity to attend to god's affairs on earth; and that the priest's person and office are sacred; just so long and no longer will such a useless class of men be possible as the modern priesthood.

If, then, it is made to appear that the preachers as a class are more criminal than any other class of people; that they are so without the excuse of want or ignorance; without reason other than because of their lazy lives and false creeds; then their dupes cannot learn that fact too soon.

These data are drawn almost entirely from the report as the same was published in some newspaper, the article having been clipped out and preserved in a scrap-book duly indexed. The author will be grateful to anyone who will cut out and send him any such, sending name of paper and date, as this interesting record will be continued, unless Anthony Comstock shall prohibit it as "obscene."

Waverly, Iowa.

Preface by The Author to Second Edition.

In issuing the first edition of this work, in 1881, it was announced that it would be a "continued love story;" and friends were invited to send the author clippings from newspapers, giving date and name of paper. Many good friends have done so, and the result shows that the author was correct in estimating that not one-half of the offenses charged against the clergy had been seen by himself.

Since publishing the first edition a flood of vituperation, slander, and falsehood has been poured upon the luckless wight who dared to publish such an exposé. A few have attempted to deny the charges against the reverend dead-beats, and in each instance have failed. From all parts of the country the author has been informed that the charges preferred were correct. All over the land, from Maine to Texas, from Oregon to Louisiana, the press has noticed the work, either criticising it in a friendly or unfriendly spirit. The Liberal press

has universally commended the work, and assisted in circulating it, and has the earnest thanks of the author.

The necessity for such a work becomes apparent when looking over the frightful list added during the last year. Let all who believe that the clerical villains should be published send the author papers containing such items. This "Labor of Love" will be issued yearly so long as priestcraft lives a life of crime, or until the author can write no longer.

Waverly, Iowa, June, 1882.

The Ten Parsons.

"TEN little preachers preaching love divine,
One kissed servant girl, then there were 9.
Nine little preachers preaching sinners' fate,
One got drunk, then there were 8.
Eight little preachers showing path to heaven,
One seduced a brother's wife, then there were 7.
Seven little preachers exposing Satan's tricks,
One beat his patient wife, then there were 6.
Six little preachers preaching Christ alive,
One debauched a little girl, then there were 5.
Five little preachers preaching 'sin no more,'
One raped a 'sister,' then there were 4.
Four little preachers, pure as they could be,
One raped an eight-year-old, then there were 3,
Three little preachers, pity so few,
One murdered his paramour, then there were 2.
Two little preachers following the son,
One whipped his child to death, then there was 1.
One little preacher in the fold alone,
He committed suicide, then there were none."

Graphic border

Crimes of Preachers.

Having met an article in the Cincinnati *Commercial* giving the names, places of residence, and facts constituting the crimes committed by preachers in the United States, giving forty instances, and entitled, "Preachers' Pranks," I thought it might be well to clip from newspapers such accounts for a time, and record the result.

The lists were opened May, 1876, and closed for first edition May, 1881.

If I was astonished at the fearful list of forty given by the *Commercial*, that astonishment paled into insignificance when I had prepared the following array of "preachers' crimes." It seems impossible that such a record could be compiled with the meager means at hand.

These data have been the result of the reading by the author, of four newspapers, and the casual reading of seven others. These papers are published in the states of Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri. None has been from the Southern states, none from the Pacific states.

The author has reason to believe that he has not collected more than one-half of the instances published, no particular pains having been taken.

It has been customary to drop the first names of men who have "taken holy orders;" consequently many a pious villain is recorded as Rev. Smith or Rev. Jones. In some cases the place was not fully given where the crime was committed. In some instances the offense is given the laconic name applied by the ecclesiastical court which tried the criminal, as "immoral conduct," "lascivious conduct," etc.; names probably given to hide the grossness of the offense, and to screen the reverend scoundrel in the interest of Christ's church.

The author has besides a long list of offenses committed by these reverend "bilks," where the name is entirely suppressed, as is supposed, out of respect for his "sacred calling."

The denomination was not given in many instances to which the "pious soul" belonged, consequently this record will hardly do to rely upon to enable the reader to ascertain what branch of "the church of God" has shown the most *efficiency* in *pastoral criminality*.

Letters will be found placed after a name, as P. E., for presiding elder, Ev. for Evangelist; for instance: Carhart, Rev. J. W., P. E., and Bayliss, Rev. E. L, Ev. The D.D., Ph.D., LL.D., and other addenda purchased of those institutions called colleges and theological seminaries—which are established and maintained for the purpose of *preventing* men from being educated—have not been preserved with any great care. If any reverend gentleman feels aggrieved by the omission, if he will send to the author the certificate of the warden of the state prison where he is confined, to the effect that he is entitled to such a distinction, the same shall be added in the next edition of "Crimes of Preachers."

If any have been overlooked, and left out of this "illustrious category," and desire the distinction of having their names made famous, they will please forward the facts, certified by some responsible person, to the author, and they shall not go away hungry.

"These be thy gods, O Israel!"

Recapitulation to First Edition.

This shows the following result, is the offenses have been charged against the clergy, and published, and the printed report preserved by the author, who, of course, cannot vouch for the truth of the newspaper statements:

Of these 456 have been against women in a sexual way, and 81 against women in other ways, or 544 against women especially.

Of this list of 477 criminal preachers, the denomination of but 208 has been preserved, leaving 268 not credited to any denomination. Of the 208 who are credited to denominations, the Methodists have 72; the Baptists, 42; the Presbyterians, 22, the Catholics 19; the Congregationalists, 13; the Church of England, 10; the Campbellites, 6; the Lutherans, 12; the Adventists, 5; the United Brethren, 3; the Hebrew, 2; the Tunkers, 1; and the Universalists, 1.

This shows the following percentage in crime according to denomination, viz.:

Of the 208 criminals of whom the denomination is given, the percentage is as follows:

By this ratio of the 917 crimes committed, as shown by the above list, the different denominations have been represented by their reverend criminals as follows:

Can it be possible that the most orthodox are the most criminal, and *vice versa*? Are men nearer pure as regards crime the further they get from the orthodox belief? It seems so. Of this list of crimes, there are 670 felonies. Of the definitions or distinctive names given to the various offenses 33 are names given by the several church courts where the reverend scoundrel was tried, perhaps with a view to hide the real offense, of course in the interests of religion. There were a great number of these, but by diligent inquiry the compiler has been able to ascertain generally that "unchaste conduct" meant a gross and beastly assault by the "divine messenger" upon and against a lady's chastity; and that "unministerial conduct" meant either adultery, rape or seduction committed against some susceptible sister who had confided in the lecherous "sky-pilot." Whenever the true state of facts were ascertained, the crime was set down by its right name.

The author has a large list of crimes, published within the last five years, committed by these reverend gentry, where the name of the reverend is not given. Could the name be ascertained, the above list would be largely increased. It is presumed the names were suppressed out of respect to the "sacred office" of the clerical scoundrels.

These data are almost entirely taken from a belt of the United States between Canada and North Carolina; almost all from Canada to Maryland, and from the Atlantic to the Western plains—that is, from the great "intellectual belt" of the nation, where most of the great secular and religious journals are published, and a section of the greatest mental and physical activity and of the greatest wealth. This "belt" comprises not one-fourth of our area and not one-half of our population.

There are in the United States about seventy thousand priests and preachers; these data are drawn from about thirty five thousand.

It is safe to say that not one half of the published accounts of preachers' crimes have been seen and the account preserved by the author.

Eminent writers on crime estimate that but one crime out of sixteen is detected and traced to the criminal. There is no probability that half of those which are ascertained are ever published, even when there is no superstitious excuse for keeping it from the public.

All these suggestions then assist the reader at arriving at a correct estimate as to the amount of criminality

which exists among our "guides to holiness" For instance, if 35,000 preachers in the "intellectual belt" of the United States commit 917 crimes in five years, 70,000 preachers in the whole United States commit 1,834 crimes; if the author has collected but one half of the number published, then 70,000 preachers have committed 3,668 in five years; if but one crime out of sixteen is traced to the criminal, then the 70,000 preachers have committed 29,344 in the United States in the last five years; and even that list must be again doubled if but one-half of the instances of discovered crime are published.

Let any one bring his own knowledge of circumstances to bear upon this subject. Could the most careful research discover and compile more than a moiety of the crime committed? Of the crime committed in our great cities, how much sees the public prints? Of the drunkenness and debauchery so openly and commonly committed in one large city, how much is published? And you must recollect that the preacher hides his crimes carefully, and his compeers and parishioners assist him to conceal it; while the night-brawler, petty thief, and drunken wretch are under police surveillance.

Is there not food for thought here? Is it not to the eye of the legislator, the magistrate, the policeman, the detective, the parent, the public, was turned toward this cesspool of pollution? Is it not time the journalist published his note of warning? Is it not time to investigate without superstition, without fear, without favor, and expose and punish without mercy the men, who, having no excuse of want, of friendliness, of homelessness, of want of confidence, who assume to be the very *elite* of society and the very *elect* of God, commit more crime as a class than ten times their number in any other class of society, than even the most poverty-stricken, famished, houseless, homeless, friendless, ignorant, degraded, imbecile or idiotic class of the human family?

The commission of crime depends—first, upon the criminal desire of the felon; second, upon the incentive; third, upon the opportunity to commit the crime.

As to the first, the foregoing record shows that the desire to commit crime is greater in this class of persons than in any other. With a full knowledge of our civil, criminal, and moral code these gentry knowingly, wickedly, and wilfully commit more crime than ten times thirty their number in any other class of people. Nor can the plea that the crime was the result of ignorance be interposed with them, as it can be in nearly one-half of the cases where crime is committed by the illiterate and foolish. Then the fact that of these 917 crimes committed by these "ministers of God," 537 have been committed against women, 456 against the morality, chastity, and decency of women certainly evinces a criminal desire among these 35,000 "holy men" unparalleled in any other class of men.

Second—as to the incentive, our theory is this: Among the illiterate, ignorant, and semi-idiotic classes there is an almost entire belief in the gods, devils, saviors, redeemers, and saints which the priesthood have invented, and in their heaven and hell, offered as a bribe and terror to the evil-doer. Although these bribes and terrors do not in the main elevate and ennoble mankind, yet to some extent they have restrained crime in the unlettered and imbecile classes, through superstitious fear. On the other hand, the "divine teachers" of these dogmas generally have no belief therein; and being accustomed to obtaining fat livings, gorgeous attire, lives of ease and indolence, and unmerited confidence and adulation from their dupes, it becomes like second nature to them to gratify every lust, desire, passion, prejudice, hate, covetousness, and ambition. Generally, well knowing that the creeds they teach are false, they come to look upon all legal and moral restraint as an abridgement of their rights, and upon all morality and virtue as a sham. Of course there are those among them who have learned but little of anything, and that little only what would confirm their superstitious fears and hopes, who have never allowed themselves to investigate the truth, and who have given a blind, unreasoning adherence to the doctrines of salvation through the atonement. These firmly believe that they can escape the just reward of their evil deeds by means of that "scapegoat;" can avoid the penalty for crime and again become "pure" through the great "bankrupt court" of "remission of sins." This branch of the tribe of "sky-pilots" are even more dangerous than the hypocritical ones. Once fully convince a man that he can by a "death-bed repentance" "shove by justice" and in nine cases out of ten he will commit any crime as fearlessly as does the wild Malay, who rushes *amuck* through the streets with his gleaming knife cutting down his fellows on every hand until he too is struck down, firmly believing that when he is killed his soul will at once ascend to paradise. Accordingly, the honest divine falls into temptation and gets up besmirched with crime; at once falls upon his knees, receives the holy "unction" and gets up "washed white as snow."

Third—as to the opportunity to commit crime, the "servant of God" has much the advantage of the servant of toil. He is to some extent entrusted with money because of his "holy orders." He is generally tolerated everywhere because of his "sanctity." He becomes the instructor of youth by virtue of his "nearness to God." He recommends persons to places of trust by virtue of his position as their pastor. He recommends Mrs Winslow's snoring syrup by virtue of his experience as a "child of immortality" (of course he never takes pay for such services). He assumes to introduce himself to anyone and anywhere, even to a lady stranger, insisting upon taking her by the hand as a "messenger from Jesus," a familiarity she would resent on the part of an honest tiller of the soil. He enters our homes without invitation and while a stranger, and volunteers advice upon all earthly

subjects of which he knows but little, and upon all heavenly subjects, of which he knows nothing.

The assumed position of a preacher as a "spiritual adviser" peculiarly places him in a position to commit crimes against morality, chastity, and decency. The danger of "pastoral visits," so strikingly exemplified in the Beecher-Tilton scandal, has become almost imminent. During the middle ages, in Switzerland and other countries, a new priest could not hear the private confession of females until he had selected and kept one or more mistresses; but even such a salutary provision would hardly have sufficed to keep some of the gentlemen of our list within bounds.

The lazy, overfed life led by most of our clergy superinduces lust, and the chances they have are shown to have been largely improved; over 400 cases of beastly lechery out of 917 cases of crime exemplifies the fact.

The ratio of crime in our general population is 3.1 in 1,000, including the clergy. This list shows 29 crimes committed by each 1,000 "sky-pilots," and these only so far as we have collected them from the printed reports; if but half have been collected, there have been 58 crimes committed by each 1,000 preachers in the last five years; if but one crime in sixteen has been published, there have been 928 crimes committed by each 1,000 preachers in the "intellectual belt" of these United States. The only question is, do clergymen conceal their criminality as effectually as do other criminals.

These data are taken exclusively from accounts published in newspapers. The abbreviation became necessary on account of the multitude of priestly villains. Some of the details are shocking. We have preserved the printed report and can furnish the same to inquirers.

The ratio of criminals in American population is 2.7 to the 1,000, including the clergy. The above list shows that out of 35,000 preachers 477 are criminals, or 13.3 to the 1,000. Making the same allowances as before, for want of data, the number becomes 26.6 to the 1,000; and if but one crime out of sixteen is discovered in this amply protected and shielded class, then out of every 1,000 "ministers of the most high" 425 are criminals, as against 176 to the 1,000 in all classes, including the preachers, measured by the same rule as to discovery, etc.

Now, although we know that there are many clergymen who are good and honest men, and who conscientiously teach the mythology of Christianity and are earnestly striving to benefit mankind, yet the conviction is forced upon us that as a class they are the most hypocritical and criminal class of men; that their knowledge that their savior is a fabled myth, common to religious enthusiasts in all ages and all lands, and that they obtain their fat livings solely on account of the ignorance and superstition of their dupes, makes them *per se* criminally inclined.

Christian, how do you like this showing? "Man of God," what have you got to offer? This is rather a new departure, is it not? What are you going to do about it? It will do little good to sigh for the good old days when Christianity ruled supreme, when you could at once invoke the aid of the axe, rack, the stake, the fagot, the thumbscrew, the iron boot, and the tongues of fire. The ghost of the murdered past will not answer your call. Thanks to the advance of Free-thought and to the legislative care of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Paine, and other Infidel compeers, there is a bound set to your despotic sway. What can you do? Of course you can beseech an all-merciful deity to burn the author forever hereafter; but as he seems willing to take the chances of the hereafter, and as your faith in that divine institution called hell has of late been fearfully shaken—thanks to the humanizing efforts of Infidels which has in a measure civilized your creed and stripped your God of half of the horrible attributes you had given him—even that sweet solace is hardly commensurate for the occasion. Then what can you do? Why, it is terrible to know that any one dares hunt up and classify and publish to the world the crimes committed by the reverend "followers of the meek and lowly Jesus!" It has always been an-exclusive right belonging to the priesthood to charge all crime upon Infidels; to assert from every "coward's castle" in the land that but for unbelief in the cleansing power of the blood of a person who they claim died some eighteen hundred and forty-eight years ago there would be no sin, no crime. It is a rather strange experience to have the tables turned, and to have an expose that shows a fearful balance of crime against those who so earnestly believe and teach the all-potent curative and preventive properties of the aforesaid blood.

Again we ask, what will the privileged class do about it? And, being a Yankee, allow us to answer our own question. We have no way to judge of the future but by the past. In the past these brassy gentry, with solemn-visaged falsehood, have from every coward's castle in Christendom answered all the arguments, facts, and figures adduced by skeptics by maligning the character of the reasoner or mathematician, especially if dead. "Unworthy to blacken the shoes of their opponont, they blackened his character." All this being more congenial to the taste of the ordinary follower of the meek and lowly Jesus than fair investigation and candid argument.

With the ghoulishness of hyenas they have dug into the grave of Thomas Paine, and covered the honored dust of the noble and defenseless dead with cesspool filth, calumny, falsehood, vituperation, hatred, and slander.

"In the arsenal of the church, which once bristled with magazines of destruction, there remains but one weapon—slander." Col. Ingersoll will one day be served as was Thomas Paine, for uttering such a thought.

"Once a donkey kicked a lion. The lion was *dead*."

This, then, is what will be done. From every pulpit will belch a stream of slander to hide by the cry of "Stop thief!" the reverend purloiner of female virtue, the ravisher of children, the murderer of wife and children, the beater of helpless women and babes, and the "meek follower of Jesus," who whipped his three-year-old boy to death for not correctly saying the "Lord's Prayer."

Well, after all this is done, will that establish the innocence of the murderer of Mary Stannard—of the seducer of Mrs. Tilton? Will that prove beyond a reasonable doubt that ministers never commit crime? No! but the "galled jade winces" just the same, and he whose corns are trod upon is apt to cry out.

The reason for this expose is apparent. For ages all crime has been charged to Infidelity. Once it was a brave man who dared announce disbelief in the myths of Christianity. "To him who had braved the church every door was shut, every knife was open." Even in our day it was to be shunned as a pest and to be ostracized from society to announce a disbelief in the "immaculate conception." From every pulpit the skeptics were charged with all the crime that darkens the face of civilization. Rev. E. L. Bayliss—now, unfortunately for him, languishing in the penitentiary of Michigan for seduction of Brother Phenix's wife and eloping with her, deserting his wife and children—while "evangelizing" in the Baptist church at Waverly, Iowa, invited all skeptics to come and hear his convincing arguments against Infidelity! Many came. The buffoon took for his text "Let him that is unholy be unholy still, and him that is filthy be filthy still," and poured a tirade of abuse upon ladies and gentlemen of the best society. He said: "Let them alone: come out from them. From skeptics comes all the crime that darkens the face of civilization." The skeptics were convinced that he was a cowardly slanderer, and arose and left, leaving him empty benches to talk to. He can hardly claim that the short time he remained so contaminated him that he shortly afterward had to expiate it in state prison.

Allow us, then, to make the following offer: There are of Freethinkers—including Atheists, Infidels, Spiritualists, etc.—about seven millions in the United States; there are about seventy thousand priests and preachers. Now, we make the following offer: We will give *ten* dollars apiece for crimes committed by any of these classes of Freethinkers within the last five years, and will take the report thereof as published in the newspapers; provided, the preachers will give us *one* dollar apiece for the same evidence of crimes committed by reverends. Thus we offer ten dollars for one, and give them seven millions to draw their data from while we have but seventy thousand.

In the language of the far West, "*Put up or shut up!*"

The author will continue to publish these records from year to year. Will friends be kind as to clip from papers such items, together with name and date of the paper, and send them to us for insertion in future editions?

If a wrong has been done by inserting a name in this list which should have been omitted, as where some paper has maliciously published a falsehood against any one, we shall be only too glad to make reparation, our object being to do exact justice to all, without fear or malice.

Recapitulation to Second Edition.

The following shows the aggregate of each crime charged, alphabetically arranged:

The first edition places the Methodist divines at the top of the criminal calendar. They still hold that bad pre-eminence. During the last year 156 of the 202 preachers charged with crime have been assigned to their respective churches: thus, Methodists, 54; Baptists, 32; Catholics, 20; Episcopalians, 13; Congregationalists, 10; Lutherans, 10; Presbyterians, 9; Campbellites, 2; United Brethren, 2; Hebrews, 2; Adventists, 1; Universalists, 1. So if the 35,000 holy men have committed 73,000 sexual crimes during the last year, the Methodist preachers have assisted in 24,333 cases, the Baptists in 12,000, the Catholics in 9,000, the Episcopalians in 7,000, the Congregationalists in 4,500, the Lutherans in 4,500, the Presbyterians in 4,000, the Campbellites 1,000, the United Brethren in 1,000, the Hebrews in 1,000, the Adventists in 500, the Universalists in 500.

Again must we ask, Are men nearer pure the farther they set from orthodoxy, and *vice versa*?

Then 220 of these crimes charged have been against the morality, chastity, and decency of women! Has the author been able to obtain published accounts of half of those deeds of the dark? Have the reverend adulterers, seducers, and ravishers been caught and published in one case out of sixteen of that carefully covered crime? If not, and the lecherous men of God have committed but one offense each, then these 35,000 vicegerents of heaven have committed twenty sexual sins per day during the last year! Did each repeat his crime ten times, then the female dupes of the "oily gammons" have suffered from their beastly lusts to the amount of two hundred instances per day. Computing at the same ratio which statisticians use with other classes of criminals, these 35,000 messengers of peace are guilty of 73,000 sexual crimes every year, two for each one of their

number every day, including Sundays. And why not? Have they less opportunity than laborers, mechanics, lawyers, doctors, miners, farmers, traders, merchants, sailors, or other hardy sons of toil? Surely not. Every opportunity is thrown in their way. Women will admit perfect strangers into their houses, into their society, into their confidence, if they but prefix the pompous title Reverend" to their names. Few care to even notice a laborer, sailor, farmer, mechanic, or miner. Yet while computing the criminal statistics the compiler includes as well the noble sons of toil as the priesthood. Who does not know that if so much sexual crime is committed the smooth-tongued wolf in a lamb's pelt has better opportunities than the busy man of useful life, even if nothing be allowed for the indolent lives, highly-seasoned food, and depraved appetites of these lambs of God?

And now, after a year spent in waiting, hoping that the previous publication might deter the elect of God from such exhibitions of depravity, we come again to the fore with a new list of 202 criminal preachers in one year, taken, as before, from the northern half of the United States and Canada. Four hundred and forty-seven in five years was a fearful list, unprecedented in the annals of crime! That made over 89 to the year! But here comes 202 in one year! 16.8 to the month! 4 each week! more than one every other day! Sundays included! Just think. 35,000 educated men, well versed in our civil and moral code, claiming secular holiness, and demanding special privileges because of their good works; committing gross and horrid crimes every other day, even if not one of them repeats his crime—does this so publicly that it is published in the papers. How much done so darkly no one ever knows of it unless it be perhaps a suffering victim. Do they, like the rest of criminals, hide fifteen out of sixteen crimes? If so, these 35,000 holy men commit 10 crimes each day! Has the author yet failed to get more than half of the published accounts? then these "sky-pilots" commit over 20 crimes every day, including Sundays, even if each commits but *one* crime in all his life! But these 202 priests and preachers are charged with an aggregate of 500 crimes in the last year. Four crimes each three days, so far as published! Did the author see but half, then they have been published as having committed 8 crimes every three days! Did they hide 15 crimes for every one published, then they have committed 128 crimes each three days! Have the clergy in the northern half of the United States committed 42 heinous crimes every day during the last year?

Recapitulation to Third Edition.

Aggregate of crime charged against the clergy of the United States in seven years:

The third edition of "Crimes of Preachers" is thus before the public, with its mass of statistics for the thoughtful to ponder upon. Some attempts have been made to show the author that certain names should be dropped from the list, but careful inquiry has not warranted doing so.

Some object to the estimates of "hidden" crime, as not being the most reliable way of computing; but they give no real reasons.

The basis of computation is varied in this edition, in a perfectly mathematical way, and in no way based upon conjecture.

As before, the crimes charged have been mostly from the Northern States, and from about 35,000 priests and preachers. Now, 35,000 men, after reaching maturity, with average health, live about twenty-seven years, on the average. Make some allowance for "parsonitis" with this class, and give an average age to preachers of twenty-five years, after they begin to preach, including "boy preachers." Then this compilation, commenced in 1876, and the 35,000 priests and preachers then "heralding glad tidings to a dying world," would live twenty-five years, or till 1901—say 1900; the recruits supplying the places of those "killed and wounded," *i.e.*, died and "otherwise accounted for."

Now let us make a different computation to ascertain the amount of crime committed by the tribe of "sky pilots." If 35,000 preachers have committed 2,000 crimes in seven years, 35,000 clergymen will commit 7,140 in twenty-five years. If but one out of sixteen has had his offense discovered and published, then 35,000 "guides to holiness" commit *one hundred and fourteen thousand* crimes in twenty-five years; and this presuming that the author has collated every instance of published offenses. If half of the "gentlemen of the cloth" are innocent, the other half will be guilty of 228,000 crimes in twenty-five years. But, says one, you are computing upon the basis of the number of *crimes* charged, not upon the number of *criminate*. Well, let us compute upon the number of priests and preachers charged with crime; let us see how that would figure. We have 870 names now published in this work during seven years, the data for the first three or four years being very incomplete; that will be 3,100 in twenty-five years, on the same ratio. But take the ratio of the last two years, of nearly 200 per year, and the number in twenty-five years will be *five thousand*—ascertained and published criminals, "wearing the livery of heaven!" Only one out of sixteen having been detected and his crime published, this 5,000 must be multiplied by 16, making 80,000 reverend criminals in twenty-five years; that is, *in the lifetime of thirty-five thousand preachers there will be eighty thousand criminal preachers!* And so notoriously criminal that their names and crimes will be so thoroughly published that an ordinary newspaper reader in a little city in Iowa will

see it and preserve the account. Really, the Bureau of Public Justice (?) should furnish the author with a good corps of clerks to keep this good work going on, so that the people may see just what kind of gentry these are, who assume to write all of our school-books, control our system of education, teach our children at Sunday-schools, deliver the "word of God" from the pulpit, and visit our wives and daughters to see about their "spiritual welfare!"

And now, reader, we ask, in all candor, is there anything unfair in the above computation? If so, show us where it is. Facts are stubborn things; figures won't lie. The preacher has many ways to conceal his fault that the poor laborer has not, besides having the greater cunning of education, and the aid of powerful and superstitious friends, none of which is at the service of the poor criminal. And then, of the 2,053 crimes charged against these "followers of Jesus," 1,113 have been committed against women—more than one-half of the crimes! Do ladies as a rule proclaim to newspaper reporters their own shame for the sake of having the parson's crime published? How much of such crime ever really gets before the public eye?

The statistics of crime, including the preachers', show that but about three per cent of all crime committed is against women. Do the ladies always "tell on" the dominie? The philosopher who has the good of posterity at heart may even express a doubt of its having the best of parentage!

There is no denying these facts. The data are open to all. Then this expose should cause even the most bigoted and superstitious to think, and, upon thought, to act.

The assistance of many kind friends, in sending the author papers containing accounts of priestly crime, has made the work much easier and more effective. Will the friends please continue to send items? Please either send the paper entire, with article marked, or cut out item, and name and date of paper, as no names are included in this "illustrious" category except where the author preserves the original authority.

The church to which the "pious sinner" belongs is given much more accurately in this edition than before. That "much persecuted," pure-hearted, *poor* sect, the Methodist, still holds pre-eminence in priestly villainy. Of the 191 reverend scoundrels in this third edition who have been accredited to churches, the list stands:

Again the showing is bad for orthodoxy and *vice versa*.

The following table shows the aggregate of reverend villainy, according to sect, in all three editions of "Crimes of Preachers:"

Church not given Unitarians. Tunker French Reformed Methodists Free Methodists. Universalists Hebrews United Brethren. Adventists. Campbellites Lutherans Episcopalians Congregationalists Presbyterians Catholics Baptists Methodists First edition, 1876 to 1881. 72 42 19 22 13 10 12 6 5 3 2 1 0 0 1 0 269 Second edition, 1881 to 1882. 54 32 20 9 10 13 10 2 1 2 2 1 0 0 0 0 46 Third edition, 1882 to 1883. 39 27 27 11 12 5 5 5 2 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 55 Total for seven years. 165 101 66 42 35 28 27 13 8 6 4 2 1 1 1 0 370

Divide the 370 divine rascals according to the same ratio, and we have the following result:

Methodists, 287; *Baptists*, 174; *Catholics*, 114; *Presbyterians*, 73; *Congregationalists*, 61; *Episcopalians*, 48; *Lutherans*, 46; *Christians*, 22; *Adventists*, 14; *United Brethren*, 10; *Hebrews*, 7; *Universalists*, 3; *Free Methodists*, 1.74; *French Reformed*, 1.74; *Tunkers*, 1.74; *Unitarian*, 0.

Multiplying each of the foregoing figures by 16, we have the aggregate of "hidden crime," as follows:

Methodists, 4,592; *Baptists*, 2,784; *Catholics*, 1,824; *Presbyterians*, 1,168; *Congregationalists*, 976; *Episcopalians*, 768; *Lutherans*, 736; *Christians*, 352; *Adventists*, 224; *United Brethren*, 160; *Hebrews*, 112; *Universalists*, 48; *Free Methodists*, 27; *French Reformed*, 27; *Tunkers*, 27; *Unitarians*, 0;

One thing becomes very evident: that in the criminal records orthodoxy stands a very unfavorable comparison with heterodoxy. Compared with Agnostics, Spiritualists, Infidels, and Atheists, Methodism—at least among the reverends—has a very dark and unseemly appearance. Can it be possible that teaching and pretending a belief in the "immaculate conception," that three times one is one, that a person is his own father, that a ghost proceeded from the father and son both, and was at the same time both that father and son, make men villains *per se*? Do teaching and pretending belief in an impossibility make men wicked? Do teaching and pretending to believe that to be true which is manifestly false, that to be historical fact which is not even a respectable mythological fable, make men into coarse and degraded criminals? It would seem so.

The facts are that a class of men who *demand* support, confidence, esteem, love, and homage, simply because of some pretended influence they have with the unseen and unknown powers in the skies, will of necessity come to look upon their dupes as their legitimate prey, and to feel aggrieved if all, their unjust demands are not at once complied with.

Another thought. A preacher is entirely incapacitated for any other occupation. Accustomed to asserting that to be true of which they know nothing, and of which they at least have much doubt, or believe to be wholly false, when compelled in other employments to meet competition, even flat contradiction, they are thrown completely off their base. Why, they never knew but one side to a question before, and are completely nonplussed when disputed or called upon to show facts. So, too, a preacher's sons are mostly worthless, and for the same reason. Beggary—call it by what name you will—renders the beggar worthless. Priestcraft is beggary.

Priests are the most insolent of mendicants! No beggar is so despicable as he who is clothed in shining vestments, the fruit of his trade.

There are honest preachers, but they are also ignorant, No really educated man can remain a priestly drone, unless he does so as a hypocrit. The educated clergymen all well know that the story of Jesus and his apostles is a myth—a fable common to the whole Aryan race for thousands of years. There is no excuse for any minister remaining ignorant on this subject. Slight investigation is all that is necessary. If he will not investigate he is a bigot, and just as unworthy as his hypocritical colleague.

Many honest preachers are investigating, many are leaving their mendicant's position and boldly announcing to the world their disbelief in the dogmas of Christian mythology. Bright stand forth the names of Chainey, Miln, Weaver, Newton, Thom- as, Swing, and scores of others, who have braved the impotent scorn of the church and assumed the garb and mien of freemen. Take the cowardly incentive of *popularity* away—and it is fast going—and none will remain priests except the groveling ignoramus and the crafty mountebank. All hail the day when men and women shall live in the live present, not in a dead and rotten past!—live to build up the cause of king-and-priest ridden humanity, instead of building costly churches and cathedrals, supporting in indolence and crime a horde of priestly drones, while the wail of the orphan and the moan of the crushed woman are heard on every hand!

Down with the system that reduces a land to the condition of master and slave, palaces and paupers' huts! Down with the privileged, untaxed class, who have no more manhood than to extort, through superstitious fear, easy living and gorgeous attire from the hardy but ignorant poor! May the day soon come when *any man* will feel ashamed to hold out a soft, delicate, bejeweled hand in beggary, to receive alms from a poor woman dressed in rags, elbow-deep in the washtub, and a horde of pinchedfaced starvelings clinging to her tattered skirts, crying for a crust.

Archbishop Purcell, hiding away six million dollars of the hard earnings of the wretched poor, receiving the commiseration of a truculent press because of his *misfortune*—in the mean while his confiding dupes perishing for food—is a picture which cannot long be painted upon the broad canvas of our free republic.

This work will be issued every year as long as the author can labor. Lovers of their kind will aid in circulating it. The author will be pleased to receive letters from friends in the future as in the past concerning the work. Thousands have written to me, from Maine to the Pacific shore, and from the source of the great Father of Waters to the tropical Everglades. The writers will excuse the author for not answering their good letters; it would require all his time. Receive his hearty thanks, and continue to aid him in the good work.

Many respected friends have requested the author to issue a work on Religious Insanity. He has much data now on hand and is collecting. Please send clippings from the papers of items of "religious craze," and in a short time a work will issue thereon. He is also collecting the same kind of data concerning murderers who are swung from the rope's end into the arms of Jesus. Send him all such accounts.

And now, for another year, goodbye.

The Truth Seeker Library.

The World's Sages, Thinkers, and Reformers. The Biographies of three hundred of the most distinguished teachers and philosophers (who were not Christians), from the time of Menu to the present. By D. M. BENNETT. 1,075 pages, 8vo. Cloth, \$3.00; leather, \$4.00; morocco, gilt edges, \$4.50.

The Champions of the Church; Their Crimes and Persecutions. Biographical sketches of prominent Christians. A companion book to "The World's Sages," etc. By D. M. BENNETT. 8vo. 1,119 pages. Cloth, \$3.00; leather, \$4.00; morocco, gilt edges, \$4.50.

The Gods and Religions of Ancient and Modern Tillies. Vol. I. gives a full account of all the gods the nations of the earth have worshiped, including Jehovah, Satan, The Holy Ghost, Jesus Christ, Virgin Mary, and the Bible. 835 pages, 8vo. Vol. II. describes fully all the religious systems of the world, including Judaism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity; the latter occupying 372 pages, going fully into its merits. 949 pages. By D. M. BENNETT. Written in prison at Albany. In cloth, \$3.00 per volume, or \$5.00 for the two volumes; in leather; \$7.00; in morocco gilt edges, \$8.00.

Supernatural Religion. An inquiry into the reality of divine revelation. Decidedly the most thorough and exhaustive work on the claims of supernaturalism ever written. By F. W. NEWMAN, Emeritus Professor of the London University. 1,115 pages, 8vo. In cloth, \$4.00; leather, \$5.00; morocco, gilt edges, \$5.50.

The Great Works of Thomas Paine. Including The Age of Reason. Examination of Prophecies, Reply to Bishop of Llandaff, Letter to Mr. Erskine, Essay on Dreams, Letter to Camille Jordan, The Religion of Deism, Common Sense, The Crisis, and The Rights of Man; the whole preceded, by the Life of Paine, and a steel-plate portrait. 800 pages, 8vo. Cloth, \$3.00; leather, \$4.00; morocco, gilt edges, \$4.50.

Analysis of Religious Belief. An examination of the Creeds, Rites, and Sacred Writings of the world. By VISCOUNT AMBERLEY, son of the late Lord John Russell, twice Premier of England. Complete from the London edition. 745 pages, 8vo. In cloth, \$3.00; leather, \$4.00; morocco, gilt edges, \$4.50.

The foregoing volumes are called "The Truth Seeker Library." If all are ordered together and sent by express, one dollar will be deducted from the price of each.

D. M. Bennett's Works.

A Truth Seeker Around the World. Four large volumes. With a steel plate engraving of the author in Vol. I. and each volume illustrated with forty-seven cuts. By D. M. BENNETT. Late editor of THE TRUTH SEEKER, author of "A Truth Seeker in Europe," "Gods and Religions of Ancient and Modern Times," "The World's Sages, Thinkers, and Reformers," "Champions of the Church," etc., etc. Handsomely bound in red cloth, \$6.50; in leather, red edges, \$9.50; in morocco, gilt edges, \$10.50.

Readers of THE TRUTH SEEKER know the circumstances under which this work was written. The last words penned by the great author were for the fourth volume, which was nearly completed at his death, and which contains an account of his world-lamented death and burial. MR. BENNETT was a very patient and faithful chronicler of the habits and customs of the different peoples of the many places he visited. The every-day life of all nations is laid before the reader by one who has visited them and beheld them with his own eyes. Particular attention is paid to the progress of Free thought in the various countries he visited, and the morality of so-called pagan nations is contrasted with the morality of Christian countries, much to the detriment of the latter. The work is a "Freethinker's History of the World." This Work and "A Truth Seeker in Europe" should be in every Liberal's library. Besides its intrinsic worth it is a memento of one of the greatest Freethinkers the world has known—of one who ranks with Voltaire and Paine in the force and clearness of his writings.

The World's Sages, Thinkers, and Reformers. 1,075 pages, 8vo. Cloth, \$3.00; leather, \$4.00; morocco, gilt edges, \$4.50.

The Champions of the Church; Their Crimes and Persecutions. 8vo. 1,119 pages. Cloth, \$3.00; leather, \$4.00 morocco, gilt edges, \$4.50.

The Gods and Religious of Ancient and Modern Times Two Volumes. Written in prison. In cloth, \$3.00 per volume, or \$5.00 for the two volumes; in leather, \$7.00; in morocco, gilt edges, \$8.00.

From Behind the Bars. A series of letters written in prison. Over 700 pages. Price, \$1.50.

A Truth Seeker in Europe. A series of letters written during a visit of ten weeks in Europe. Giving some account of the International Freethinkers' Congress held at Brussels, to which Mr. Bennett was a delegate, followed by a description of what he saw in England, France, Holland, and Italy. The letters from Rome alone are worth the price of the book. With a steel-plate portrait of the author. 850 pages. \$1.50

The Semitic Gods and the Bible. Treating upon the gods of the Semitic nations, including Allah, Jehovah, Satan, the Holy Ghost, Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the Bible. To the latter 230 pages are devoted, showing that book to be a very inferior production for a first-class God. 333 large pages. Paper covers, 60 cents; cloth, \$1.

Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism examined historically and critically. It is thought to be the most damaging exhibit of Christianity that has appeared. 500 large pages. Price, \$1.50.

Thirty Discussions, Bible Stories, Essays and Lectures. 700 pages. Paper covers, 75 cents; cloth \$1.

The Humphrey-Bennett Discussion. A debate on Christianity and Infidelity, between D. M. BENNETT and Rev. G. H. HUMPHREY. This book has had a very large sale, and is a splendid work for Freethinkers to loan to Christian neighbors. 550 pages. Price, \$1.

Bennett-Teed Discussion. Between D. M. BENNETT and CYRUS ROMULUS R. TEED. Jesus the Lord God Creator of Heaven and Earth. Paper, 30 cents; cloth, 50 cents.

What Objections to Christianity? A discussion between D. M. BENNETT and G. M. MAIR, divided into the following theses: 1. Christianity is neither new nor original, being borrowed or copied from much older systems of religion, (a) The belief in an offspring being begotten by a god upon a human virgin is nearly a thousand years older than the mythical story of Jesus and his virgin mother. (b) Other so-called saviors and redeemers have been believed in and reported to have been crucified and to have died on the cross many hundreds of years before the same was said of Jesus, (c) There is not a dogma, rite, sacrament, or ceremony in Christianity that did not exist in pagan systems from five hundred to two thousand years before Christianity was known in the world.

2. Miracles and supernatural achievements have been as fully and truly ascribed to other teachers and founders of religion as to Jesus.

3. The story of Jesus and his mission in the world is unhistorical; it is not corroborated by contemporaneous

history.

BENNETT affirms; MAIR denies. This is an exhaustive discussion. Price, - \$1.50.

Interrogatories to Jehovah. Being 3,000 questions propounded to his Jewish Godship upon a great variety of subjects. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Deacon Skidmore's Letters. First Deacon of Zion Hill Baptist Church, giving many church incidents and his evolution from Christianity to Liberalism. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Anthony Comstock: His Career of Cruelty and Crime. 25 cents.

Eighth and Last Letter from Ludlow-Street Jail. 10 cents.

Letters from Albany Penitentiary. 25 cents. Matter, Motion, Life, and Mind. 10 cents. Answers to Christian Questions. 25 cents.

The Book of Chronicles of the Pilgrims in the Land of Yahweh; also the Epistle of Bennett the Apostle to the Truth Seekers. Cloth, \$1.00.

The First Epistle of Bennett the [unclear: Apos le] to the Truth Seekers. 10 cents.

The Gods of Superstition. 8 cents.

The Great Religions of the World. 10 cents.

Open Letter to Samuel Colgate. 10 cents.

Jesus Christ. Considered as an Infidel. 10 cents.

An Hour With the Devil. 10 cents.

Sinful Saints and Sensual Shepherds. 10 cents.

Honest Questions and Honest Answers. 5 cents.

An Open Letter to Jesus Christ. 5 cents.

Trial of D. M. Bennett in the United States Circuit Court upon the charge of depositing prohibited matter in the mail. This gives a full history of this celebrated case and shows what monstrous injustice was perpetrated upon Mr, BENNETT. Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

Paine's Works.

Paine's Theological Works, including The Age of Reason, Examination of Prophecies, Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, Reply to Mr. Erskine, Letter to Camille Jordan, etc., etc., with a life of Paine and a steel-plate portrait. 12mo. In paper covers, \$1; cloth, \$1.50.

Paine's Great Works (complete) in one volume. Cloth, \$3.00; leather, \$4.00; morocco, \$4.50.

Paine's Political Works, including Common Sense, The Crisis, and Rights of Man. Cloth, \$1.50.

The Age of Reason. An investigation of true and fabulous theology. Without a peer in the world. Paper, 25 cents, or 5 for \$1. Cloth, 50 cents.

The Age of Reason and An Examination of the Prophecies. Paper, 40 cents; Cloth, 75 cents.

Common Sense. Paine's first work. 15 cents.

The Crisis. Containing numbers from I. to XVI. inclusive. Paper, 40 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

The Rights of Man. For the oppressed of humanity. Paper, 40; cloth, 75 cents.

B. F. Underwood's Works.

Essays and Lectures. Embracing Influence of Christianity on Civilization; Christianity and Materialism; What Liberalism offers in Place of Christianity; Scientific Materialism; Woman; Spiritualism from a Materialistic Standpoint; Paine the Political and Religious Reformer; Materialism and Crime; Will the Coming Man Worship God? Crimes and Cruelties of Christianity; the Authority of the Bible: Freethought Judged by its Fruits; Our Ideas of God. 300 pp., paper, 60 cents; cloth, \$1.

Influence of Christianity upon Civilization. 25 cents.

Christianity and Materialism. 15 cents.

What Liberalism Offers in Place of Christianity. 10 cents.

Scientific Materialism: Its Meaning and Tendency. 10 cents.

Spiritualism from a Materialistic Standpoint. 10 cents.

Paine the Political and Religious Reformer. 10 cents.

Woman: Her Past and Present: Her Rights and Wrongs. 10 cents.

Materialism and Crime. 10 cents.

Will the Coming Man Worship God? 10 cents.

Crimes and Cruelties of Christianity. 10 cents.

Twelve Tracts. Scientific and Theological. 20 cents.

Burgess-Underwood Debate. A four day's debate between B. F. UNDERWOOD and PROF. O. A. BURGESS, President of the Northwestern Christian University, Indianapolis, Ind. Accurately reported. 188 pp. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 80 cents.

Underwood-Marples Debate. A four nights' debate between B. P. UNDERWOOD and REV. JOHN MARPLES. Fully reported. Paper, 35 cents; cloth, 60 cents.

Miscellaneous

Freethought Works Published by D. M. Bennett,

A Business Man's Social and Religious Views. Bold and trenchant blows againsts theology and inhumanity. \$1.

Advancement of Science. The Inaugural Address of Prof. JOHN TYNDALL delivered before the British Association for the Advancement of Science. With Portrait and Biographical sketch. Also containing opinions of Prof. H. HELMHOLTZ and articles of Prof. TYNDALL and Sir HENRY THOMPSON on prayer. Price, cloth, 50 cents. Inaugural Address alone in paper, 15 cents.

Alamontada the Galley-Slave. Translated from the German of Zschokke by IRA G. MOSHER, L.L.B. A deeply philosophical narrative, intensely interesting. Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

Amberley's Life of Jesus. His character and doctrins. From the Analysis of Religious Belief. By VISCOUNT AMBERLEY. Paper, 35 cents; cloth, 60 cents.

Beyond the Veil. Claimed to be dictated by the spirit of Paschal Beverly Randolph, aided by Emanuel Swedenborg, through the mediumship of Mrs. FRANCES H. MCDOUGALL and Mrs. LUNA HUTCHINSON, with a steel engraving of Randolph. \$1.50

Blakeman's 200 Poetical Riddles. 20 cents.

Career of Religious Ideas; Their Ultimate the Religion of Science, fey HUDSON TUTTLE. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Chronicles of Simon Christianus. His manifold and wonderful adventures in the Land of Cosmos. A new scripture (evidently inspired) discovered by I. N. FIDEL. From the English. Very rich. 25 cents.

Crimes of Preachers in the United States. By M. E. BILLINGS. Shows how thick and fast the godly have fallen from grace. Price, 25 cents.

Deity Analyzed and the Devil's Defense. In Six Lectures by Col. JOHN R. KELSO, A.M. These are among the ablest lectures ever delivered, and should be read by everybody. Price, \$1.50.

Ecce Diabolus; or, The Worship of Yahveh or Jehovah shown to be the Worship of the Devil, with observations on the horrible and cruel ordinance of Devil Worship, to wit, Bloody Sacrifices and Burnt Offerings. By the Very Rev. EVAN DAVIES (Myfyr Morganwg), D.D., L.L.D., Arch-Druid of Great Britain. Translated from the Welsh by MORION, B. C. Price, 25 cents.

Eight Scientific Tracts. 20 cents.

Gottlieb: His Life. A Romance of earth, heaven, and hell. Beautifully written, by S. P. PUTNAM. 25 cents.

Hereafter. A scientific, phenomenal, and biblical demonstration of a future life. By D. W. HULL. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Issues of the Age. Consequences involved in modern thought. A work showing much study and great familiarity with other writers and thinkers. By HENRY C. PEDDER Price \$1.

Jesus Christ. His life, miracles, deity, teachings, and imperfections. By W. S. BELL. 25 cents.

John's Way. A pleasing domestic Radical story. By MRS. E. D. SLENKER. 15 cents.

Last Will and Testament of Jean Meslier, a curate of a Roman church in France, containing the best of his writings. 25 cents.

Nathaniel Vaughan. A radical novel of marked ability. By FREDERIKA MACDONALD. 404 pages. Price reduced to \$1.25.

Nature's Revelations of Character; or Physiognomy Illustrated. The science of individual traits portrayed by the temperaments and features. Illustrated by 260 wood cuts. By JOSEPH SIMMS, M.D. 650 pages, 8vo. Cloth, \$3.00; leather, \$4.00; morocco, gilt edges, \$4.50.

New England and the People up There. A humorous Lecture. By GEORGE E. MACDONALD. 10 cents.

Outline of the French Revolution: Its Causes and Results. A clear and comprehensive portrayal of this interesting portion of human history. By W. S. BELL. 25 cents.

Outlines of Phrenology. By F. E. ASPINWALL, M.D. Most acceptable to Liberals of anything of the kind published. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Pocket Theology. By VOLTAIRE. Comprising terse, witty, and sarcastic definitions of the terms used in

theology. The only edition in English. 25 cents.

Proceedings and Adresses at the Watkins Convention. 400 pages of excellent Speeches and Essays. Price reduced to \$1.00.

Pyramid of Gizeh. The Relation of Ancient Egyptian Civilization to the Hebrew Narrative in Genesis and Exodus and the Relative Claims of Moses and the Pyramid to Inspiration Considered. By VAN BUREN DENSLOW, L.L.D. Price, 25 cents.

Religion Not History. An able examination of the Morals and Theology of the New Testament. By Prof. F. W. NEWMAN, of the London University. 25 cents.

Resurrection Of Jesus. Showing the contradictions and doubts in which the subject is involved. By W. S. BELL. Revised edition. 25 cents.

Revelations of Antichrist. An exhaustive work proving conclusively that no such person as Jesus Christ existed in the reign of Tiberius, but that a Jesus, the son of Mary, was stoned and hanged about a century before, and that his disciples, Simon Kepha, alias Peter, and the apostle Paul, both lived and died before the Christian era. 446 pages and full index. Price, \$2.00.

Sepher Toldoth Jeshu; or, the Book of the Generation of Jesus. First translation into English of a remarkable Hebrew document, giving the original from which the story of Jesus was made up. 20 cents.

Sixteen Saviors or None. By KERSEY GRAVES, author of the World's Sixteen Crucified Saviors; The Bibles of Bibles, and Biography of Satan. Paper, 75 cents; cloth, \$1.

Six Lectures on Astronomy. By Prof. R. A. PROCTOR. 20 cents.

Socialism: Reply to Prof. Roswell. Hitchcock. The Professor's sophistries fully exposed. Paper, 25 cents; cloth, 50 cen's.

Superstition; The Religion of Believe or be Damned, an Open Letter to the St. John's School Board. By M. BABCOCK. 25 cents.

The Adventures of Elder Triptolemus Tub. Containing startling and interesting disclosures about hell, its locality, magnitude, climate, employments, etc. By the Rev, GEO. ROGERS. 15 cents.

The Anonymous Hypothesis of Creation. A Brief Review of the so-called Mosaic Account. By JAMES J. FURNISS. Cloth, 50 cents.

The Besant-Hatchard Debate. A two-nights' Debate between MRS. ANNIE BESANT and Rev. A. HATCHARD on The Jesus of Nazareth a Historical Character, and The Influence of Christianity on the World. Held at the Hall of Science, London, December, 1880. 25 cents.

The Brain and the Bible. By EDGAR C. BEALL. With a Preface by ROBERT G. INGERSOLL, who says of it: "This book, written by a brave and honest man, is filled with bravo and honest thoughts. The arguments it presents cannot be answered by all the theologians in the world." Price reduced to \$1.00.

The Clergyman's Victims. A Radical story vividly portraying the wrongs committed by the professed men of God. By Mrs. J. E. BALL. 25 cents.

The Creed of Cristendom. Its foundation contrasted with its superstructure. By W. RATHBONE GREG. One of the clearest and ablest works ever written. Price \$1.50.

The Contrast: Evangelicalism and Spiritualism Compared. By MOSES HULL. Paper, 60 cents; cloth, \$1.

The Darwins. A domestic Radical story. By Mrs. ELMINA DRAKE SLENKER, author of John's Way, Studying the Bible, and numerous essays. 257 pp. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

The Essence of Religion. From the German of L. FEUERBACH. Author of the Essence of Christianity, etc. Price, in cloth, reduced to 50 cents.

The Ghost of St Johns. By M. BABCOCK. 25 cents.

The Godly Women of the Bible. A History of all the women who figure in the Bible. Sharp and telling in stylo. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

The Heathens of the Heath. A finely written Radical romance. By WM. MCDONNELL, author of Exeter Hall, Family Creeds, Day of Best, etc. 500 pages. Price reduced. Paper, 80 cents; cloth, \$1.25.

The Holy Bible Abridged. Containing the choice passages and lovely morceaus particularly pleasing to COMSTOCK. 169 pages. Paper, 30 cents; cloth, 50 cents.

The Jamieson-Ditzler Debate. A nine-days' debate on God, the Bible, Christianity, and Liberalism. Between Wm. F. JAMIESON and REV. JACOB DITZLER, D.D. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

The Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets. By S. Baring-Gould. \$1.50. The *Congregationalist*, in speaking of it, says: "There are few Bible readers who have not at some time wished for just such a volume. It is a thoroughly interesting book, and will be seized with avidity by all students of the Bible.

The Martyrdom of Man. Embracing the four divisions of War, Religion, Liberty, and Intellect. A work of rare merit, and written in superior style. By WINWOOD READE New edition. 544 pages. Price reduced from \$3 to \$1.75.

The New Dispensation; or, the Heavenly Kingdom. By D. W. HULL. 25 cents.

The Old Faith and the New. A confession. By David Friederich Strauss, Author of the "New Life of Jesus," etc. Authorized translation from the sixth German edition. By Mathilde Blind. Two volumes in one. The translation revised and partly rewritten, and preceded by an American version of the author's "Prefatory Postscript." Strauss is too well known by the readers of America to require a single word to be said in his praise. Price, \$1.50.

The Outcast. A deep, finely-written Radical story. From the London edition. By WINWOOD READE, author of Martyrdom of Man. 30 cents.

The Philosophy of Spiritualism, and the Philosophy and Treatment of Mediomania. By FREDERIC R. MARVIN, M. D. Cloth, 50 cents.

The Pro and Con of Supernatural Religion. Both sides fairly and ably presented. By E. E. GUILD, ex-Universalist clergyman. Paper, 30 cents; cloth, 50 cents.

The Question Settled. A careful comparison of Biblical modern Spiritualism. By MOSES HULL. Cloth, \$1.

The Radical Pulpit. Comprising discourses of advanced thought by O. B. FROTHINGHAM and FELIX ADLER, two of America's clearest thinkers. By O. B. FROTHINGHAM: The New Song of Christmas, The Departed Years, Life as a Test of Creed, Apocryphal Books of the New Testament, The Sectarian Spirit, The American Gentleman, The Language of the Old Testament, The Dogma of Hell, The Value of the Higher Sentiments, The American Lady, The Consolations of Rationalism. By FELIX ADLER: The Ethics of the Social Question, Emancipation. Lecture at the Second Anniversary of the Society for Ethical Culture, Our Leaders, Have We Still a Religion? Conscience. Price, in cloth, \$1.00

The Roaring Lion on the Track. By M. BABCOCK. 15 cents.

The Real Blasphemers. By Col JOHN R. KELSO, A.M. Price, 50 cents.

The Truth Seeker Collection of Forms, Hymns, and Recitations. Containing forms for organizing societies, marriage, funeral services, naming of infants, obituary notices, epitaphs, etc. Also 525 Liberal and Spiritualistic Hymns for public meetings, funerals, social gatherings, etc. To which are added beautiful Recitations for various public occasions. 550 pp. Cloth, 75 cents.?

Truth Seeker Tracts. Bound in volumes of 525 pages each—Vols. I., II., III., IV., and V. Each volume containing 525 pages—thirty tracts or more. A Library within themselves of most excellent Radical reading matter at a low price. Paper, 60 cents per volume; cloth, \$1.00. If the whole set are taken—paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents each.

The Truth Seeker in bound volumes. Vol I., 25 cents; volume II., 50cents; volumes III. and IV., \$2 each; volumes V., VI., VII., VIII., and IX., \$3 each. The whole set by express for \$15.00.

Voltaire in Exile. Translated from the French of M. GASTINEAU by his son EDMOND GASTINEAU. Being Memoirs of the life of the great writer never before published. Paper, 75 cents. Cloth, \$1.

Why Don't God Kill the Devil? A Series of Essays dedicated to the St. Johns School Board. By M. BABCOCK. 25 cents.

Which: Spiritualism or Christianity? A discussion between MOSES HULL and REV. W. F. PARKER. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

The Holy Cross Series.—Antipapal.

Auricular Confession, and Nunneries. By Wm. HOGAN. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Maria Monk: the Mysteries of a Convent; or, Monks and their Maidens. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Priestly Celibacy Exposed. A full disclosure of foul priestly practices. 15 cents.

Sister Lucy and her Awful Disclosures. 10 cents.

The Mother of Harlots; or, Popery Dissected. Paper, 5 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

The Popes and their Doings; or, an Account of the Vicars of Christ and the Vicegerents of God. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

The Priest in Absolution. An abstract and criticism of the large work by that name. Price 25 cents.

Truth Seeker Tracts.

Discount on one dollar's worth 10 per cent off; on two dollars' worth, 20 off; on five dollars' worth, 40 off; on ten dollars' worth, 50 off.' This rate of discount is given on the foregoing tracts only,

Iron-Clad and Manna Series.

Dictionaries.

Webster's Unabridged Dictionary. 118,000 words, 3,000 engravings; four pages Colored Plates; a Supplement of over 4,600 New Words and Meanings, including such as have come into use during the past fifteen years, many of which have never before been placed in any English Dictionary; also added, a New Biographical Dictionary of over 9,700 names of noted persons, ancient and modern, including many now living—giving Name, Pronunciation, Nationality, Profession, and date of each. By express. Sheep, marble edges, plain or stamped sides, \$10; (publishers' price, \$12). Cloth, and in 3 volumes, same price. Half Turkey or Russia, extra marble edges, \$11.50. Full Russia, marble edges, \$14. Full Russia, vermilion edges, \$14.50. Turkey morocco, vermilion edges, \$14.50. Turkey, morocco gilt edges, \$18.00

American Standard Dictionary. Besides containing all needed words in the English language, with their correct definitions, this work embraces facts in Chronology, Law, Population, Scripture, Mythology, etc. 717 pp. Illustrated. Cloth, \$1.20; leather, \$2.00.

Useful Dictionary of the English Language. Compiled by AUSTIN NUTTALL, LL. D. 900 pp. Cloth, \$1.10; half morocco, \$1.40.

Comprehensive Lexicon of the English Language. 50,000 words. Illustrated. Price, 60 cents.

Webster's Pocket Dictionary. 40,000 words. Illustrated. Price, 20 cents.

Diamond Pronouncing Dictionary. 700 pp. Price, 35 cents.

Webster's Dictionary. 50,000 words. Price, 30 cents.

American Popular Dictionary. Price, 60 cents.

Ingersoll's Works.

[Sold Wholesale and Retail at THE TRUTH SEEKER Office.]

The Gods. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, \$1.25. In five lectures, comprising, "The Gods," "Humboldt," "Thomas Paine," "Individuality," and "Heretics and Heresies."

The Ghosts. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, \$1.25. Including, "Liberty for Man, Woman, and Child;" "The Declaration of Independence," "About Farming in Illinois;" "The Grant Banquet," "The Rev. Alexander Clarke," "The Past Rises before Me Like a Dream," and "A Tribute to Ebon C. Ingersoll."

Some Mistakes of Moses. Its chapters are: Some Mistakes of Moses, Free Schools, The Politicians, Man and Woman, The Pentateuch, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, He Made the Stars Also, Friday, Saturday, Let us Make Man, Sunday, The Necessity for a Good Memory, The Garden, The Fall, Dampness, Bacchus and Babel, Faith in Filth, The Hebrews, The Plagues, The Flight, Confess and Avoid, Inspired Slavery, Inspired Marriage, Inspired War, Inspired Religious Liberty, Conclusion. Paper, 50 cent; cloth, \$1.25.

The Christian Religion. By R. G. Ingersoll, Judge Jeremiah S. Black, and Prof. George P. Fisher. This is a series of articles which appeared in the *North American Review*, and excited great interest from the high position of the authors. Judge Black refused to answer Mr. Ingersoll's second paper and the services of Mr. Fisher were obtained. Paper, 50 cents.

Interviews on Talmage. Being Six Interviews with the Famous Orator on Six Sermons by the Rev. T. DEWITT TALMAGE, of Brooklyn, to which is added "A Talmagian Catechism." Stenographically reported by I. NEWTON BAKER. Printed in bold, clear type, on heavy, tinted paper, and handsomely bound in muslin, with heavy boards, beveled edges, gilt top. Octavo. 443 pages, \$2.00. Paper, \$1.00; plain cloth, \$1.25.

What Must We Do to be Saved? In this pamphlet Mr. Ingersoll analyzes the so-called gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and devotes a chapter each to the Catholics, the Episcopalians, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Evangelical Alliance, and answers the question of the Christians as to what he proposes instead of Christianity, the religion of sword and flame. Paper, 25 cents.

Works by Prof. William Denton.

Be Thyself. Price, 10 cents.

Christianity no Finality; or, Spiritualism Superior to Christianity. Price, 10 cents.

Common Sense Thoughts on the Bible. Price, 10 cts.

Garrison in Heaven. A Dream. Price, 10 cents.

Geology: The Past and Future of our Planet. Price, \$1.50.

Is Spiritualism True? Price, 10 cents.
 Man's True Savior. Price, 10 cents.
 Orthodoxy False, since Spiritualism is True. Price, 10 cents.
 Radical Discourses on Religious Subjects. Price, \$1.25.
 Radical Rhymes. Price, \$1.25.
 Sermon from Shakspeare's Text. Price, 10 cents.
 Soul of Things; or, Psychometric Researches and Discoveries. In three volumes. Price; \$1.50 per volume.
 The Deluge in the Light of Modern Science. Price, 10 cents.
 The God Proposed for Our National Constitution. Price, 10 cents.
 The Irreconcilable Records; or, Genesis and Geology. Cloth, 40 cents; paper, 25 cents.
 The Pocasset Tragedy. Price, 10 cents.
 What is Right? Price, 10 cents.
 What Was He; or, Jesus in the Light of the Nineteenth Century. Price, cloth, \$1.25; paper, \$1.
 Who are Christians? Price, 10 cents.
 Who Killed Mary Stannard? Price, 10 cents.

Apostolical Succession,

A Sermon by the Rev. James Buller,

Preached in the Wesleyan Church,

Mannrs Street, Wellington,

On Sunday Evening,

APRIL 17TH, 1859.

Published by Request.

Printed at the "Advertiser" Office, Willis-Street; And Published by Charles Bull, Lambton Quay.

Price Sixpence,

Advertisement.

THE following Sermon owes its origin to a discourse which was delivered by the Right Rev. Dr. SELWYN, (Bishop of New Zealand), in St. Peter's Church, on the afternoon of the first Sabbath of this Month. It was on the occasion of the Consecration of the Venerable Archdeacon Williams to the Episcopal Office for the new diocese of Waiapu. The Bishop's Sermon was based upon 2 *Tim.* ii., 1, 2. With the exception of a few pertinent observations on the "Grace that is in Christ Jesus," as the only efficient cause of Ministerial success, and some appropriate remarks which, towards the close, were addressed to the excellent man and highly honored Missionary who was about to be consecrated, the address was an energetic enunciation of the doctrine of "Apostolical Succession." The writer entertains a very high respect for his Lordship's person and office: admits his varied talents, and admires his devoted, self-denying zeal; therefore, with the more regret, he listened to the utterance of views which are as unsound when tried by Scripture, as they are unsupported by historic testimony, and monstrous in their logical consequences: sentiments which are opposed to the spiritual nature of Christianity, fatal to the mutual co-operation of the various sections of the Protestant Church, and favourable only to the pretensions of the Romish Hierarchy.

J. B.

Wellington,

April 19th, 1859

Sermon.

1 THESSALONIANS, V. 21.

"Prove all tilings: hold fast that which is good."

CREDULITY and instability are practical errors nearly allied to each other. We are Warned against them in God's Word:—"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God"—1 *John* iv. 1. "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine"—*Ephesians*, iv. 14. My text is to the same purpose. "Prove all things." Take nothing upon trust. Bring everything to the test of proof. By what standard? By the Word of God—"the law and the testimony." This is

our authoritative rule—"The commandments of men" must be submitted to its judgment, lest they "make the Word of God of none effect." However eloquent, learned, or pious the preacher—were he St. Paul himself—the hearer is not relieved from the duty of "searching the Scriptures, to see whether those things are so," after the example of the right-minded Bereans, who thus, *on conviction*, "received the word with all readiness of mind." This personal examination is required, "that your faith may not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." In this alone can we find a resting place for our belief—can we be "steadfast in the faith," and he not "moved away from the hope of the Gospel." On matters of doctrine and discipline, the Christian world is greatly divided, and no man can be "grounded and settled" in his principles until he has compared them with the word of truth. The system of Popery, by denying the right of private judgment, cuts the knot at one stroke. But we, my brethren, profess a more manly, as well as a purer, faith which teaches "every man to be fully persuaded in his own mind." There are questions of belief and practice, on which Christians will continue to differ, and may "agree to differ." Each will have his conscientious views, and respect those of the other, while both unite in saying, "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." The pious Calvinist and evangelical Arminian—differing widely as they do in their speculations on abstract theological science—meet as brethren on the common ground of "Justification by faith," and its correlative doctrines. The Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, and the Congregationalist, may each bring forth his "strong reasons" for that form of Church polity which he has chosen, while neither may claim for his opinion the right of Divine authority. Each may be justified in his preference, while he gives to the other "the right hand of fellowship." But this ceases to be the case when pretensions are assumed by one, which necessarily condemn the rest. Such, I submit, is the dogma of "Apostolical Succession." This figment is maintained by some eminent Episcopalian divines. We respect their virtues, their talents, and their position; but we cannot accept their *assertion* in the place of *proof*. Divines equally numerous, and equally gifted, appear on the other side. But we ask not, "what do men say?" Our question is, "What saith the Scripture?" If the "Apostolical Succession" scheme be found in the Word of God, we must accept it with all its consequences. Does it rest on a divine origin? than, however repugnant to our feelings, we must believe that the most vicious Pope is as much a channel of divine grace as the most holy Prelate; that an imbecile, if episcopally ordained, is as true a minister as the Apostle Paul; that a libertine, if in canonicals, is a legate from the skies, while such men as Hall and Chalmers, as Binney and Angell James, as Watson and Bunting, are but unauthorized pretenders to the service of the sanctuary; that God has bound himself to the narrow limits of man's judgment, and by the caprice of human passion, in the communication of His grace; and that all ministers and churches without the pale of Episcopal regularity, including more than one-half of the Christian population of England, nearly the whole of Scotland, the Continental and other churches, are excluded from the promise of Christ's presence. Nay, more: admit the principle of Apostolical Succession, and if the chain be traced at all, it must be through the moral filth of the Church of Rome, the polluted sewer of the Poppedom! While episcopal divines are unchurching others, as able, as holy, and as useful as themselves, Popish priests are unchurching them, and by a logical deduction from the principle of the succession are declaring that "there is no salvation out of their Church." In a word, brethren, the doctrine of *Apostolical Succession* is the foundation, or principle, on which the whole fabric of the Papal system rests. And I confess before you to-night, that if, on examination, I found this doctrine in the Bible, I should feel it my duty to seek admission into that communion. You are aware that many, misled by this belief, have done so. One candidate (at least) for the Episcopalian ministry in New Zealand, to my personal knowledge, has become a Roman Catholic priest;

—The Rev. Mr. Dale, who was formerly a student in St. John's College, near Auckland. and I think, on the Apostolical Succession principle, he was consistent. With consequences so momentous, we cannot regard this question as a minor or unimportant thing—it affects the very substance of Christianity. If it be true, we are to "hold fast that which is good," but we will first "prove" it. Clear, unquestionable proof must be produced in support of a claim of such magnitude. It shall be "weighed in the balances" of God's Word, and if "found wanting," its falsehood should be exposed. Is it a mere assumption of priestly arrogance, a monstrous error, subverting the doctrine of Christ? Then the spell should be broken, and men should "walk in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free." To this enquiry I now address myself, and bespeak your candid and patient attention. My appeal is to the Word of God. If the claims of high churchism could be supported by tradition, that would be insufficient, unless authorized by Holy Scripture. I shall take no advantage of mere phraseology. Strictly speaking, *Apostolical Succession* cannot be. The Apostles were an extraordinary and temporary order; *as such*, they had, and could have, no successors; for it was an essential qualification that they had seen the Lord, and were "witnesses" of His resurrection. Thus St. Paul asserts his claim, "Am I not an apostle? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" The word "apostle" signifies a messenger. In a lower sense, all ministers are apostles, for "they are the messengers of the Churches, and the glory of Christ." But in its limited and special sense, none are apostles but those extraordinary men whom our Lord personally sent forth to evangelize the world. Nor is this at all supposed in the pretended succession. It is therein maintained that an

unbroken line of *Bishops* represents the perpetuity of the Christian ministry; that Bishops are a distinct and superior order, originating with the Apostles; and that the only valid ministry is that which is derived from the Episcopal order, so constituted and perpetuated. Our enquiry then relates to three subjects, as comprehended in the doctrine now brought under our consideration. These are, the *succession*, the *episcopate*, and the *ministry*.

I. *The Succession*.—That from the days of the Apostles there has been a succession of "*faithful men able to teach*," is a point in which we are agreed. The question is not as to the *fact* of a succession, but to the *mode* of it. High Churchmen tell us that the succession runs only through their own order—an order traced in an uninterrupted line, by ordination in a certain form, from the Apostolic age. If their doctrine be right, it is a grave doubt whether there be a true ministry at all. That any can substantiate his claim on such a ground, is most questionable. Did time allow, I might produce a long list of quotations from learned Episcopal divines, to the effect that such a succession cannot possibly be proved.

—See Appendix.

The claim, indeed, amounts to nothing more than "great swelling words of vanity." Dr. Whateley, the very learned Archbishop of Dublin, in his "*Kingdom of Christ*," says:—

"There is not a minister in all Christendom, who is able to trace up, with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual degree. Even in the memory of persons living, there existed a Bishop, concerning whom there was so much mystery and uncertainty prevailing as to when, where, and by whom he had been ordained, that doubts existed in the minds of many persons whether he had ever been ordained at all."

The Episcopal Church of England must fail to make good its Apostolical descent, *even through the Church of Rome*, for Archbishop Usher says that:—

"The Scots that professed no subjection to the Church of Rome, were they that sent preachers for the conversion of the Counties (of England), and ordained Bishops to govern them."

History informs us that in the seventh century, Aidan was selected by the Presbytery of Iona, and appointed to be Bishop in England; and the same Presbytery of Iona consecrated Colman to the Archbishopric of York. With such facts, any attempt to make good the succession, which is pretended, must be fatal. But, could it be done it would not prove the *early* origin of modern Prelacy; Bishops of the first and second centuries were not the Bishops of the present day, for all ecclesiastical history proves that the primitive Bishops were in charge of *single* churches, and not of an extensive modern diocese; as, for instance, the "*angels*" of the seven churches of Asia, admitting the word "*angel*" to signify Bishop. And could even this be done—could it be shewn that the Episcopal line is unbroken from the beginning, that a Bishop of the present day is an exact type of the Bishops of the first ages, we should still demand proof for the assumption that God had confined the gift of ministerial grace to that succession. The question would still be open—"What saith the Scripture?"

"How readest thou?" In the Antedeluvian world there was a "Preacher of righteousness" in the person of Noah and before him, "Enoch also the seventh from Adam prophesied." Probably there were others, but the Bible is silent on any distinct, or special order of ministers during that age. Unto the days of Moses the same state of things continued. Under the Levitical economy, the Aaronic Priesthood was appointed by God as a standing type of the Priesthood of Christ, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews. Here was a personal succession, by divine order, in a given family. But this succession was not without interruption, for in later days, the Roman Procurators appointed whom they would to the office of the High Priest. Yet the Church was not extinct; it did not therefore depend for its existence upon any special order of men. Between the Levitical Priesthood and the Christian Ministry there is doubtless some analogy, but not a precise parallel. That Priesthood terminated in Christ, who is "a Priest for ever." All Christians are alike Priests, and that only in a metaphorical sense, "offering spiritual sacrifices." The Jewish Synagogue, and not the Temple, afforded the model for the Christian Church. If in order to the perpetuity of the Ministry, Christ had provided by a direct succession in the way of ceremonial appointment, as under the Mosaic dispensation by natural descent, he would no doubt be as explicit. But where is there one reference to this mark of his Church? We read much about the future condition of the Church, and the qualifications of the Ministry, but not one word about their ecclesiastical succession—unless it be where Paul says to Bishop Timothy, as the successionists call him—"Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than Godly edifying," and to Titus Bishop of Crete, as some style him—"Avoid foolish questions and genealogies." On the principle of the Succession, we should rather suppose Paul to be giving directions for especial care in the transmission of their register, that no mistake might possibly occur on the subject of ministerial validity. But we "search the Scripture" in vain for any direction of this kind. Incidentally, it is true, we do find something of the spirit, if not the doctrine, of our high churchmen. I refer you to Luke IX., 49, 50. Even the catholic and loving disciple John seems to have been once tainted with this moral virus, for he said "Master we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbid him, because he followeth not us." Here surely was an opportunity for laying down the principle on which His Church was to be constructed. What saith the Master? Hear Him! "Forbid him not, for he that is not against us is for us." The Apostle Paul had some experience too of the spirit and

tendency of what is called High Churchism in the persons of certain Jewish teachers. Paul was irregularly called into the Apostolic office, He was not of the college of the Twelve, nor did he receive any commission from man. He was one "born out of due time." No human agent came between Christ and himself in his official appointment. To say that Paul was consecrated a Bishop by Ananias, "a certain disciple at Damascus," is to say that any pious layman in this congregation, might consecrate a Bishop of the Anglican Church. The laying on of the hands of Ananias was that he "might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost." If this was consecrating a Bishop, then a multitude of Bishops were consecrated in Samaria, when Peter and John "laid their hands upon them, (the disciples) and they received the Holy Ghost," Acts VIII., 17. That Paul was thus consecrated to his office, is a discovery of the present day. It is plain that his opposers recognised no such appointment, On the ground of his exceptional position, they impugned his right to the Apostolic dignity. How did he defend his claim? Not by any reference to his ecclesiastical commission, but by an appeal to those who were his "work in the Lord," saying—"if I be not an Apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you; for the seal of mine Apostleship are ye in the Lord."

To shew the fulfilment of prophecy it was necessary to prove that Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary, was of "the house and lineage of David." Therefore registers were carefully prepared, from which genealogies are supplied, that place his human pedigree beyond a question. According to the succession scheme, it is just as necessary that every Minister should produce proof as unquestionable of his ecclesiastical descent. In what archives is it to be found? It is easy to jump from "the seven Anglican Bishops of the Saxon Heptarchy to the five Bishops in New Zealand." But where is the connecting line? The principle of genealogy under the Old Testament is clear—but none is laid down in the New: such "letters of commendation" are not needed by the true Ministers of Christ. Of the twelve whom our Lord chose "Judas by transgression fell" and if Judas, a divinely appointed Apostle, could fall: if an apostolic Church could fall, so that God would spue Laodicea "out of his mouth:" where is the security that any Church, the' proving its descent even from the apostles, might not also "depart from the faith," be deserted by Christ, and have "Ichabod" written on its gate "the glory is departed?" Matthias, instead of Judas, was numbered with the eleven Apostles. Paul was evidently the thirteenth. We have seen how his ministerial validity was called in question by the prototypes of our Successionists, but not so by the Apostles themselves. They laid no stress upon the form, provided they had the substance; for St. Paul himself says, "When James, and Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, *perceived the grace that was in me*, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship." *Galatians*, xi. 9.

—The only consecration of Barnabas of which we read, was by the laying on of the hands of "certain prophets and teachers."—Acts, xiii. 3.

The awful fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram has been often held up as an example to what are called unauthorized teachers. By such, however, it is strangely forgotten that Korah, at least, as a Levite, was *not* an unauthorised man. His guilt consisted in an unauthorised act. If any practical lesson is to be learned from his punishment, it is plainly against the Apostolical Succession doctrine. It is not a departure from external regularity, but the violation of moral obligation, that is offensive to God. So Nadah and Abihu, sons of Aaron, perished, not for aiming at the priesthood—they were so by Divine appointment—but for offering "strange fire before the Lord." This it is that offends God. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine (that is of Christ, verse 9), receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." 2 *John*, 10. "As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." *Galutians*, i. 9.

II. *The Episcopate*.—Names have sometimes a magical effect upon the minds of men. Analyze their meaning, and the spell is dissolved. There is a tendency, in the human mind, to repose on the outward and visible, to "walk by sight." This tendency manifests itself in the ideal importanoe attached to the name of Bishop. It may perhaps be startling to some to be told that the word Bishop differs not from that of Presbyter—that both are significant of *one and the same order*. This is fatal to Apostolical Succession, and therefore it is alleged that the Bishop belongs to a distinct and higher order than the Presbytery. Bishop is an old Saxon word, and is derived from the Greek EPISKOPOS, which is compounded of two words, signifying *over*, and to *look*, or *inspect*. The literal rendering of *Episcopus*, or Bishop, is given in Acts, xx. 28, *overseers*. This is the simple meaning of the term, a superintendent, an overlooker. In the ancient Greek version of the Old Testament, called the Septuagint, the same word is employed. In 2 *Kings*, xi. 18, "And the priest appointed officers (*bishops*) over the house of the Lord." In *Psalms* cix., 8, the word occurs again. "Let his office (*or bishopric*) another take;" a passage applied in the New Testament to Judas. We have the same word in *Isaiah*, lx. 17. "I will make thine officers (*bishops*) peace, and thine exactors righteousness." In the New Testament the word is used as descriptive of the *office* of the Christian minister, and *Presbyter*, or elder, as expressive of its dignity. The two words are used interchangeably.

The noun *Episcopus* occurs five times in the New Testament, and a brief examination of each passage will clearly shew that it is the same in meaning as the word *Presbuteros*, or Presbyter. We first find it in Acts, xx.,

28 where St. Paul, in delivering a valedictory address to the elders, or Presbyters, of the Church of Ephesus, says "take heed therefore unto yourselves, and all the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, or *Bishops*." Here the Apostle declares Presbyters to be Bishops, and that the charge of a Bishop is the *flock* and not the *Clergy*. In *Phillipians* I, 1 Paul sends his salutations to the "Bishops and Deacons," Deacons are allowed, on all hands, to be an inferior order of the Ministry, but Bishops only are mentioned as distinct from Deacons in this Epistle. Consequently if Bishops and Presbyters were distinct orders, here is a flourishing Church with no Presbyters and therefore, needing no Bishops whose office, according to the modern idea, is to superintend the Presbytery; whereas there was none but the people here for them to oversee. Dr. Whitby says that "the Greek and Latin fathers do with *one consent* declare that the Apostle here calls their *Presbyters* their *Bishops*." The next passage is 1 *Timothy* iii., 1—5. "If any man desire the office of a Bishop, &c.,"—he speaks of only two orders. There is not a word about Presbyters as differing from Bishops. But the latter are here represented as filling the office of the former—a Bishop is said to take care of the Church of God—that is, the flock, and *not of the Ministers*. This is equally plain from *Titus* 1, 5. 9, wherein Titus is appointed to ordain elders or *Presbyters* in every City. He proceeds to lay down their qualifications; and in doing this he says, "a *Bishop* must be blameless &c." How unmeaning is the language of this Apostle if Presbyters and Bishops are not the same? The last place in which we find the word is in *I Peter* 11, 25. "For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls," Here the term is applied to our adorable Redeemer, but evidently not as the Bishop of his ministers but over the souls of the people—Bishop of *your souls*." This clearly proves that in the New Testament the title is not given to designate an office *principally distinguished*, in its superiority, by its *oversight* over other Pastors, but to imply *oversight over the flock*. The same is evident from the two first verses of the fifth chapter. "The elders, or *Presbyters*, which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, or *Presbyter*, feed the flock of God which is among you taking the *oversight* thereof," which latter word is equivalent to, *taking the Bishoprick thereof*. From these passages it is manifest that Bishops and Presbyters implied the *same office*, possessed the *same power and authority*, required the *same qualifications* and received the *same ordination*. If this be not enough to prove their identity, it does at least prove that Bishops were not *superior* to Presbyters. But could as much be urged for the divine right, or the superiority, of Bishops, as for the *apparent* superiority of Presbyters over Bishops, the apostolicals would feel invulnerable: For, 1. The Apostles call *themselves* Presbyters, but *never* Bishops. 2. Presbyters are mentioned as united with the Apostles in the *Council* at Jerusalem, but no express mention is made of Bishops. See *Acts*, xv 2, 4, 6, 22, 23, And to the Presbyters were the collections for the poor at Jerusalem sent without reference to Bishops. *Acts*, xi., 30. 3. *Presbyters* are the *only* ministers expressly mentioned as having the oversight and government of the churches planted by Paul and Barnabas. "And when they had ordained them elders (*Presbyters*) in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." *Acts*, xiv. 23. And Presbyters *only* are *expressly* said to ordain, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," 1 *Tim.* iv. 14. In another place the Apostle says to Timothy, "Stir up the gift that is in thee, by the putting on of my hands." It is well known that the Apostles laid their hands on disciples apart from any ordination to the ministry. But in the former passage, the reference is clearly to Timothy's ministerial capacity. Bishop Taylor, a strenuous advocate for the divine right of modern Episcopacy, is greatly puzzled by this obstinate passage, and after some very tortuous attempts at explanation, is compelled to admit that here, "by the *Presbytery*, St. Paul meant *Bishops*." Timothy and Titus are called Bishops only in the inscriptions to St. Paul's letters, *which inscriptions are of no authority*, and they are required to *ordain elders or Presbyters*, but are not directed to *consecrate Bishops*. The ancient Syriac version of the New Testament, which translation was made in the second century of the Christian era, employs Presbyter and Bishop as convertible terms. From all this, it is conclusive that they constitute but one, and not two, orders; or if there be superiority at all, it is in favor of the term Presbyter. They only are said to *ordain*, and consequently *Presbyterian* ordination is, *at least*, as scriptural as Episcopalian.

It does not, however, follow from this, that Episcopacy is anti-scriptural. As an ecclesiastical arrangement, it is not only lawful, but may be the best form of Church government. No *system* of Ecclesiastical polity is enjoined in the New Testament. A few principles only are laid down, but "Apostolical Succession" is not one of them. These principles provide a foundation. (See *Ephesians*. II. 20.) The form of the superstructure is left much to circumstances, and Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism, may each claim for itself scriptural authority and sanction. A modified Episcopacy seems to me the best adapted of any system of polity for the government of the Church. The Methodist Church has it in reality, though not in name; while the extensive Churches in the United States, which have been the fruits of the Wesleyan ministry, are called the *Methodist Episcopal Church*. It is very certain that the Episcopal form took its rise very early in the Christian era, and has therefore the sanction of high antiquity. As in the question of the Succession, our objection is not to the *fact* but to the *mode*; so in that of the Episcopate, it is not to the *principle* but to the *Divine origin*, that we enter our protest. Every Christian minister is a Scriptural Bishop, but there are those, and expediency will

require them, who by way of distinction and eminence, may be called Bishops—not by a difference of *order*, but of *degree* only:—"Primi inter pares," *first among equals*. Modern Bishops, "that rule well," may "be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who *labor* in the word and doctrine." We will respect their office, imitate their zeal, and rejoice in their success; but we will not admit that, by virtue of an ecclesiastical talisman, they possess the key of David—"that openeth, and no man shutteth; that shutteth, and no man openeth" the door into

III. *The Christian Ministry*.—That the office of the Ministry in the Christian Church is instituted by the authority of Christ: that it requires peculiar gifts and graces to its efficient exercise; and that Christ has promised to perpetuate it and bless it with His presence; are points on which there is little difference of opinion. It is on the *order* of ministerial authority that the controversy rests:

1. We are told by the secessionists that Christ has authorized none but those who are *ordained by Bishops in a direct line*. The Bible tells us that it is the prerogative of the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers into his harvest. As He asked not the concurrence of the Jewish Hierarchy when He chose plain fishermen and tax-gatherers, and "counted them worthy, putting them into the ministry," so still He "will send by whom He will send." He is not dependent on Universities or other seats of learning. He is not limited by Episcopacy or any other rule or system. Though every human system failed, His ordinance would stand for "he is able out of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," and will not fail in the order of his Providence, and by the power of his grace, to bring forth faithful men to "preach the Word," although he may take them from the plough, or from the Custom-house, from the fishing-boat or from the sheep-fold, from the sons of the prophets, or from the feet of Gamaliel. He sees those who are his "chosen vessels," fit instruments for the Ministry of his word and ordinances. True ministers are His gifts and His servants. Money cannot buy them, learning cannot produce them, the whole Episcopate cannot make one. He and He alone can qualify men for the office and work of the Ministry, and cause them "to triumph, making manifest the savour of his knowledge, by them, in every place."

2. The Successionists say that ministerial grace flows *only in the channel of Episcopal ordination*. The Bible represents this grace as the anointing of the Holy Ghost, who is the direct gift of God proceeding from the Father and the Son. Ministerial grace consists "according to the Scriptures" not in any outward designation, but in personal conversion, soundness of doctrine, and ability to teach. God sends no man to preach without these qualifications, whoever else may give him authority to do so. Who would suppose a lawyer competent to conduct a case, or a doctor to treat a patient, merely because he had been ceremoniously designated, without regard to personal acquisitions? Even so, men must first be reconciled to God before they can receive "the ministry of reconciliation;" time would fail to name the many passages of the New Testament which declare that "the doctrine which is according to godliness" is the only subject for a faithful ministry; and ability to "preach the Gospel" must be derived, not from the imposition of hands, but from "the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven." To whomsoever God imparts these graces, He may by His providence place before them "a great door and effectual" in the successful ministry of His word. Spiritual gifts are not the donation of any man, or of any set of men. They are from above, "now there are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit. But all these worketh that one and self-same Spirit, dividing to every one severally *as he will*" 1 Cor., xii., 4, 11.

3. It is contended by the advocates of Apostolical Succession, that Christ has promised to be present *only with those who are in the alleged line—that without Episcopal ordination, no ministry, nor ordinance, nor sacrament, has the promise of Christ to the end of the world*. But the Saviour assures us that "Wherever two or three are gathered together in His name, there is He." And facts declare that He is with His servants, and ever has been with them, whether Episcopally ordained or not. If conversion be the work of Christ, then it follows that He is with them who have not received their ordination from a Bishop's hands, for He has made them instrumental in the conversion of multitudes. In the Nonconformist Churches of England, in the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, in the Continental Protestant Churches, in North America, and the British Colonies, and in the wide field of Missionary labour, multitudes are "manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God."—2 Cor. iii. 3. "Whenever a true revival of vital Godliness has taken place, it has usually been done, Not by the pretended *Succession Bishops*, but generally *in spite of them*." The spirit of the true Minister is not to exalt his order, but to magnify his office by an effective discharge of it, giving himself wholly unto it. It is time for me to close. I must leave it to the province of your enlightened judgments to pronounce whether the "Apostolical Succession" doctrine be that of Holy Scripture. I conclude by an appropriate question from a living author:—

"Men might be appointed to the sacred office by mere human authority, without having been the subjects of sanctifying grace and divine vocation, and might go to their place in the church, and like the pillars in some ancient and ruined temple, support for awhile the outward and heavy pile; but within is desolation and the moaning of the midnight wind. The Holy Spirit is the glory of the latter house. Nothing can be more unworthy in itself, or more dishonorable to the Holy Ghost, than that theory which would limit ministerial authority to a

certain line of men exclusively who can trace back, it is asserted, their regular succession from the Apostles of our Lord. Who ever has shown that there has been such an unbroken lineage as that which is so much vaunted, especially when contending Pontiffs have at the same time been disputing each other's claim, and raising around them a storm of spiritual thunder? And if it were so, if there were such a chain, does divine influence and unction, imparting authority, confine itself to follow a succession which has so many dismal links? Man may indeed so far avail himself of his knowledge as to direct the stream of electric fire, and provide the path in which it shall run; but he cannot so control the illimitable Spirit, nor has the Spirit himself laid down any prescribed track in which he will move. No: 'the wind bloweth where it listeth,' and vain is the attempt to bind it in fetters: in passing over this desert world, it may move in a gentle breeze, or forceful gusts in a certain path, or by a universal gale; but it accomplishes the purpose of redeeming mercy, and breathes life and health through every sweep. Under its influence many shall arise from spiritual death, as in the vision of the Prophet, and shall fill the assemblies of the Church, and the ranks of the ministry; and the Holy Ghost shall be the universal authority, because he is when fully obeyed, the universal order, light and life. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.'—2 Cor. iii. 17."

Appendix.

A List of Authorities, being Divines of the Episcopal Church of England, whose writings can be quoted in direct opposition to the theory of the "Apostolical Succession."

Archbishops:

- Cranmer,
- Whitgift,
- Whateley.

Bishops:

- Hooper,
- Bale,
- Jewell,
- Alley,
- Cooper,
- Abbott,
- Pilkington,
- Bridges,
- Morton,
- Babington,
- Bilson,
- White,
- Burnet,
- Stillingfleet.

Archdeacons:

- Philpot,
- Mason.

Dean

- Nowell,
- Sutcliffe,
- Field,
- Sherlock.

Doctors:

- Becon,
- Barnes,

- Fulke,
- Lancelot Ridley,
- Whitaker,
- Favour,
- Willet,
- Reynolds,
- Powell,
- Perkins,
- James,
- Thorp,
- Clagett.

Reverends:

- John Bradford
- John Lambert,
- William Tyndale,
- William Chillingworth,
- &c., &c.

The Bible in Schools. Being. Reasons Stated for the Reintroduction of the Bible into the School of the Colony. BY THE REVEREND A. BLAKE, M. A.

Price Sixpence.

Printed at the Office of "the Ashburton Mail," Burnett St. 1886.

Tinwald, Canterbury,

October, 4, 1886.

In compliance with the of friend, who desired to have the accompanying arguments in favor of of Bible Reading in school available in a more complete and permanent form, this pamphlet has been prepared It is now sent forth as a humble contribution to the literature of this important subject, and I am sure that, were the convictions of the friends of Bible Reading in School in this Colony better known and their efforts more concentrated, it would tend to a speedy and satiafactory settlement of the question. I shall be glad to receive additional information.

A. B.

Contents.

The Bible in Schools

In an editorial notice of a pamphle under the above title recently published at this office for the Rev A [unclear: Blake, M. A.] Tinwald, the *New Zealand Christian Record* says:—"Mr Blake presents in clear, concise, and com rehensive form the strong reasons which exist, for the re-introduction of Bible reading in on cubic schools He supports his position by testimonies drawn from the most varied authorities which should Carry weight with every one who will look at the question in an impartial spirit. The consensus of the feelings and and opinions of Christian countries regarding the necessity of acquainting the rising veneration with the Bible during their school education, and as an integra part of it, is shown in the fact that in all of them, with the exception of Victoria Queensland, South Australia and Zealand, such instruction is provided for in the public schools. The information presetted on this and similar points in of special interest to all who desire to see the present agitation brought to a successful issue. . . . Meantime under the lawful shade of our secular system, a similar result is shown in New Zealand to that which Bishop Moorhouse lately announced in London regarding

the Victorian educational system. 'Under it' he said, 'children grew up in the most profound and deplorable Ignorance of the Bible,' We heartily commend Mr Blake's pamphlet to our readers. They will find, condensed in brief compass, much information on the whole subject, which deserves greater attention than it has of late received."

Bible Reading in Schools.

Articles Contributed to "the Ashburton Guardian," from August 14 to 27, 1886.

When this subject came before the Upper House some time ago an article appeared in your columns which was unfavorable to the adoption of the measure. No more has been heard of the matter and yet we know a large proportion of the parents are favorable to Bible reading in schools. That the matter should yet be let alone is not surprising. It is not pleasant amid the bustle of life to agitate a question on which friends disagree. Others are disposed to let matters alone for the sake of peace. Moreover, it is a large question, with complications and difficulties, and it is not easy to treat of it in brief space with due regard to the grave interests involved. Nevertheless, it is a question which, as a matter of fact, is not being let sleep in those British communities where no satisfactory arrangement has been come to; it will not be let sleep in New Zealand, its importance demands consideration, and the difficulties ought to be faced. A great deal of misunderstanding and variance has arisen, which may be removed by a clear statement and candid consideration of the matters involved. For example, I have heard it said, and I have seen it in newspaper articles, that ministers, Sabbath school teachers and parents should do their duty and the difficulty would be removed. Again, I have seen this put forward: that the State has nothing to do with religion. Now these are mere assertions, emanating in most cases, I presume, from these who have never had any practical acquaintance with the subject. They seem to take for granted that what is aimed at is the conversion or spiritual well-being of the children only, which we grant are to be sought for by ministers or parents; whereas it can be shown that education has a moral side, and, the State, having taken it in hand, has to do with religion in that aspect, for the well-being of the State itself.

This is so well understood in a Christian country that the question may well be asked, how came it about that the reading of the Bible was ever excluded from the day schools. Was it the wish of the people? No, it arose from the exigencies of party strife in 1877. The result has not been satisfactory. Coming, as most of us do, from lands where the Supreme Being is recognised, where the Bible is honored, it is not to be expected, in the laud of our adoption, where the Bible had a place in the State schools from their very establishment, that its total exclusion could be accepted as a solution of the difficulty. Under what pretext then has this been brought about in a Christian Country?

BIBLE READING NOT UNJUST TO ROMAN CATHOLICS

1. It was said to be unjust to the *Roman Catholics*. They objected to the Protestant Bible being read in the schools—it was an offence to their conscience. This difficulty could have been met, either by the withdrawal of the children, during the reading of Scripture, or the rights of conscience could have been preserved by the use of the Douay version, or of the old Vulgate. But provision has been made all along for such conscientious scruples. The presence of the children of the Roman Catholic or of the Jew has never been insisted upon. Whose conscience then is offended? But, if regard has been had to the conscientious scruples of the Roman Catholic, no regard has been shown to the conscientious convictions of those who desire that which tends to the best welfare of the State and of society. The Roman Catholics are consistent in their demand that religion be connected with education, but if our statesmen thought to reconcile them to our school system by the conclusion of the Bible they made a grievous mistake. The attempt was made in Cincinnati with what result the words of the *Tablet* will show—"We see from the papers the School Board has voted to exclude the Bible and all religious instruction from the public schools in the city. If this has been done with a view to reconciling Catholics to the common school system its purpose will not be realised. To us godless schools are still less acceptable than sectarian schools, and we object less to the reading of King James's Bible, even in schools, than we do to the exclusion of all religious instruction," The prohibition of the Bible, then, has not met with the approval of the Roman Catholics. The result has been that they have not ceased to despise the schools as "godless," and to regard them as being deprived of one element which makes them valuable as a means of

education in the eyes of all men of any religious belief; and their zeal in establishing schools of their own order is a rebuke to all other denominations, But what underlies this objection is the alleged injustice of taxing them in common with others for the support of schools not under the control of their own Church. In discussing this question we have really nothing to do with the justice or injustice of the mode of taxation any more than it would be binding on those who feel it their duty to protest against French occupation of the New Hebrides to assist the Premier in providing against a flood of convicts coming to these colonies; or, to use another illustration more apropos of the circumstances, the inequality of incidence of taxation is no more an argument for the exclusion of the Bible from our schools than it would be an argument for the prohibition of the sowing of the finest wheat among the cereals. Any just claims the Roman Catholics have ought to be recognised; but that cannot be accepted as a solution of the question which, in having regard to one-twentieth of the community, does violence to the conscience of the great majority. The exclusion of the Bible could only be viewed with Satisfaction by a nation of Freethinkers. It cannot be right for our statesmen to shelve such a question because it is beset with difficulties. Neither would it be right for us to rest contented with matters as they are.

BIBLE READING NOT SECTARIAN

2. It has been urged that the Bible is *sectarian*. Now, that which is sectarian belongs to some particular body or sect. But the elementary truths of religion are common to all sects, and unless all religion be sectarian the Bible cannot be excluded under this plea.

If all religion be sectarian then the administration of oaths in Courts of Justice is sectarian. But no one affirms this. I hold, on the contrary that the Bible is not sectarian and shall adduce proof. Those who bring forward this objection studiously conceal the fact that there are certain great religious truths which are admitted and firmly believed by all Christians. They all believe in the existence of a God, in the immortality of the soul, in the beneficent character of the teaching of the New Testament, and in its divine origin and authority. All who really value Christianity and its noble and benevolent agencies, rejoice that there is so much that the various divisions of the Christian Church have in common. And it is the earnest desire of all such in every portion of the British colonies, and throughout the world, to see the broad foundation of truth laid, the pillars firmly fixed, and these benevolent agencies in vigorous operation. This objection to the number of the sects, and the differences of their doctrines, is an old infidel argument. It is those who dislike Christianity who cavil about sects, magnify the differences that exist between them, and ignore the broad basis of truth about which there is no controversy, and no difference of opinion.

The whole argument, in the opinion of some of our senators, has turned upon the supposition that the Bible is a volume whose teachings lead to sectarianism, and therefore it ought not to remain in the schools. To this we strongly demur, and it can be easily disproved. The Bible is the word of God; Sectarianism is the work of man. In the Bible we are taught that God hath made of one blood all men that dwell on the face of the earth, that we are to forgive injuries and to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us, that we all have one origin, and must all stand at one judgment seat; and the volume which contains such truths surely cannot be charged with being sectarian. It is a singular thing that Roman Catholics and Secularists are both agreed in their opposition; the first, because they will have no creed taught but their own, and no Bible reading without priestly interpretation, the latter, because they disbelieve in creeds altogether. The advocates of Bible reading hold against both, that there are eternal principles of truth in the bible which lie at the basis of religion, and which, apart from creeds and formularies, ought to find place in the school.

In point of fact the differences among denominations is not a sufficient excuse for the exclusion of the Bible, seeing that religious teaching is successfully carried out by the School Boards at home. That the Bible is not sectarian appears from the result of

A LAWSUIT IN AMERICA

regarding the reading of the bible in a College. The testator had positively enjoined "that all the instructors and teachers should take pains to instil into the minds of the scholars the purest principles of morality, so that on their entrance into active life they may, from inclination and habit, evince benevolence towards their fellow-creatures, and a love of truth, sobriety, and industry, adopting at the same time such religious tenets as their matured reason may enable them to prefer." The decision of the Court in this case was unanimous in favor of the use of the Bible as a text book, the Chief Justice being a devout Catholic. The Bible, without note or or comment, was recognised by the highest court of the land to be the purest and best source of morality as well as of religion, and to be not sectarian in its character or teachings.

JOSEPH COOK, in his book on "Socialism," says:—"A sectarian system is not natural—a godless system is

not natural. Germany, under the lead of Infidelity, once drove the Bible out of the school, but has since restored it. The most learned land in the globe, incisively divided between Catholic and Protestant, infidel and believer, scouts the idea that the Bible is to be excluded from the common schools."

PROFESSOR STOWE, in his Report on Elementary Education in Europe, says:—"I enquired of all classes of teachers, and men of every grade of religious faith, instructors in Common Schools, High Schools, and Schools of Act, of Professors in Colleges, Universities, and Professional Seminaries,—in cities and in the country—in places where there was an uniformity of plan, and where there was a diversity of creeds.—and I *never found, but one reply*, and that was, that to leave the moral faculty uninstructed was to leave the most important part of the human mind undeveloped, and to strip education of almost everything that can make it valuable. Every teacher whom I consulted repelled with indignation the idea that moral instruction is not proper for schools, and spurned with contempt the allegation that the Bible cannot be introduced into common schools without encouraging a sectarian bias in the matter of teaching."

THE STATE HAS TO DO WITH RELIGION

3. Another pretext for the exclusion of the Bible is, that *the State has nothing to do with religion*. If by this is meant that it is not the duty of the State to support the Church with endowments, we are agreed. If it is meant that it is not the duty of the State to give preference to one religious body above another, we can understand that; but if it is meant that the State is to have absolutely nothing to do with religion we strongly demur. What is "religion"? Dr Johnson defines it as "Virtue as founded upon reverence of God, and expectation of future rewards and punishments." Dr Webster defines it, "As distinct from theology, religion is godliness, a real piety, in practice consisting in the performance of all known duties to God and our fellowmen, in obedience to divine commands, or from love to God and his law." The custom of a country will define the use of the word; religion in China, for example, would be allowed to mean the observance of the precepts of Confucius. Now, there can be no question that in Britain and the colonies the prevailing religion is the Christian. This is a Christian country. The precepts and principles of religion enter largely into the formation of the common law as now administered in this land. The laws of Alfred and Edward the Confessor continually cite the Scriptures as their sanction, and the influence of religion is to be seen more or less in the practice of the Courts jury is not empanelled, and a judge does not sit, without taking an oath to Almighty God.

The letters D.G. are imprinted on our coins. The cross of our Lord is the emblem of our National flag.

The Holy Bible is to be found in the two Houses of the General Assembly, and in every Court of Justice in the land.

The State deals with offences against the observance of the Sabbath, and with offences of the nature of blasphemy against the Father, and Son, and the Holy Ghost.

It is not correct, then, to say that the State has nothing to do with religion. As a matter of fact it takes to do with it every day. It does not take to do with it for the spiritual welfare of the citizens, but it takes to do with it for its own preservation and welfare.

Religion is inseparably connected with good government, and that the truths of religion should be known by the children is essential to the safety of the State, and even to the right conduct of its business. The State has to do with religion, not by way of propagating it, but with the view of maintaining itself. For the State depends on certain truths held by all religious sects, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews alike.

THE OBJECT OF BIBLE READING

in Government schools is that the scholars may know the truths that form the basis of all religion. When they know these then they know the truths that give sanction and authority to the laws of the State. The State recognises the Bible in so far as it has to do with the temporal affairs and well-being of the people, and it might prescribe a certain amount of it to be read for this purpose,—but totally to prohibit it is to go beyond all bounds. Society as constituted in these colonies has a claim upon the State that these truths shall be known, in view of the importance of the elementary truths of religion to the mind of *every child in the community*.

Apart from the duties of any Church or of any sect, the State which declares Education to be compulsory has an imperative duty to communicate a certain amount of religious truth.

If the State has nothing to do with religion, how came the use of the Bible and prayer into our Houses of Legislature,—how come it into our Supreme and Magistrate's Courts,—and now come religious instruction to be given in our Government schools? It came in the ordinary way of legislation, and it was part of the Education Ordinance. The State has taken to do with religion, and it cannot do otherwise in accordance with the constitution and laws of the country. In this matter of education it is not competent for the State to prohibit the Bible unless it can be shown that the Christian religion does not prevail, and that Secularism predominates

among the people. And here it will be appropriate to consider how it was in this country previous to the alteration of the Education Act in 1877.

The *Canterbury Report*, published in 1863, says:—"It would seem that the Government, by which is meant the Representative acting power of the people,—being professedly Christian, is bound in all its legislation, and not least in the matter of Education, to recognise Christianity, not on points on which it is the subject of human imperfections and infirmities, nor in the divisions of the community into rival sects violating the laws of the creed they profess, but as a general ruling principle in the life of State." And then, a little further on,—*"The Commission do not think it necessary to enter into a discussion of the opinion held by some, that all but purely secular knowledge should be banished from our schools. Such a course would not satisfy the wants of the people generally; and further, without entering into the religious question, it would be impossible, in any system of teaching, which professed to fit men for the social and civil duties of every day life to ignore the existence of Christianity as pervading the laws, literature, and institutions of the civilised world. In a Christian country no one could be called educated who was ignorant of the Christian Scriptures, to which our civil institutions are so largely indebted."*

There are two points here worthy of special attention—the one is that it would be impossible for teachers who are doing their duty efficiently to ignore Christianity. The State, then in prohibiting the Bible has crippled teachers in fitting men for the social and civil duties in a country the laws and literature of which are so largely impregnated with Christianity. The other point is this: that no one could be called educated who was ignorant of the Christian Scriptures.

SAFETY DEPENDS ON MORALITY,

Morality depends upon religion, and the safety of the the Government depends on the moral condition of the people. Their moral condition may be seen reflected in the enactments and ordinances of the Government. Thus the commandments of God in the Bible are reflected in our common laws, *e.g.*, with reference to the violation of the Sabbath, blasphemy, perjury, theft, and murder. The state has to do with religion, and this does not mean that there must be a State Church, or that some form of religious belief shall be enforced throughout the country, but it implies that religious worship is protected; that church property is exempted from the payment of taxes, while the State has nothing to do with the mode of worship. Religion has a political value as a means of securing civilisation, liberty, and good government. Our country's laws have largely to do with man's dealings with his fellow-men. In the Bible the rules for man's conduct are to be found most clearly laid down. In those lands where the Bible is most revered the majesty of the law is best upheld. It will thus be seen that this objection brought by some against the Bible in schools, is, when rightly considered, a strong argument in its favor.

4. Of other objections, I only notice those adduced from *alleged evil effects* of Bible reading. I have heard it said that in the hands of

THE UNGODLY TEACHER

it might cause much mischief. In that case it is not the Book, it is the man, you have to fear. He has opportunity enough during school hours to do a great deal of harm without the introduction of the Bible. The objection, like some others, is theoretical. It is based on the theory that Bible reading is an act of worship, and that it would be wrong to entrust it to an ungodly man. But the advocates of the Bible in schools argue for it not as an act of worship, but as a part of education, the Bible being an admirable text book, and the reading of it an essential part of children's education. From my acquaintance with the teachers I regard it as a libel on them as a body to speak of the ungodly teacher as if he were so commonly to be found as to influence legislation on this question. On the contrary my knowledge of them would lead me to say they are the reverse of ungodly, and would hail the introduction of the Bible as a boon. But if there were a teacher whom a Committee could not trust, they have a check on any abuse in their own hand. Such an objection will not be seriously entertained by those who have a practical acquaintance with our schools, who consider the magnitude of the interests at stake, and who remember that the State has not to legislate for teachers, but for the education of her future citizens.

WHAT IS PROPOSED

The question now comes to be, how is the evil to be remedied? The chronic agitation in New Zealand, especially in the provinces of Otago and Auckland, makes it clear that the people are not satisfied. Representations have not ceased to be made to Parliament on the subject up to the present year. Some may say, why not return to

DENOMINATIONALISM?

The reason against it is that it could only operate in the towns, where it would lead to a great deal of unnecessary expense in keeping up separate educational institutions. There would then require to be three or four schools where one is sufficient at present. The national system of education would be broken up, and the efficiency of the schools, in some instances, would likely be impaired. Denominationalism has for such reasons not found favor in the British colonies. Still, with all its disadvantages, it is to be preferred to the secular system. For the tendency of the secular system is to Free thinking. And where Freethinkers are so small a section of the community, it is manifestly unjust to have the system of education purely secular. It is unjust to all who acknowledge the Bible, and the bible is acknowledged by the large majority of the people.

VOLUNTARY LABOR.

Again, it has been thought that ministers of the Gospel should undertake the task. And many praiseworthy instances can be adduced of ministers giving a portion of their time and strength to the providing of religious instruction [*unclear: in town*] and country schools throughout the land. Ministers of various denominations have also met in conference on the subject on several occasions in the principal towns. They met so in Christ church in 1883. A concerted effort was made in Dunedin in 1882 to give religious instruction in several of the city schools, with the consent of the authorities. The late Rev Lindsay Mackie, for example, in addition to the multifarious duties of a large city congregation, undertook a large class in the Normal School. In a year or so the ministers so engaged found they had all to give it up. Bishop Moorhouse, late of Melbourne, has proved that it is utterly impossible for clergymen to visit the schools from week to week to the extent of their parishes, and train them in religion. And the reasons are not far to seek. In the first place attendance is to a large extent, optional. Then, for any one else than the master to undertake the instruction of a number of children of the different standards, without the aid of school discipline, will be found a difficult task, and this, either before or after school-hours, and from year to year. Besides, the children who avail themselves of such efforts, are as a rule, those who are already receiving some religious instruction. The neglected children of careless parents are still unreached, and the evil of their ignorance of essential truths is still unremedied. There are over 80,000 scholars in our State schools, and it is a very small fraction of these that has been reached by ministers of religion. How can it be otherwise? In a country like this, if no encouragement is given by the authorities, voluntary effort of this kind may be carried on under many disadvantages.

DR MORRISON

Principal of the Scotch College, *Victoria*, gave the following evidence on this point before the Victorian Education Commission. He said, "The exclusion of Biblical teaching from the State schools curriculum had a most detrimental effect on a boy's training. Children remained ignorant of a branch of Education which coloured and impregnated the best English literature from Chaucer down to the present time. The alleged difficulty was purely theoretical—it had been created by theorists and politicians, and not by practical men, who had overcome the difficulty.

THE TEACHERS

being trained men, always at their posts, were best fitted to carry on the work—there being a conscience clause for teachers and scholars." In the other colonies of Australia, this has been one of the questions of the day. At a representative meeting in *Adelaide*, the following resolutions were carried:—"That no system of instruction can be regarded as sufficient which does not include Bible reading and teaching. 2 That such Bible reading and teaching should be given within school hours. 3. Should be undenominational in character, and should be given by the ordinary teacher, or, if he conscientiously object by a substitute to be approved by the Education department. 4. That no teacher, who conscientiously objects, should be compelled to give such instruction, and that no child whose parents object should be compelled to attend such instruction. 5. That the Bible selections and instruction thereupon should be similar in character to those in the London School Boards." These resolutions were to be brought before the country and legislature. In New South Wales, Western Australia, and Tasmania religious instruction forms a part of the school work.

HOW SETTLED ELSEWHERE.

And here I may mention, in few words, how the religious difficulty has been settled elsewhere

1. In ENGLAND,—the law is, "Times for religious instruction—at beginning or end of school meeting, or at both—inserted in time table approved by Education Department, and conspicuously affixed in every schoolroom,

The London School Board has the following regulation—"In the schools provided by the Board the Bible shall be read, and there shall be given such explanation and such instruction therefrom in the principles of morality and religion, as are suited to the capacities of the children." Two provisions follow,—1. Against proselytising; 2. For objections by parents or ratepayers, to be considered by the Board.

2. In SCOTLAND religious instruction is part of the system.

3. In IRELAND education is controlled by the Board for National Education; "Readers" are used containing much scriptural instruction. There is a half-hour for religious instruction by ministers or teachers appointed by them.

4. In GERMANY, there is dogmatic religious instruction by teachers appointed or by ministers.

5. In the UNITED STATES, during the first half hour there is prayer, singing, and Bible reading without comment. Care is taken that teachers shall be of good moral character.

6. In FRANCE, the system includes religious instruction.

7. In HOLLAND, the Bible is read and taught by the teachers, who are required to avoid most carefully touching on grounds of controversy between the sects.

8. In CANADA, school is opened and closed by reading: scripture and prayer. Christianity is recognised as an element that ought to pervade all the regulations for elementary instruction.

9. In VICTORIA, the system is secular.

The following cablegram from London appeared in our local newspapers in August:—"Bishop Moorhouae, speaking of the Victorian educational system, expressed his opinion that under it children grew up in the most profound and deplorable ignorance of the Bible."

10. In QUEENSLAND, secular; facilities for ministers out of school hours.

11. In NEW SOUTH WALES, the Irish school books are used, containing Bible history, and also books of scripture extracts specially prepared. Secular instruction is understood to include religious teaching, but not dogmatic theology. Sectarianism is excluded but not religion.

12. In SOUTH AUSTRALIA, the system is secular; provision is made for the teacher reading the Bible before school hours if the parents of 10 children send a written request.

13. In WESTERN AUSTRALIA, the Bible is read and taught by the teachers, under a conscience clause.

14. In TASMANIA, religious instruction is imparted by the teachers from 9 to 10 a.m. in Scripture history and narratives, under a conscience clause. The Bible, Irish school books, or others approved by the Board may be used.

In South Australia, they are agitating for a course of Bible reading and teaching on the basis of the London School Board. According to that plan a year's instruction would be systematically given from selected portions of Scripture, in school hours, subject to a conscience clause.

THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD

system has worked remarkably well, and here the testimony of one of its late members on his arrival in Australia, may be given. *Dr Barry*, of Sydney, on his arrival at Melbourne, spoke on this subject as of the highest importance and affecting the future of a great community. He had some experience in England of public elementary education, more especially as a member of the London school Board, and what struck him most emphatically was the almost unanimous verdict of the country in favor of making religious instruction—i.e., the Bible freely read and taught—an integral part of the system. A fairly efficient scheme framed for that purpose was largely adopted, and he was not aware that a single case of proselytism had manifested itself. In Birmingham, the home of the secular system, they had actually been obliged to have the Bible read in the schools from which they had formerly banished it. So far as he knew, no denominational antagonism had ever interfered in carrying out this work. If we could only get over our political and sectarian differences here, he thought there was no reason why the same great object should not be achieved here in the same way. This is an interesting confirmation of what has been understood regarding the London School Board system that it has worked without a hitch.

All the elements of sectarian differences and denominational distinctions were surely as rife in England or Scotland as here. Yet the great lessons of divine wisdom may be taught to the young there, as part of the school course, without any hurtful consequences, and even with great success—Why not here?

AGITATION IN NEW ZEALAND.

It is alleged by some that *the people are indifferent*.—"Mr Swanson, in his place in the House said, 'The people are not agitating for a change,' But this is not correct. There may have been no agitation on a large scale in North Canterbury, but an association was formed in Christchurch in 1888 consisting of the various ministers, and prominent laymen, some of them members of the Education Board.

In Otago, an elaborate return was prepared in 1881, the result of a plebiscite, and it was found from 13,500 replies that the parents of 11,886 children answered yes, and the parents of 1,613 children answered no. The number of parents for was 4,674, and against 602; being 8 to 1."

In South Canterbury a plebiscite was also obtained, the result being even more favorable, 9 to 1. I have not at hand the result of the returns from the northern parts of the colony, but I believe they would show an average of 9 to 1 in favor of Bible reading.

In Auckland there is an Association, and a great deal has been published on the subject. An Association has been also formed in Napier.

For canvase in Nelson see page 17.

It cannot then be urged in the face of agitation sustained for many years, in several centres, at considerable expense, that the people are indifferent. But, it will be said, as appeared in your issue of August 7, 1885, "if religious teaching of any description were allowed it would immediately arouse all sorts of denominational antipathies." That this is an erroneous hypothesis, may be seen by the result of religious teaching in Britain, and on the Continent, in the United States, and in Canada, and in others of the colonics. The elements of sectarian differences are to be found, perhaps with increased force in the home lands, and yet religious teaching has been systematically and successfully given.

The object of the measure before the Upper House was the simple reading of the Bible without note and comment. There are two positions taken up against this, which are mutually destructive of each other. The one is, that it would be dangerous, or, as appeared in the paper above referred to, trampling on the religious feelings of a minority. The other is, that it is of no value in itself—a delusion and a snare—and would lead to nothing. These positions destroy each other, for if it be so useless and inane, it must also be harmless and can injure no one's feelings.

SIMPLE READING DEFENDED,

Some contend that the mere reading of the Bible in schools, without note or comment, is an advantage so doubtful as not to be worth contending for. It is astonishing to hear this said by any professing Christian. To be consistent they must hold that that portion of divine service in every church where scripture is merely read is meaningless, and that the reading of the Bible in a household is of no account. But surely any one may learn from the mere reading of the Bible that God is to be loved with all the heart, and soul, and mind. Surely any one may learn that we are to love our neighbor as ourselves. Is it a doubtful advantage for a child to hear the words, Honor thy Father and Mother.?" I have been present at the opening of one of our High Schools while the rector reads a portion of Scripture, the pupils meanwhile ranged in lines opposite, and the teachers by his side, prayer was reverently offered; and one could only feel assured that instead of being of doubtful advantage, the exercise was wholesome and profitable, such a manner of opening school seems calculated to aid definitely in the maintenance of discipline, not to speak of higher results. Scripture says of itself. "The entrance of thy word gives light. . . The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple." Why should not the advantage enjoyed in our High schools be extended to all of them?

JUDGE STORER, in the famous Cincinnati case, 1870, says on this point, "Nor do we think that the mere reading of the Bible, without Comment, can be deemed an act of worship in the commonly received definition. The lessons selected are in all probability those which elevate the mind and soften the heart—an exercise not only proper but desirable to calm the temper of the children, while it impresses the truth of personal responsibility for good or evil conduct. It furnishes a perfect standard of moral rectitude, not to be found elsewhere, which is immutable as it is authoritative." He goes on to claim that the Bible may be properly read for its moral teaching,—its history, its geographical descriptions, "its pure Faxon English, so simple that every ordinary capacity may be instructed." He lays it down that it may well form a part of a school course from its antiquity, its bearings on modern travel and discovery, as well as from its historical value, and continues, "There is to be no censorship over Latin and Greek classics, or German and French literature, however, exceptionable may be the production, the crusade is against the Bible, and the Bible only,—the first printed volume after types were invented, a book which from its first publication in Latin has been translated and is now circulated in more than 200 languages, a volume recognised by every civilised government as sacred, and has ever retained as contradistinguished from all other books the name it bears—the Bible." In this

CINCINNATI CASE

argued for nearly a whole week, and with four judges on the bench, the prohibition of the Bible by the School Board was ordered to be withdrawn so that the Bible might be read.

It is a mistake to undervalue the simple reading of the Bible. While that may be granted to be insufficient for denominational purposes yet those fundamental truths may be learned from it, that are held in the highest estimation in all Christian lands, such as the death of Christ, and his prevailing intercession. But apart from its distinctive religious teaching, we can claim that the Bible is the best and most reliable text book in the important departments of ancient Jewish history. Anything short of denominational instruction has been styled 'a jelly fish religion.' (*Church News* March, 1884.) Such allegations must be made thoughtlessly, and in forgetfulness of the fact that the saints of the Bible existed before our modern denominations took their rise. Failing religious instruction, as given previous to 1877, it is to be hoped that no lover of the Bible will decry its being at least read in the schools day by day. The acquaintance even with the ten commandments and the Lord's Prayer and the elementary truths of religion would afford a basis of conduct not to be despised.

In New Zealand, some of our Governors and members of Parliament have expressed such views on this matter as show that in their opinion the legislation was a mistake.

SIR HERCULES ROBINSON, Governor of New Zealand, at the opening of the Normal School, Wellington (1880), having referred to the system pursued at Home and in New South Wales, said, "Here, I believe, there is nothing of the kind, and the omission appears to me to indicate a forgetfulness of the fact that the twofold object of National Education is to secure in the individual citizen intellectual clearness and moral worth." He went on to say that with the franchise so extended as it is now, it is important that every man should have intelligence enough to form a sound judgement on subjects of public concern. "But (he continued) it is even more essential to the well-being of a community that its youth should be taught to love right and hate wrong, that they should be brought up to entertain a strong sense of truth and justice, virtue and integrity, honor and duty, respect for constitutional authorities, and the law,—these and such like moral results can, I fear, never be accomplished by intellectual cultivation alone." He quoted PROFESSOR HUXLEY as confessing himself at a loss to know how the religious feeling, the essential basis of conduct, could be kept up, without the use of the Bible. The quotation is continued to show, from its character and contents, the propriety of its being made known to the children.

SIR WILLIAM FOX (1880), speaking in support of his position that an overwhelming majority of the fathers and mothers in this country desired the Bible read in schools, stated that a clergyman who had resided in the province of Nelson had for thirteen years tested public feeling in the matter by personal canvass, and the result was that nine-tenths of the people were opposed to the secularising of the Act. The Provincial Council in 1873 refused to secularise it accordingly. Sir William continued:—"There is another point of view from which I approach this subject. I think it is an indignity offered by ourselves to ourselves, that in a country, nine-tenths of whose inhabitants profess a religion of Some sort based on the sacred scriptures, the sacred Scriptures should be

THE ONLY BOOK INTERDICTED

in our schools. You may teach the religion of Confucius or of Brahminism—the whole of the ancient mythology, including everything about Jupiter, Mars, Venus, and their loves, and so on—*ad nauseam*—but you are on no account to let them know that there is a God in Heaven or to mention the name of our Saviour. I may be told that we have no National religion. That is true in one sense—we have no State Church—the State does not identify itself with any special form of religion, but the identification of the nation with the Christian faith is complete; and I appeal to you, Sir, to say whether the book in front of you, from which the prayer is read every day, is not a proof that we are a Christian nation." He then pointed to the example of the New England States, France, Prussia, and New South Wales, and the success of Mr Forster's English Bill, which has been in operation twelve years. In the London Board Schools 200,000 children were being educated by the State, and there had been a withdrawal of only 1 in 4000 under the conscience clause. In reply to the statement that the parents could do it he said, "Anybody who knows anything of the rising generation must be aware that a proportion of

THE MOTHERS ARE DEGRADED

and debased to a degree which makes them utterly incapable of imparting religious instruction. And more than that there are hundreds of these whom we know to be decent and respectable women who are incapable of doing it. Therefore if we are to depend upon the religious instruction given at the mother's knee, I am afraid it will not reach a large proportion of the class of children to which I have alluded. And then, Sir, with regard to those mothers themselves in the next generation we have to think of them and how they will grow up. If they

grow up without any religious teaching, what sort of mothers will they make!"

The Member for Bruce, MR MURRAY, (1877) held that, "it was improper to declare by statute that the future people of this colony should be brought up without religious knowledge. To exclude all religious training would tend to make education a curse rather than a blessing, and make lead to the creation of a class of educated scoundrels who would be more dangerous to society than the uneducated class could possibly be."

The member for Hokitika, MR BONAR said, "I think that brought up as we all have been, the ignoring of the Supreme Being is matter of deepest regret, and with the great majority of the people of New Zealand will be equally a matter of regret. Here we are in Parliament assembled, and we feel it to be our duty, and more than our duty, our privilege, to recognise the existence of the supreme Being and to invoke His blessing on all we do. Surely if such a recognition is thought fitting for Parliament, it is especially fitting in the training of young children. I would deprecate anything approaching to sectarian training, but I think that in a Christian country like this, we are doing wrong in not recognising, in some way which will not give offence to persons of any denomination, the existence of the Supreme Being. I do not know that we have any Atheists in the colony at all, but if we have I am sure they are very few, and I do not see how any one's feelings could be hurt by the simple reading of the Lord's Prayer or a chapter of the Bible,—not necessarily hurried or gabbled over, it can be done respectfully, and it would be optional to attend, but I would very much like to see some clause in the Bill that would recognise the existence of One whom we have all been taught to know and obey."

The HON DR MENZIES, who protested against the decision arrived at in 1877, subsequently proposed that the Boards should have authority to permit the Bible to be read in schools where the Committee desired it. He argued for religion being made not only an essential, but the foundation of education, quoting from American writers on the low ground of expediency, and from Guizot, Lavaleye, Principal Shairp, and others, on the higher ground of the duty of the State to train the rising generation to a full recognition of the Divine authority and to familiarise them with the Word of God. After referring to the system in operation in Prussia, Sweden, and America, he went on to say,—"Sir, we find that many petitions have been presented to the Legislature on this subject, and the expressions which they contain show that over a very large extent of country, in many districts, the most cherished feelings of the community have been outraged by the banishment from the schools of that book, which, in the words of the petitioners, they regard as the Word of God, and the Supreme rule of conduct. Under the present arrangement, because a small minority of the community will not tolerate a plan which would satisfy the majority—a system which is working well elsewhere, and which could work well here if honestly administered,—is not allowed a trial. The action of the minority in pressing this forward shows that they endeavour to guard the rights of their conscience so vigilantly, that they appear to be ready to trample upon those of the majority. The minority say that the church and the parents should undertake the duty of giving religious instruction. I am afraid that the parents in too many cases are careless and neglectful, sometimes unable; but independently of all this, I contend that the State has a paramount right to see that the rising generation are educated in such a way, and grounded in such principles, that they shall grow up to be good citizens; and I say that the State cannot find any more effective mode of doing this than grounding them in Scripture."

MR H. HILL, B.A., Inspector of Schools, Napier, regrets to find moral training ignored in the new system. In his opinion, it is an entirely vicious system that teaches children to imagine that the culture of the intelligence is the "be-all and end-all" in learning. Now that the Bible has been expunged from the list of school books as used by the department, practically there is no standard of morality to be recognised by the teachers. He sincerely hopes that the present educational machinery, good as it is in many points, may be perfected by permitting the introduction of the Bible as a reading book into public schools, subject to a conscience clause.

Mr W. HAMMOND, formerly Inspector of Schools for South Canterbury, stated in a report—"I cannot close my report without deploring the apparent necessity for ostracising religious and moral instruction from our schools. A child possesses religious instincts which are ever showing themselves and waiting for development; and, apart from the loss of a powerful means of religious and moral training, I am convinced that the simple fact of tacitly ignoring these instincts or principles must have a very injurious effect.

The objections that have been urged may be seen to be theoretical, groundless, and of no force. If it be sufficient to urge against it that there were objectionable portions in the Bible, or that there were ungodly teachers, or that it would stir up sectarian animosities, how is it, I ask, notwithstanding all these, the Bible is read in the schools of all the lands in Christendom, with the exception, unfortunately, of some Australasian colonies? If it be pleaded that ministers can do it, then it can be shown that the voluntary efforts have not been sustained in the past, and, in most cases, cannot be, in justice to their other duties. If it be said that parents can do it, then it must be remembered that many parents are incapable or negligent, so that, while some do their duty, many children are growing up without any religious instruction. Our national system of education is good, but the prohibition of the Bible renders it insufficient; it is unjust to the children, to the parents, and to the colony."

It is unjust to *the children*, for it recognises only their rational and intellectual faculties; it ignores their religious and moral instincts. It must be injurious to them to be brought up to look on the Bible as a book proscribed in School. Every child in an enlightened Christian country has a right to the superior benefits enjoyed by that country over heathen and idolatrous lands; they have a sacred right to be informed as to the difference between right and wrong, and as to the existence, authority, and law of the Supreme Being. From the important place the Bible occupies in literature, children have a right to know its contents. The effect of the exclusion of the Bible from the day schools in New Zealand is to bring them nearly to the level of our Government Schools in idolatrous India, and to deprive our children of one element of highest value enjoyed throughout Christendom.

It is unjust to the *parents*. It is in opposition to the enactments under which the great body of settlers built up their new homes in this land. It is contrary to the express intentions and desires of those who founded the New Zealand settlements. Parents are under a sacred obligation to see that the State to whom they have committed the education of their children, does not violate the divine prescriptions.

The prohibition of the Bible can only be defended on the plea that the rights of conscience are interfered with. On this ground the British Government might not feel at liberty to introduce it into their schools in a part of the Empire where the vast majority are Hindoos and Mahommedans, as in India. But this ground cannot be urged here. On the contrary, injury is done to the conscientious convictions of the vast majority of parents by its exclusion. It has been proved by elaborate returns that 80 or 90 per cent of the whole population desire to have it introduced.

It is unjust to *the State* itself. The real greatness of the British nation is traceable to the influence of the Bible. Its laws are founded on it; its noblest institutions are the outcome of it. The State having taken education out of the hands of the parents, it is compulsory, and having thereby taken it in hand, it is necessary, as in Great Britain, that God and the conscience should be recognised. As it would tend to preserve the unity of the Empire, confer equal advantages upon the rising generation here with those of other lands in Christendom, and secure the safety of the state, it is necessary to repeal the prohibition of the Bible. For the logical issue of the present state of matters is, that there should be no national recognition of God, no Bible or prayer in the Legislative Assemblies, no oath and no Bible in the Courts of Justice, no punishment of blasphemy or Sabbath-breaking, no standard of moral rectitude for the people of the country, no reference to God or religion in any of the school books. The Freethinkers have already agitated for the repeal of the law against blasphemy. And what would be the effect of education that sharpens mental faculties and supplies no moral basis of character, that looks upon a child as made of brains without any religious instincts and feelings? If God and religion be utterly ignored, shall we have fewer educated scoundrels, fewer suicides, fewer murders, actually committed or skilfully planned? Shall we have more regard for the majesty of law, for the sanctities of family life, for parental authority; shall we have less crime, and more commercial soundness, fewer unemployed, and more colonial prosperity? Nay, it is vain to hope for it. And as in Birmingham the home of the secular system, they have been obliged to have the Bible read in the schools from which they had banished it, we have had warning enough during the last nine years of the necessity of having the Bible re-introduced into the schools in this land. As the Jew reveres his Old Testament Scriptures, and the Roman Catholic his Prayer Book, all of them must scorn a system that recognises no God at all.

Here is a last and grave consideration. It must be *displeasing to God*; that He, by whom kings reign and princes decree justice should be thus ignored in the State schools; that his book, recognised by every civilised Government as sacred, should alone be proscribed to the children; that his blessing should not be sought in the primary schools in the land, without which education may only prove a curse; for He is the protector of all that trust in Him, "without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy;" and the very pagans seek a blessing from their gods on the learning they acquire. How long shall this blot remain on the escutcheon of our National Education? How long shall members of Parliament guided by expediency rather than by principle, listening to the clamor of a small section of the community, vote against the Bible? How long shall the Christian people of New Zealand submit to a compromise that has proved a failure?

Appendix.

As further proof of the prevailing desire for the re-introduction of the Bible into the day schools throughout New Zealand, I adduce the following:—

Auckland, December 29, 1883. *New Zealand Free Press*.—It is altogether a momentous theme, affecting as it sooner or later must do, the moral and social standing of this young and growing nation . . . Education, of itself, will never form a sure safeguard for society, unless it be diffused with sound moral and religious principles, and where are such principles to be obtained excepting from the Word of God.

Napier Bible-in-Schools' Association. A meeting of the Bible-in-Schools Committee was held on June 27,

1880, in the Council Chamber. The Bishop of Waiapu was in the chair. The Secretary, the Rev. J. Spear, read a statement of the result of the canvass for signatures to the Bible petition; the number amounting to 1400 . . . The result of the canvass of Napier showed that, in the vast majority of instances, parents, and especially those of the working classes, were extremely desirous that their children should be instructed in the Word of God in the public schools.

Christ church, December, 1, 1883. Proposed New Zealand Bible-in-Schools Association.

Constitution.—The object of this Association is to secure the reading of the Bible, without Denominational teaching, as part of the regular State School course, subject to a conscience clause; it being distinctly understood that this Association disavows all intention of advocating any interference with the Education Act in any particular, save that herein specified.

Dunedin. At a meeting of the *Education Board* of the Provincial District of Otago, held 26th June, 1879, the following resolution was passed, only one dissenting; 'That, in the opinion of this Board, it is very desirable that the Education Act be amended with the view of allowing the introduction of Bible reading in the public schools.

Bible in Schools Association constitution.—(2.) The object of the Association shall be to obtain the sanction of Parliament to the reading of the Bible daily in the public schools of the Colony, with the provision of a conscience clause.

Southland.—In the report of the *Southland Education Board* for the year ending December 31, 1879, the following paragraph appears:—"The Bible-in-Schools.—This question was brought before the Board, at a meeting held on the 6th June end, after considerable discussion, a motion was carried almost unanimously, declaring it to be the opinion of the Board that the Bible should be read daily in the schools without comment. Copies of this motion were forwarded to the Government, and also to all the School Committees, accompanied in the latter case with the request that they should give an expression of their opinion on the subject. Out of 55 Committees, only 8 were against, 37 were in favor, and 10 sent no reply.

In the compilation of the foregoing statements I have consulted the following:—*The Bible at Home and in the Schools.*—A sermon preached in the Presbyterian Church, Milton, on the 30th September, 1877, by the Rev James Chisholm, and published by request. *The History of the Cincinnati Case.*

Bible Beading in the Public Schools. A sermon preached in the Presbyterian Church, North Dunedin, by the Rev Dr Copland, and published in the *Christian Record*, June 6, 1879. *Primary Education in New Zealand:*—1880. *Bible-in-Schools: Extracts from Speeches, Letters, etc, collected and compiled by Prophetes,* published in Wellington, 1880. *The Bible-in-Schools*—read at the ordinary meeting of the Otago Schoolmasters' Association, 7th September, 1872, by J. B. Park. Published under the auspices of the Bible-in-Schools Association, Dunedin, 1879.

Napier Bible-in-Schools Association. Letter of Ven. Archdeacon Maunsell, to the *New Zealand Herald.*—The only resource now left to those who wish to remove the present great blot from our school laws is to organise, and to take steps for ascertaining the views of parents on the subject; and I will frankly confess that my object in asking you to make this movement at Napier known, is to stir up those who have leisure and ability to take steps for organizing a similar movement in Auckland—I am &c, R. MAUNSELL.

Mr Macandrew was intimately acquainted with the Scriptures, and held that their acceptance as the guide of life is indispensable to the production of that 'righteousness which exalteth a nation and is the glory of any people.' Hence the passion with which he desired to have Bible-reading in the schools of the people. I have reason for saying that it was his belief that our representatives are coming round to the right views on this subject. He thought that the new parliament would give school districts option in regard to this important matter. Mr Fulton, M.H.R., has just informed me that Mr Macandrew, on the very morning of the accident, had made arrangements for calling together a meeting of the members of both Houses of the Legislature in Otago, who are interested in Bible-reading in schools, for the purpose of deciding what should be done. I understand that the following were among his reasons for seeking the Bible in schools:—(1) It is honoured by many as the word of God. (2) It has created our civilisation. (3) No man is educated who is ignorant of its contents. (4) The consciences of minorities can be protected by a conscience clause, by time-tables, by denominational grants. (5) The conscience of the nation forbids continuance of the barbarism in having the Book of books alone in an index expurgatorius of democracy.

The Ashburton Publishing Company, Printers, Burnett Street.

The Impossibility of Knowing What is Christianity. By the Rev. Peter Dean,
Minister of Clerkenwell Unitarian Church
Price-Three pence.

"If an offence come out of Truth, better is it that the offence come than the Truth be concealed."

Graphic border Dunedin: Joseph Braithwaite, Corner of Arcade & High Street; AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.
MDCCCLXXX.

The Impossibility of Knowing

What is Christianity.

[*"ANOTHER CONUNDRUM.—Professor Salmond has been lecturing on the question, 'What is Christianity?' We are afraid that the Professor will feel some difficulty in giving a proper definition. Unless there is some system—some creed elaborated, we fail to see how an answer can be given."*—ECHO, 19th June, 1880. *The Professor did give an answer, but it will be seen from the following paper that the Rev. Peter Dean "gives it up" and why.*]

TRYING to know what is Christianity is like trying to catch the Will-o'-the-Wisp,—the longer we seek to do so the longer and more it eludes us. He who starts in pursuit of the *ignis fatuus* feels positive, at first, that he knows its exact locality; and he who begins to try to realise what is Christianity feels sure that either he can know or does know. Pursuit, however, enlightens both: it makes the one less and less able to say where Jack-o'-the-Lantern is, and the other less and less able to say what is Christianity. That which is looked upon by the less informed class of Christians as one of the plainest things in the world, is to the candid and intelligent thinker a perfect mystery.—As great a mystery as, "Why does evil exist?" or, "How far has man free will?"—And the longer he thinks and ponders the more has he to say of all three, "I cannot know."

Now intellectual difficulties are of two kinds. They are those *we* seek, and those which seek us. "Why does evil exist?" and "freedom and necessity," are questions of the latter class; and so is What is Christianity? and the phases of our mental attitude towards all three have much in common. Most of us have had theories explanatory of Evil and Free Will which allowed us rest and satisfaction in them for a time. By and by, however, we have come across something which has altogether upset our position, and put us once more at sea. So of What is Christianity? At one time we have persuaded ourselves that Christianity is such and such a thing, and in this, for a time, we have felt satisfied. Then our moorings have been again unloosened, and we have concluded—"O! Christianity is not what we thought before, but it is so and so:" and again we have found rest for a time. But only for a time. Again and again the irrepressible questions—Is what I believe to be Christianity *really* Christianity? and, AM I, or am I not, a Christian?—have arisen to trouble us, and set us afloat on the wide sea of doubt and uncertainty. Now I cannot in this brief paper deal with all these halting stages of Christians,—with all the intellectual positions which various men and parties respectively assert to be true Christianity. I can, however, notice some few of them, and of these (as of all I have yet been made acquainted with) I am compelled to conclude that they are altogether unsatisfactory; and that the most philosophical attitude towards the question of to-night is that implied in answering—We cannot know.

I. Now, the first position I shall examine—with a view to show its unsatisfactoriness—is the position of a great many Christians, that CHRISTIANITY is CHRIST. These people have no idea of Christianity apart from the personality of Jesus—of his nature and office. Their view has been well summed up by Dr. Green, Principal of the Rawdon Baptist College, when he said in a sermon—"For what is it, my brethren, that makes a Christian? Is it not the sincere and hearty acceptance of this revelation of the Divine: I believe in Christ?" With this class of Christians Christianity means Christology. But when we have got at this, we have only removed the difficulty, not solved it. We can no more know what is true Christology than we can know what is true Christianity. The Christ of every *age*, the Christ of every *Church*, the Christ of every *sect*, the Christ of every *man* is a different Christ; how, then, is it possible for any to know which is the true Christ, what is Christianity? May be we are told that by searching the New Testament the true Christology, the true Christianity is to be found. Well, some of us have done this, and we have found, not one, but at least six or seven different and irreconcilable Christs or Christologies there. There is the Christology of Christ's contemporaries, the Christology of the First and Third Gospels, the Christology of the Epistles of *Peter*, *James*, and *Jude*, the Christology of Paul's Epistles, and the Christology of the Johannic writings, and they are all different. They cannot *all* be true; *which* is the true one? I reply that it is utterly impossible for us to know. We cannot know which is the true Christology; and, if Christianity is Christology, we cannot know what is Christianity.

II. Well, leaving that, we pass to the next most common answer—CHRISTIANITY is the TEACHINGS OF CHRIST. And here again we find ourselves in a perfect labyrinth of difficulty and impossibility. Even so good a Christian believer as Dr. Channing had to feel this, for he says in one of his sermons: "Go to Jesus Christ for goodness, inspiration and strength in your office. This precept is easily uttered, but not easily obeyed. Nothing, indeed, is harder than to place ourselves near Jesus Christ. The way to him is blocked up on every side. Interpreters, Churches, Sects (past and present), Creeds, Authorities, the influence of Education all stand in our

way." But these difficulties are nothing compared with others which the good Doctor might have mentioned. If Christianity is the teachings of Christ it is utterly impossible for any one living now to know what those teachings were, and, consequently, utterly impossible to know what is Christianity. Some, however, will tell us that Christianity is the teachings of Christ as recorded in the New Testament. But this also is to surround us by impossibilities. We can never know which of these are Christ's teachings, and which those of his reporters. We can never know the true meaning of many of the statements of the Gospel records. And, above all, we are troubled to know whether or not Christianity is the *whole* or only *part* of Christ's teachings there recorded? whether it is the good or the bad, or both combined? If Christianity means the *whole* of those teachings, there is very little real Christianity amongst us; for I find very few so foolish as to try to carry them out. Those who "Take no thought for the morrow," but act as if they "considered the lilies of the field how they grow, and neither toil nor spin," are to be found in the back slums of Whitechapel and St. Giles', rather than in churches. And all human progress has been made by disobeying this precept. Those who (according to the Christ of the Gospels) act much more nobly than they who marry—those who "Make themselves eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake"—are confined chiefly to Priests and Nuns. They who "Swear not at all" are neither the God of the Old Testament, the Paul of the New, and but few of modern professing Christians. Even the New Testament Christ himself could not obey that part of Christianity which says, "Resist not evil," for he made a whip of cords and with it cleared the Temple. As has been well said by another, "To give one's cheek to the smiter, one's coat to the thief, one's life to the tyrant, is to make evil supreme and good impossible. It is to render the wicked (by successful villany) more wicked, and the penalty for being good too heavy for human goodness to endure." And (not to proceed further in detail) Theodore Parker—great admirer of Jesus as he was—has pretty conclusively shown that the teaching of the Jesus of the Gospels was mistaken in points of the greatest magnitude, in the character of God, the existence of the devil, the interpretation of the Old Testament, the doctrine of demons, in the celebrated prediction of his second coming and the end of the world within a few years. Further than this, Mr. Rathbone Greg, in the *Creed of Christendom*, has shown that the teaching of the Christ of the Gospels is defective in its self-interested motive for resignation, its view of forgiveness, its ascetic contempt for this world, its idea of the future life, and of heaven as God's dwelling place far inferior to the description of the Psalms and Job, its notion of compensation, of the un-changing character of future pains and pleasures, excluding the idea of progress, and of the eternal duration and physical nature of the pains of hell. Now are these mistaken, these untrue parts of the teaching of the historical Christ, parts of Christianity? Some say they are, some say they are not. Some say that to give up a single recorded statement of Christ's is to sacrifice a part of Christianity; others, that all these mistakes of the historical Jesus may be given up, and Christianity still remain intact. How are we to know which is right? We cannot know, we have no means of knowing, and therefore (through this avenue of the recorded teachings of Christ) we cannot enter into what is Christianity? Individual surmises, individual opinions, we may gain; but decisive knowledge, none whatever.

Another matter which ought to have some bearing upon this connection is the fact that Christianity, as Christ taught it, contained nothing that was original. This is a point to which I think our friends the Supernatural Revelationists ought to direct their attention a little more than they appear to do. I should like them to say how what Jesus taught could be a supernatural revelation when he taught it, and not a supernatural revelation when others taught it long before him. For we know of nothing in any of the kinds of Christianity held up before us which cannot be found outside Christianity altogether. Our friends the Textual Unitarians are fond of talking about "Christianity as Christ preached it." They might also speak of the self-same Christianity as preached by Democrates, Epictetus, Terence and many others. For I am ignorant of a single doctrine in the teachings of Christ which is not to be found elsewhere, as I am ignorant of a single example of his life which is not to be found in other lives. We are told that Jesus taught the fatherhood of God, so did Epictetus; the oneness of humanity, so did Terence; love of God and man and striving to be perfect even as God is perfect, so had many before him, the golden rule, so had Confucius; that goodness is the greatest of all treasures, so had Pythagoras; that men sin by lusting to do a thing as well as in doing it, so did Democrates. Equivalents of all he taught are to be found in the Jewish *Talmud*, even of the sentences of the Lord's Prayer. While his description of the last judgment is to be found almost word for word in Plato. And that "Christianity as Christ taught it" contains nothing not before known and taught, has been admitted in all ages since its introduction. Tindall proved "Christianity" to be "as old as creation." It was part of the policy of the early Christians to show that they were introducing no innovation. Lactantius declared that all the doctrines of Christianity were taught before Christ, but not before collected into one mass. Dr. Reginald Peacock, in the fifteenth century, wrote:—"Christianity added nothing at all except the sacraments; "which is equivalent to saying Christianity added nothing at all, for that it did not add the sacraments is quite certain. And as the prophet of the Absolute Goodness of God—Theodore Parker—has well summed up the matter, "The great doctrines of Christianity were known long before Jesus, for God did not leave man 4,000 years unable to find out his plainest duty. There is no precept of Jesus, no real duty commanded, no promise offered, no sanction held out which cannot be paralleled in writers

before him." But, if all this be true, what becomes of Christianity as a *separate* system, and who can possibly know it as such? Who can show us the *dividing line*—who tell us where Paganism ends and Christianity begins? Or what right has Christianity to arrogate to itself as its own what it has borrowed from previous systems? Why should men call themselves followers of Christ, when they are more truly followers of those of whom Christ himself was a follower? There may be satisfactory answers to these and similar questions which arise in this connection, but some of us have not yet heard of them, and their absence makes it still more impossible for us to know What is Christianity?

III. I remember some years ago, when I was myself being very much troubled about the question of this paper, and not knowing whether I was a Christian or not, seeing that I had ceased to believe in many of Christ's recorded teachings, I received great comfort from hearing a brother minister remark, "Whoever is Christlike is a Christian," and for sometime forward I rested in the position, CHRISTIANITY IS CHRIST-LIKENESS. That is a position of many Christians, notably that of men like Henry Ward Beecher. But, as I soon found, it is not a satisfactory—it is not a true position. For, first of all, if Christianity is likeness to Christ's good qualities, it must also be likeness to the self-same qualities when shown by other men; and as Christ did not show a single good quality which cannot be paralleled in others, Christianity on this hypothesis comes to mean not something new and distinct, but simply piety and benevolence—two things which it has no right whatever to arrogate to itself. Another difficulty occurs when we come to ask the question, In *what* are we to be like unto Christ? Are we to be like Christ in *all* he did, or only in those things we ourselves *think* good and excellent? Does the Christianity of Christ-likeness include cursing fig trees for not having fruit on them out of their season? Does it include whipping those we think impious with a whip of small cords? Does it include denouncing the inconsistent as "whited sepulchres," "hypocrites," and "generations of vipers?" Does it include saying to one's mother, when she has failed to appreciate him, "Woman, what have I to do with thee, mine hour is not yet come?" Does it mean that we are to tell women of other districts when they ask us for our benevolence, "It is not meet to take the meat of the children and cast it to the dogs?" Does it include that we are to exercise our powers so as to destroy 200 swine belonging to an unoffending man? Or does it mean that we are to be so little the friends of temperance as to produce 200 gallons of good wine for our guests after they have already well drunk? It appears to me that those who say Christianity is Christ-likeness—is having in us the mind and spirit which was in Christ Jesus—will find (as I did) some difficulty in disposing of questions such as I have just put. Some will say that Christianity does not include such conduct; others that the conduct was not what the words say, but something different. Some will say one thing about it, and some another; and we shall be driven to conclude that Christianity can no more be made into Christ-likeness than it can be made into Christology, or the teachings of Christ; or, that if it can be, there is no one can tell us what it truly is. And, once more, we have to satisfy ourselves by saying, What Christianity is, we cannot know.

IV. Now I will not waste your time by examining the plea—CHRISTIANITY IS WHAT THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH SAYS IT IS. If there was only the Roman Catholic Church in existence, this would deserve examination; but in the face of *sixty* different and differing Churches and sects, each claiming to have the nearest approach to Christianity in *its* doctrine, and in the face of the impossibility of anyone ever being able to know which one of them has the most right to what it claims, it must appear clear to all that it is hopeless to try to find out what is Christianity in that direction. A kindred plea, however, the plea that CHRISTIANITY IS WHAT ALL CHRISTIANS TEACH IN COMMON, is worth a remark or two. And the remark I make is, that what all Christians teach in common is Theism, pure and simple. For the moment you step beyond this—the moment you begin to say what Jesus was or did—what the Bible is,—the differences begin. Theism is the common Christianity, but what right have you to call Theism—that which is derived from the name of God—something lower than Christianity, that which is derived from the name of a man? As Theism is a much more euphonious term than Christianity, so it has a more just right to express what it represents.

V. Due limits will not permit me to notice all the assertions made as to what Christianity is, which I had intended. I will simply sum up those others by saying that their great underlying fallacy is that they claim that for Christianity which rightly belongs to religion. Now Christianity is not Religion. Whatever it is, it is simply a system of Religion; and Religion is more and higher than any (or all) systems of Religion. When the Rev. John Hunt in a recent magazine article said "Christianity is to do justly, love mercy, and to walk humbly with God," what right had he to call that which existed long before Christ was born, Christianity? When some of our friends say, CHRISTIANITY IS NOT A SYSTEM, BUT A SPIRIT AND A LIFE, are they not speaking of Religion itself rather than Christianity? Canon Barry is now preaching a course of sermons at King's College upon such topics as "Christianity an Intellectual Power," "Christianity a Moral Power," "Christianity a Spiritual Power." I imagine that if he were to say *Religion* is these different powers, he would more truly express what he means. Systems and theories are not the same with the powers they evoke or aid, any more than are spectacles the same with the eyes.

VI. In conclusion, Christianity either *can be* known, or it *cannot be* known. If it can be known it ought to be

an easy thing for a gathering of intelligent men like this to say clearly what it is. I venture to predict, however, that this meeting will not to-night succeed in defining what Christianity is, and if we met every night for a twelvemonth the result would be the same. We shall have Mr. A's Christianity, or Mr. B's Christianity, or Mr. C's Christianity, but what is Christianity will still remain unsolved. And why should we be so anxious to cling to the undefinable and non-understandable? Surely the terms "Religion" and "Religious Man" are much grander than the terms "Christianity" and "Christian." Why not keep to them? Doing this would give us width and depth, freedom and liberality. For historical *Religion* contains a larger affirmation than historical *Christianity*; the *brotherhood of prophets* than that of a *solitary revealer*; *progressive enlightenment* than *special revelations*; *evolution from the beginning* than *development from a single point of history*; *truth to be attained* than *truth once delivered*; *God incarnate in humanity* than *God incarnate in Christ*; the *inspiration of Reason* than *the inspiration of a few Apostles and Evangelists*; and *redemption by truth and love* than *redemption by Jesus*.

graphic border

Printed by Mills, Dick & Co., Stafford-St., Dunedin.

A Form of Thanksgiving and Prayer to Almighty God, Upon the Completion of Fifty Years Her Majesty's Reign;

To be Used

On Tuesday the 21st day of June next, and certain other days as herein appointed,

In all Churches and Chapels in ENGLAND and WALES, and in the Town of BERWICK-UPON-TWEED.

By Authority.

London: Printed by EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE, Printers to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty. 1887.

(Note.) This Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving is to be used either upon Tuesday the Twenty-first day of June next, or on any other day between the Twenty-first and the Twenty-eighth day of June inclusive.

And if it be used on *Sunday* the Twenty-sixth, then the whole, or else such parts as here are named, shall be used in addition to the ordinary service of the day, namely:—

After the Collect of the Day *the Third Prayer in this Office*, O Lord our God, Who upholdest.

After the General Thanksgiving *the First Thanksgiving in this Office*, Almighty God, we humbly offer.

Before the Prayer of St. Chrysostom *the Prayer*, Blessed Lord, the Prince.

In the end of the Holy Communion *the two last Prayers with the Benediction as here appointed*.

A Form of Thanksgiving and Prayer.

Priest. O Lord, open Thou our lips. *Answer.* And our mouth shall shew forth Thy praise. *Priest.* O Lord, save the Queen. *Answer.* And mercifully hear us when we call upon Thee. *Priest.* Praise ye the Lord. *Answer.* The Lord's name be praised.

Te Deum Laudamus.

WE praise thee, O God: we acknowledge thee to be the Lord.

All the earth doth worship thee: the Father everlasting.

To thee all Angels cry aloud: the Heavens, and all the Powers therein.

To thee Cherubin, and Seraphin: continually do cry,

Holy, Holy, Holy: Lord God of Sabaoth;

Heaven and earth are full of the Majesty: of thy Glory.

The glorious company of the Apostles: praise thee.

The goodly fellowship of the Prophets: praise thee.

The noble army of Martyrs: praise thee.

The holy Church throughout all the world: doth acknowledge thee;

The Father: of an infinite Majesty;

Thine honourable, true: and only Son;

Also the Holy Ghost: the Comforter.

Thou art the King of Glory: O Christ.

Thou art the everlasting Son: of the Father.

When thou tookest upon thee to deliver man: thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb.

When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death: thou didst open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers.

Thou sittest at the right hand of God: in the Glory of the Father.

We believe that thou shalt come: to be our Judge.

We therefore pray thee, help thy servants: whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood.

Make them to be numbered with thy Saints: in glory everlasting

O Lord, save thy people: and bless thine heritage.

Govern them: and lift them up for ever.

Day by day: we magnify thee;

And we worship thy Name: ever world without end.

Vouchsafe, O Lord: to keep us this day without sin.

O Lord, have mercy upon us: have mercy upon us.

O Lord, let thy mercy lighten upon us: as our trust is in thee.

O Lord, in thee have I trusted: let me never be confounded.

¶ *And after that these Prayers, all devoutly kneeling, the Minister first pronouncing with a loud voice,*

The Lord be with you.

Answer. And with thy spirit.

Minister. Let us pray.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Christ, have mercy upon us.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

OUR Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, As it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, The power, and the glory, For ever and ever. Amen.

Priest. O Lord, shew thy mercy upon us. *Answer.* *And grant us thy salvation.* *Priest.* O Lord, save the Queen; *Answer.* *Who putteth her trust in thee.* *Priest.* Send her help from thy holy place. *Answer.* *And evermore mightily defend her.* *Priest.* Let her enemies have no advantage against her. *Answer.* *Let not the wicked approach to hurt her.* *Priest.* Endue thy Ministers with righteousness. *Answer.* *And make thy chosen people joyful.* *Priest.* O Lord, save thy people. *Answer.* *And bless thine inheritance.* *Priest.* Give peace in our time, O Lord. *Answer.* *Because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only thou, O God.* *Priest.* Be unto us, O Lord, a strong tower; *Answer.* *From the face of our enemies.* *Priest.* O Lord, hear our prayer; *Answer.* *And let our cry come unto thee.*

¶ *Then shall the Priest say,*

ALMIGHTY God, we humbly offer unto Thy Divine Majesty our prayers and hearty thanksgivings for our gracious Sovereign Lady Queen VICTORIA, unto whom Thou hast accomplished full fifty years of Sovereignty. We praise Thee that through Thy grace She hath kept the charge Thou gavest Her in the day when Thou didst set the Crown upon Her head, bidding Her "to do Justice, stay the growth of iniquity, "and protect the Holy Church of God; to help "and defend widows and orphans; to restore the "things gone to decay, maintain the things that "are restored; punish and reform what is amiss, "and confirm what is in good order; to keep the "Royal Law and Lively Oracles of God. "We bless Thee that Thou hast heard, through sorrow and through joy, our prayer that She should alway possess the hearts of Her people. And we humbly pray Thee that for the years to come She may rejoice in Thy strength, and at the Resurrection of the Just enter into Thine immortal kingdom; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

ALMIGHTY God, who didst call Thy servant VICTORIA, our Queen, as at this time to the Throne of Her Ancestors in the governance of this Realm; we yield Thee humble thanks for the abundance of Dominion wherewith Thou hast exalted and enlarged Her Empire, and for the Love of Her in which Thou hast knit together in one the hearts of many nations; we praise Thee for the swift increase of knowledge with power, for the spreading of Truth and Faith in Her times, and gifts above all that we could ask or think. And humbly we beseech Thee that overmastering both sinful passion and selfish interest, and being protected from temptations and delivered from all evil, the unnumbered peoples of Her heritage may serve Thee, bearing one another's burdens and advancing continually in Thy perfect Law of Liberty; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

O LORD our God, Who upholdest and governest all things in heaven and earth; receive our humble prayers with our hearty thanksgivings, for our Sovereign Lady VICTORIA, as on this day set over us by Thy grace and providence to be our Queen; and so together with Her bless *Albert Edward* Prince of Wales, the Princess of Wales, and all the Royal Family, that they all, ever trusting in Thy goodness, protected by Thy power, and crowned with Thy grace and endless favour, may continue before Thee in health, peace, joy and honour, and live long and happy lives upon earth, and after death may obtain everlasting life and glory in the kingdom of heaven; by the merits and mediation of Christ Jesus our Saviour, Who with the Father and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. *Amen.*

¶ *Then shall be sung,*

Psalm xx. *Exaudiat te Dominus.*

THE Lord hear thee in the day of trouble: the Name of the God of Jacob defend thee;

2 Send thee help from the sanctuary: and strengthen thee out of Sion;

3 Remember all thy offerings: and accept thy burnt sacrifice;

4 Grant thee thy heart's desire: and fulfil all thy mind.

5 We will rejoice in thy salvation, and triumph in the Name of the Lord our God: the Lord perform all thy petitions.

6 Now know I, that the Lord helpeth his Anointed, and will hear him from his holy heaven: even with the wholesome strength of his right hand.

7 Some put their trust in chariots, and some in horses: but we will remember the Name of the Lord our God.

8 They are brought down, and fallen: but we are risen, and stand upright.

9 Save, Lord, and hear us, O King of heaven: when we call upon thee.

¶ *And then shall be read this Lesson,*

1 *Pet. ii. 6-18* [Behold, I lay ... Honour the King].

¶ *Here followeth a Hymn or Anthem.*

¶ *Which ended the Prayers following shall be said by the Minister,*

BLESSED Lord, the Prince of the Kings of the earth, Who callest Christian Princes to defend Thy faith, and maintain Thy spiritual kingdom; grant that no errors may disturb the Peace of Thy Church, nor causeless divisions weaken it. Give unto our Queen all heavenly graces, for the service of Thy true Religion and the hallowing of Thy Name among all nations. And that these blessings may be continued to after ages let there never be one wanting in Her House to receive the sceptre of our United Kingdom, that our posterity may see her children's children, and peace upon the Israel of God. *Amen.*

O GOD, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace; give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great danger we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord; that as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one Hope of our calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart and of one soul, united in one Holy Bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

GRANT, O Lord, we beseech Thee, that the course of this world may be so peaceably ordered by Thy governance that Thy Church may joyfully serve Thee in all godly quietness; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

THE peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord: and the Blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you and remain with you always. *Amen.*

Rome and Education. By Pastor Chiniquy.

Proceeds of Sale to be Devoted to Pastor Chiniquy's Mission to Roman Catholics in America.

Auckland: Printed by John Brame, "Free Press" General Printing Office. High-Street. 1880.

Rome and Education. By Pastor Chiniquy.

Proceeds of Sale to be Devoted to Pastor Chiniquy's Mission to Roman Catholics in America.

Auckland: Printed by John Brame, "Free Press" General Printing Office. High-Street. 1880.

Errata.

4th page, 1st column, 24th line from bottom: for "created," read attained only by education.

6th page, 2nd column, 3rd line from bottom: for "subject," read abject slaves.

7th page, 1st column, 12th line from bottom: for "intelligence," read intellectual.

7th page, 2nd column. 19th line from the top: for "*perinde acti*" read *perinde acsi*.

8th page, 2nd column, 12th line from the top: for "Montachert," read Montalambert.

9th page, 2nd column. 2nd line from the bottom: for "and for which," read out of which.

10th page, 2nd column, 11th line from the bottom: for new mark," read new mask.

12th page, 1st column. 28th line from the top: for "By the noble act," read By this noble act.

12th page, 2nd column, 25th line from bottom: for "a link," read a broken link.

13th page, 7th line from top: for "dispose," read depose.

Rome and Education.

Pastor Chiniquy Delivered this Lecture at Auckland, New Zealand, on Thursday Evening, January 8TH, 1880.

MY CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,—I have never felt the responsibility of my position more than this evening. The subject on which I am requested to speak is of vital importance: "Education in the Church of Rome Compared with Education Among: Protestants," or "Why do the Priests of Rome Hate our Schools?" This subject is vast as the great ocean which washes your shores; it is more profound than the mighty Pacific; it is limitless in its extent. My regret is that it is impossible to do justice to it in a single lecture. However, relying on the help of our great and merciful God, whose holy name has just been invoked through our Saviour, Jesus Christ, and remembering that I am not among strangers who will judge me with severity, but among brethren on the kind feelings of whom I can rely, I will do all I can to throw some new light on that momentous question which, to-day more than ever, does occupy the minds of the civilised world. Though born in Canada, I feel one of yourselves. Canada belongs to that Great Britain which is your fatherland. My ancestors were born, some in Spain, some in France, but my parents were born in Canada, like myself. I am, then, a British subject by my birth, like everyone of you. Hence, I am interested in your country, as being a part of that British Empire, the glorious flag of which floats over my native land and protects it. Our interests are akin: What injures one portion of the nation, injures the other parts; what affects the interests of a member of that great Empire, affects us all; for if you throw a stone in the waters of the mighty Pacific from this side of its shores, that stone will make rinks that will cross the Pacific and be felt on the other shore. You cannot do a wrong, or commit a sin against God here without spreading your sin all over the world. We are all responsible, to some extent, for each other's actions, and we are then bound to help each other when crossing the thorny path of this land of exile on our way to the shores of eternity. The word EDUCATION is a beautiful word. It comes from the Latin *educare*, which means to raise up, to take from the lowest degrees to the highest spheres of knowledge. The object of education is, then, to feed, expand, raise, enlighten, and strengthen the intelligence. You hear the Roman Catholic priests making use of that beautiful word education as often, if not more often than the Protestant. But that word "education" has a very different meaning among the followers of the Pope, than among the disciples of the Gospel. And that difference, which you Protestants ignore, is the cause of the strange blunders you make every time you try to legislate on that question, here, as well as in England or in Canada and the United States. The meaning of the word education among you Protestants is as far from the meaning of that same word among Roman Catholics as the southern pole is from the northern one. When a Protestant speaks of education, that word is used and understood in its true sense. When you I send your little boy to a Protestant school,; you honestly desire that he should be reared up in the spheres of knowledge as much as his intelligence will allow it. When that little boy has gone to school, he soon feels that he has been raised up to some extent, and he experiences a sincere joy, a noble pride, for this new, though at first very modest raising; but he naturally understands that this new and modest upheaval is only a stone to step on, and raise himself to a higher degree of knowledge, and he quickly makes that second step with an unspeakable pleasure. When the son of a Protestant has acquired a little knowledge, he wants to acquire more. When he has learned what *this* means, he wants to know what *that* means also. Like the young eagle, he trims his wings for a higher flight, and turns his head upwards to go farther up in the atmosphere of knowledge. A noble and mysterious ambition has suddenly seized his young soul. Then he begins to feel some thing of that unquenchable thirst for knowledge, which God himself has put in the breast of every child of Adam, a thirst of knowledge, however, which will never be perfectly realised except in heaven. When God created man in His own image, He endowed him with an intelligence and moral faculties worthy of the high, I was going to say the divine dignity of His own beloved children. He Himself put in us aspirations and instincts by which we were to be constantly longing after the oceans of light, truth, and knowledge, whose waves wash His eternal throne. It is that thirst after more knowledge, that constant longing after more light which constitutes the difference between man and brute. Man has received from God an intelligence which, though clouded by sin, is to him what the helm is to the noble ship which crosses your boundless ocean; he has a conscience; an immortal soul which binds him to God, and he feels it. His destinies are glorious, they are incommensurable, they are infinite, and he knows it. Though a

dethroned king, he feels that he is still a king. The six thousand years which have passed over him, have not yet effaced the kingly title which God Himself wrote on his forehead when he told him "Multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." (Gen 1-28.) With that glorious, that divine mission of subduing the air and the light, the wind and the waves, the seas and the earth, the roaring thunder and the flashing lightning, constantly before his eyes, man marches to the conquest of the world, with the calm certitude of his power, and the glorious aspirations of his royal dignity. The object of education, then, is to enable man to fulfil that kingly mission of ruling, subduing the world under the eyes of his Creator. Let us remember that it is not from himself, nor from any angel, but it is from God Himself that man has received that sublime mission. Yes, it is God Himself who has implanted in the bosom of humanity the knowledge and aspirations of those splendid destinies which can be created only by "Education." What a glorious impulse is this that seizes hold of the newly awakened mind, and leads the young intelligence to rise higher and pierce the clouds that hide from his gaze, the splendours of knowledge that lies concealed beyond the gloom of this nether sphere? That impulse is a noble ambition; it is that part of humanity that assimilates itself to the likeness of the great Creator; that impulse which education has for its mission to direct in its onward, and upward march, is one of the most precious gifts of God to man. Once more, the glorious mission of education is to foster these thirstings after knowledge and lead man to accomplish his high destiny. It ought to be a duty with both Roman Catholics and Protestants to assist the pupil in his flight towards the regions of science and learning. But is it so? No. When you Protestants send your children to school you put no fetters to their intelligence, they rise with fluttering wings day after day. Though their flight at first is slow and timid; how they feel happy at every new aspect of their intellectual horizon! How their hearts beat with an unspeakable joy, when they begin to hear voices of applause and encouragement from every side saying to them: "higher, higher, higher!" and when they shake their young wings to take a still higher flight, who can express their joy, when they distinctly hear again the voices of a beloved mother, of a dear father, of a venerable pastor, cheering them and saying: "Well done! higher yet my child, higher!" Raising themselves with more confidence on their wings, they then soar still higher, in the midst of the unanimous concert of the voices of their whole country encouraging them to the highest flight. It is then that the young man feels his intellectual strength ten-fold multiplied. He lifts himself on his eagle wings, with a renewed confidence and power, and soars up still higher with his heart beating with a noble and holy joy. For from the south and north, from the east and the west the echoes bring to his ears the voices of the admiring multitudes—"Rise higher, higher yet!" He has now reached what he thought at first to be the highest regions of thought and knowledge; but he hears again the same stimulating cries from below, encouraging him to a still higher flight towards the loftiest dominion of knowledge and philosophy, till he enters the regions where lies the source of all truth, and light and life. For he has also heard the voice of his God speaking through His Son Jesus Christ, crying: "Come unto me! Fear not! Come unto me! I am the light, the way! Come to this *higher* region where the Father, with the Son, and the Spirit reign in endless light!" Thus my friends, does the Protestant scholar, making use of his intelligence as the eagle of his wing, go on from weakness unto strength, from the timid flutter, to the bold, confident flight, from one degree to another, still higher; from one region of knowledge to another still higher, till he loses himself in that ocean of light and truth and life which is GOD! In the Protestant schools no fetters are put on the young eagle's wings, there is nothing to stop him in his progress, or paralyse his movements and upward flights. It is the contrary—he receives every kind of encouragement in his flight. Thus it is that the only truly *great* nations in the world are Protestants. Thus it is the truly *powerful* nations in the world are Protestants! Thus it is that the *only free* nations in the world are Protestants! The Protestant nations are the only ones that acquit themselves like men in the arena of this world: Protestant nations only, march as giants at the head of the civilized world. Everywhere they are the advanced guard in the ranks of progress, science, and liberty; leaving far behind the unfortunate nations whose hands and feet are tied by the ignominious iron chains of Popery. After we have seen the Protestant scholar raising himself, on his eagle wings to the highest spheres of intelligence, happiness, and light, and marching unimpeded towards his splendid destinies, let us turn our eyes towards the Roman Catholic student, and let us consider and pity him in the supreme degradation to which he is subjected. That young Roman Catholic scholar is born with the same bright intelligence as the Protestant one; he is endowed by his Creator with the same powers of mind as his Protestant neighbour; he has the same impulses, the same noble aspirations implanted by the hand of God in his breast. He is sent to school, apparently like the Protestant boy, to receive what is called "Education." He, at first understands that word in its true sense, he goes to school with the hope of being *raised*, elevated as high as his intelligence and his personal efforts will allow. His heart beats with joy, when at once, the first rays of light and knowledge comes to him, he feels a holy, a noble pride at every new step he makes in his upward progress, he longs to learn more, he wants to raise higher:—*he*, also, takes up his wings like the young eagle, and soars up higher. But here begin the disappointments and tribulations of the Roman Catholic student: for he is allowed to raise himself, yes,—but when he has raised himself high enough to be on a level with the big toes of the pope, he hears piercing, angry, threatening cries coming from every side:—"Stop! stop! Do not raise yourself higher

than the toes of the holy pope! . . . Kiss those holy toes, . . and stop your upward flight! Remember that the pope is the only source of science, knowledge and truth! . . . The knowledge of the Pope is the ultimate limit of learning and light to which humanity can attain. . . . You are not allowed to know and believe what his Holiness does not know and believe Stop!—Stop! Do not go an inch higher than the intellectual horizon of the supreme Pontiff of Rome, in whom only is the plenitude of the true science which will save the world." Some will perhaps answer me here: "Has not Rome produced great men in every department of science?" I answer yes. Rome can show us a long list of names which shine among the brightest lights of the firmament of science and philosophy. She can show us her Copernics, her Galileos, her Paschals, her Bossuets, her Laménais, etc., etc. But it is at their risk and peril that those giants of intelligence have raised themselves into the highest regions of philosophy and science. It is in spite of Rome that those eagles have soared up above the damp and obscure horizon where the pope offers his big toes to be kissed and worshipped as the *nee plus ultra* of human intelligence: and they have invariably been punished for their temerity. On the 22nd of June, 1663, Galileo was obliged to fall on his knees in order to escape the cruel death to which he was to be condemned by the order of the pope; and he signed with his own hand the following retraction: "I abjure, curse, and detest the error and heresy of the motion of the earth," etc., etc. That learned man had to degrade himself by swearing a most egregious lie, namely, that he would never say any more that the earth moved around the sun. Thus it is that the wings of that giant eagle of Rome were clipped by the scissars of the pope. That mighty intelligence was bruised, fettered, and, as much as it was possible to the Church of Rome, degraded, silenced, and killed. But God would not allow that such a giant intellect should be entirely strangled by the bloody hands of that implacable enemy of light and truth,—the pope. Sufficient strength and life had remained in Galileo to enable him to say, when rising up, "This will not prevent the earth from moving!" The infallible decree of the infallible pope, Urban VIII., against the motion of the earth, is signed by the Cardinals Felici, Guido, Desiderio, Antonio, Bellingerio, and Fabricicio. It says, "In the name and by the authority of Jesus Christ, the plenitude of which resides in His vicar, the pope, that the proposition that the earth is not the centre of the world, and that it moves with a diurnal motion is ABSURD, philosophically false, and erroneous in faith." What a glorious thing for the Pope of Rome to be infallible! He infallibly knows that the earth does not move around the sun! And what a blessed thing for the Roman Catholics to be governed and taught by such an *infallible* being! In consequence of that in-fallible decree, you will admire the following act of humble submission of two celebrated Jesuit astronomers, Lesueur and Jacquier: "Newton assumes in his third book the hypothesis of the earth moving around the sun. The proposition of that author could not be explained, except through the same hypothesis: we have, therefore, been forced to act a character not our own. *But we declare our entire submission to the decrees of the supreme Pontiffs of Rome, against the motion of the earth.*"—*Newtoni's Principia*, vol. iii. p. 450. Now, please tell me if the world has ever witnessed any degradation like that of Roman Catholics. I do not speak of the ignorant and unlearned, but I speak of the learned,—the intelligent ones. There you see Galileo condemned to goal because he had proved that the earth moved around the sun, and to avoid the cruel death on the rack of the holy Inquisition, if he does not retract, he falls on his knees, and swears that he will never believe it,—in the very moment that he believes it! He promises, under a solemn oath, that he will never say it any more, when he is determined to proclaim it again, the very first opportunity! And here you see two other learned Jesuits, who have written a very able work to prove that the earth moves around the sun: but, trembling at the thunders of the Vatican, which are roaring on their heads, and threaten to kill them, they say that they submit to the decrees of the Popes of Rome, against the motion of the earth: they tell a most contemptible and ridiculous lie to save themselves from the implacable wrath of that great light extinguisher, whose throne is in the city of the seven hills. Laménais, a Roman Catholic priest, who lived in this very century, was one of the most profound philosophers, and eloquent writers, which France; has ever had. But Laménais was publicly excommunicated, for having raised himself high enough in the regions of Gospel light, to see that "liberty of conscience" was one of the great privileges which Christ has brought from heaven for all the nations, and which He has sealed with His blood. No man has ever raided himself higher in the regions of thought and philosophy than Pascal; but the wings of that giant eagle were clipped by the pope. Pascal was an outcast in the Church of Rome. He lived and died an excommunicated man. Bossuet is the most eloquent orator which Rome has given to the world. But Veuillot, the editor of the *Univers* (the official journal of the Roman Catholic clergy of France), assures us that Bossuet was a disguised Protestant. If, at any step made by the Protestant through the regions of science and learning, he asks God or man to tell him how he can proceed any further without any fear of falling into some unknown and unsuspected abyss, both God and man tell him what Christ said to His apostles,—that he has eyes to see, ears to hear, and an intelligence to understand; he is reminded that it is with his own eyes, and not his neighbour's eyes, he must look; that it is with his own ears, and not with another one's ears he must hear; and that it is with his own intelligence, and not another's intelligence, he must understand. And when the Protestant has made use of his own eyes to see, and his own ears to hear, and his own intelligence to understand, he, nevertheless feels again his feet uncertain on the trembling waves of the mysterious and unexplored regions of

science and learning which spread before him as a boundless ocean. All the echos of heaven and earth bring to his ears the simple but sublime words of the Son of God:—"If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he, for a fish, give him a serpent? Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" Emboldened with this infallible promise of the Saviour which has enobled, and almost divinised him, the Protestant student has ceased to tremble and fear; a new strength has been given to his feet, and a new power to his mind. For he has gone to his Father for more light and strength. Nay! he has boldly asked, not only the assistance and the help of the Spirit of God, but the very presence of His Spirit in his soul to guide and strengthen him. The assurance that the Great God who has created heaven and earth is his Father, his loving Father, has absolutely raised him above himself; it has given a new, I dare say a divine impulse to all his aspirations for truth and knowledge. It has put in his breast the assurance that, sustained by the love, and the light, and the help of that great infinite eternal God, he feels himself as a giant able to cope with any obstacle. He does not any more walk, on his way to eternity, as a worm of the dust; a voice from heaven has told him that he was the child of God! Eternity, and not time, then becomes the limits of his existence, he is no more satisfied with touching with his hands and studying with his eyes the few objects which are within the limited horizon of his eyelid-vision. He stretches his giant hands to the boundless limit of the infinite, he boldly raises his feet and eyes from the dust of this earth to launch himself into the boundless oceans of the unknown worlds. He feels as if there was almost nothing beyond the reach of his intelligence, nothing to resist the power of his arms nothing to stop his onward progress towards the infinite, so long as the infallible words of Christ will be his compass, his light, and his strength. He will then touch the mountains and they will melt and bow down before him to let his iron and fiery chariot pass over the rocky mountains, 8,000 feet above the level of the sea. He will boldly ascend to the regions where the lightning and the storms reign, and, there, he will plunge his daring hands into the roaring clouds, and wrench the sparkle of lightning which will carry his message from one end to the other of this world. He will force the oceans to tremble and submit, as humble slaves, before those marvellous steam-engines which like giants, carry "floating cities" over all the seas in spite of the winds and the waves. Had the Newtons, the Franklins, the Fultons, the Morses, been Romanists, their names would have been lost in the obscurity, which is the natural heritage of the subject slaves of the popes. Being told from their infancy that no one had any right to make use of his "private judgment" intelligence and conscience in the research of truth, they would have remained mute and motionless at the feet of the modern and terrible God of Rome the pope. But they were Protestants! In that great and glorious word "Protestant" is the secret of the marvellous discoveries with which they have changed the face of the world. They were Protestants! yes, they had passed their young years in Protestant schools, where they had read a book which told them that they were created in the image of God, and that that great God had sent His eternal Son Jesus to make them free from the bondage of man. They had read in that Protestant book (for the Bible is the most Protestant book which exists in the world) that man had not only a conscience, but an intelligence to guide him; they had learned that that intelligence and conscience had no other master but God; no other guide but God; no other light but God. On the walls of their Protestant schools the Son of God had written the marvellous words: "I am the Light, the Way, the Life." But when the Protestant nations are marching with such giant strides to the conquest of the world, why is it that the Roman Catholic nations not only remain stationary, but give evidence of a decadence which is day after day more and more appalling and remediless? Go to their schools and give a moment of attention to the principles which are sown in the young intelligences of their unfortunate slaves, and you will have the key to that sad mystery. What is not only the first, but the daily school lesson taught to the Roman Catholic? Is it not that, one of the greatest, crimes which a man can commit is to follow his "private judgment? which means that he has eyes but he can not see, ears but he can not hear, and intelligence but he can not make use of it in the research of truth and light and knowledge without, danger to be eternally damned. His superiors—which means the priest and the pope—must see for him, hear for him, and think for him. Yes, the Roman Catholic is constantly told in his school that the most unpardonable and damnable crime is to make use of his own intelligence and follow *his private judgment* in the research of truth. He is constantly reminded that man's own private judgment is his greatest enemy. Hence, all his intelligence and conscientious efforts must be brought to fight down, silence, kill his "private judgment." It is by the judgment of his superiors—the priest, the bishop, and the pope—that he must be guided in everything. Now, what is a man who cannot make use of his "private personal judgment." Is he not a slave, an idiot, an ass. And what is a nation composed of men who do not make use of their private personal judgment in the research of truth and happiness, if not a nation of brutes, slaves and contemptible idiots? But as this will look like an exaggeration on my part, allow me to force the Church of Rome to come here and speak for herself. Please pay attention to what she has to say about the intellectual faculties of men. Here are the very words of the so-called Saint Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit Society: "As for holy obedience, this virtue must be perfect in every point, in execution, in will, in intellect; doing which is enjoined with all celerity, spiritual joy, and

preserverance; persuading ourselves that everything is just; suppressing every repugnant thought and judgment of one's own, in a certain obedience; and let every one persuade himself that he who lives under obedience, should be moved and directed under Divine Providence, by his superior, JUST AS IF HE WERE A CORPSE (*perinde acti cadaver esset*) which allows itself to be moved and led in every direction." Yes! Protestants, when you send your child to school it is that he may more and more understand the dignity of man. Your object is to enlighten, expand, and raise his intelligence. You want to give more light, more strength, more food, more life to that intelligence. But know it well, not from my lips, but from the solemn declaration of Rome. The young Roman Catholic goes to school not only that his intelligence may be fettered, clouded, and paralysed, but that it may be killed. (You have heard it.) It is only when he will be like a *corpse* before his *superior* that the young Roman Catholic will have attained to the highest degree of perfect manhood! Is not such a doctrine absolutely anti-Christian and anti-social? Is it not diabolical? Would not mankind become a flock of brute beasts if the Church of Rome could succeed in her plans of persuading every one of her hundred of millions of slaves to consider themselves as *cadavers*,—corpses in the presence of their superiors? Some one will, perhaps, ask me what can be the object of the popes and the priests of Rome in degrading the Roman Catholic in such a strange way that they turn them into moral corpses? What can be the use of those hundred of millions of corpses? Why not let them live? The answer is a very easy one: The great, the only object of the thoughts and workings of the priests and the pope, is to raise themselves above the rest of the world. They want to be high! high! high above the heads not only of the common people, but of the kings and emperors of the world. They want to be not only as high but higher than God. It is when speaking of the pope that the Holy Ghost says, "He opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped: so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."—2 Thes., ii. 4. To attain their object the priests have persuaded their millions and millions of slaves that they were mere corpses; that they had no will, no conscience, no intelligence of their own, just "as corpses which allow themselves to be moved and led in any way, without any resistance." When this has been once gained, they have made a pyramid of all those motionless, inert corpses which is so high, that though its feet are on the earth, the top goes to the skies, in the very abode of the old divinities of the Pagan world, and putting themselves and their popes at the top of that marvellous pyramid, the priests say to the rest of the world: "Who among you are as high as we are? Who has ever been raised by God as a priest and a pope? Where are the kings and the emperors whose thrones are as elevated as ours? Are we not at the very top of humanity?" Yes! yes! I answer to the popes and the priests of Rome, you are high, very high indeed! No throne on earth has ever been so sublime, so exalted as yours. Since the days of the towers of Babel the world has not seen such a huge fabric. Your throne is higher than any thing we know. But it is a throne of corpses!!! And if you want to know what other use is made of those millions and millions of corpses, I will tell it to you. There is no manure so rich as dead carcasses. Those millions of corpses serve to manure the gardens of the priests, the bishops and the popes, and make their cabbages grow! And what fine cabbages grow in the pope's garden. Is it not a lucky thing for the world in general, and for the Roman Catholics in particular, that though they are taught to become like corpses, to have no will, no understanding, no judgment of their own, in the presence of their superiors there are many who can never attain to that perfection of intellectual degradation and death! Yes, in spite of the efforts, in spite of the teachings of their Church, a few Roman Catholics retain some life, some will, some intelligence, some judgment of their own, which prevents them from becoming complete brutes. They now and then refuse to descend to the damp, dark, and putrid abode of the corpses. They want to breath the fresh and pure air of liberty which God has given to man. They raise their humiliated forehead from the ignominious tomb which their Church has dug for them and they give some signs of life. But at every such signs of life given by an individual, or by a people in the Church of Rome, be sure that you will see the flashing light and hear the roaring thunders of the Vatican directed against the rebel who dares to refuse to become a *corpse* before his superiors. It is for having shewn such signs of life and independence of mind that Galileo was sent to gaol and threatened to be cruelly tortured on the racks of the Inquisition in Italy, three hundred years ago. It is for having shown those symptoms of life, that only a few days ago, the honest Kenna, one of the most respected Roman Catholics of Bathurst, N.S. Wales, was excommunicated the day before his death, and had to be buried as a dog in his own field, for having refused to take away his children from an excellent grammar school, to obey the priest. It is for having dared to think for himself a few days before his death, that the amiable and learned Montalchert was considered as an outcast by the pope, who refused him the honor of public prayers in Rome after his death. But that you may better understand the degrading tendencies of the principles which are as the fundamental stone of the moral and intellectual education of Rome, let me put before your eyes another extract of the Jesuit teachings, which I take again from the "Spiritual Exercise," as laid down by their founder Ignatius Loyola: "That we may in all things attain the truth, that we may not err in any thing, we ought ever to hold as a fixed principle that what I see white I believe to be black, if the superior authorities of the Church define it to be so." You all know that it is the avowed desire of Rome to have public education in the hands of the Jesuits. She says every where that they are the best, the model teachers. Why so?

Because they more boldly and more successfully than any other of her teachers aim at the destruction of the intelligence and conscience of their pupils Rome proclaims everywhere that the Jesuits are the most devoted, the most reliable of her teachers, and she is right, for when a man has been trained a sufficient time by them, he most perfectly becomes a moral corpse. His superiors can do what they please with him. When he knows that a thing is white as snow, he is ready to swear that it is black as ink if his superior tells him so. But some among you may be tempted to think that these degrading principles are exclusively taught by the Jesuits, that they are not the teachings of the Church, and that I do an injustice to the Roman Catholics when I give as a general iniquity, what is the guilt of the Jesuits only. Listen to the words of that infallible pope, Gregory XVI., in his celebrated Encyclical of the 15th August, 1832. "If the holy church so requires, "let us sacrifice our own opinions, our know-ledge, *our intelligence*, the splendid dreams "of our imagination, and the most sublime "attainments of the human understanding. "It is when considering those anti-social principles of Rome that our learned and profound thinker Gladstone wrote, not long ago: "No more cunning plot was ever "devised against the freedom, the happiness "and the virtue of mankind than Romanism." (*Letter to Earl Aberdeen.*) Now Protestants do you begin to see the difference of the object of education between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic school? Do you begin to understand the truth of what I said, at the beginning of this address, that there is as great a distance between the word *Education* among you, and the meaning of the same word in the Church of Rome, than between the southern and the northern poles! By education you mean to raise man to the highest sphere of manhood. Rome means to lower him below the most stupid brutes. By education you mean to teach man that he is a free agent, that liberty within the limits of the laws of God, and of his country is a gift secured to every one; you want to impress every man with the noble thought that it is better to die a free man than to live a slave. Rome wants to teach that there is only one man who is free, the pope, and that all the rest are born to be his abject slaves in thought, will, and action. Now that you may still more understand to what bottomless abyss of human degradation and moral depravity these anti-christian and anti-social principles of Rome load her poor blind slaves—hear what Liguori says in his book "The Nun Sanctified": "The principle and most efficacious means of practising obedience due to superiors, and of rendering it meritorious before God, is to consider that in obeying them, we obey God Himself, and that by despising their commands, we despise the authority of our divine Master. When, thus, a religious receives a precept from her prelate, superior, or confessor, she should immediately execute it, *not only to please them*, but principally to please God, whose will is made known to her by their command. In obeying their command, in obeying their directions, she is more certainly obeying the will of God, than if an angel came down from heaven to manifest his will to her. Bear them always in your mind, oh! blessed sister, that the obedience which you practise to your superior is paid to God. If then, you receive a command from one who holds the place of God, you should observe it with the same diligence as if it came from God Himself. Blessed Egidius used to say that it is more meritorious to obey man for the love of God than God Himself. It may be added that there is more certainty of doing the will of God by obedience to our superior than by obedience to Jesus Christ, should he appear in person and give his commands. St. Phillip Neri used to say that religious shall be most certain of not having to render an account of the actions performed through obedience; for these, the superiors only who commanded them shall be held accountable." The Lord said, once, to St. Catharine of Sienne, "Religious will not be obliged to render an account to *me* of what they do through obedience, for that I will demand an account from the superior. This doctrine is conformable to Sacred Scripture: Behold says the Lord, as clay is in the potter's hand, so are you in my hands, oh! Israel! (Jeremiah xviii—6) Religious must be in the hands of the superiors to be moulded as they will, shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it what art thou making? The potter ought to answer, 'Be silent, it is not your business to inquire what I do, but to obey and to receive whatever form I please to give you.'" I ask of you, Protestants, what will become of your fair country if you were blind enough to allow the Church of Rome to teach the children of New Zealand? What kind of men and women can come out of such schools? What future of shame, degradation, and slavery you prepare for your country, if Rome does succeed in forcing you to support such schools. What kind of women would come out from the schools of nuns who would teach them that the highest pitch of perfection in a woman is when she obeys her superior, the priest *in every thing he commands* her! that your daughter will never be called to give an account to God for the actions she will have done to please and obey her superior, the priest, the bishop, or the pope? That the affairs of her conscience will be arranged between God and that superior, and that she will never be asked why she had done this or that, when it will be to gratify the pleasures of the superior and obey his command that she has done it. Again, what kind of men and citizens will come out from the schools of those Jesuits who believe and teach them that a man has attained the perfection of manhood only when he is a perfect spiritual corpse before his superior; when he obeys the priest with the perfection of a *cadavers*, that has neither life nor will in itself. But you will be tempted to think that this perfect blind obedience to the priest, which is the corner-stone of the Roman Catholic education, is required only in spiritual matters; yes! but you must not forget that, in the Church of Rome, every action of the private or public life belongs to the spiritual sphere which the superior only must rule. For

instance, a Roman Catholic has not the right to select the teacher of his boy, nor the school where he will send him, he must consult his priest, and if he dares to act in a different way from what his priest has told him in the selection of that teacher or that school, he is excommunicated and damned, as Mr. Kenna has been lately at Bathurst. If he votes according to his own private judgment for Mr. Johns, instead of Mr. Thompson, the selected member of the bishop and the priest, he is damned and considered as a rebel against his Holy Church, and for which there is no salvation. The Church of Rome's only object in giving what she calls education is to teach her slaves that they must obey their superiors in every thing as God himself. All the rest of her teaching is only a mask to conceal her plans. History is never taught in her schools; what she calls history is a most shameful string of falsehoods. Of course she does not dare to say a word of truth about her past struggles against the great principles of light and liberty, when she covered the whole of Europe with tears, blood, and ruins. Writing, reading, arithmetic, geography, and grammar are taught to a certain degree in her schools, but all these teachings are nothing else but covered roads through which the priest wants to reach the citadel of the heart and intelligence of his poor victim, and take an absolute possession of them. Those things are taught every day only to have a daily opportunity to persuade the pupil that he must never make any use of his private judgment in anything, and that he must submit his intelligence, his conscience, his will, to the intelligence, conscience and will of his superior, if he wants to save himself from the eternal fire of hell. He is constantly told what I have been told a thousand times myself, when studying in the college of St. Nicholas: That those who obey their superiors in every thing, will not be called to give an account of their actions to their Supreme Judge, even if those actions were bad in themselves,—for as Liguori told you, a moment ago:—"Whosoever obeys his superior, for the love of God, obeys God "Himself and that there are more merits "to obey one's own superior than God "Himself." The Church of Rome shows her great wisdom in enforcing that dogma of the entire and blind subjection of the will and intelligence of the inferior to the superior. For the very moment that a Roman Catholic thinks that it is his right and sacred duty to follow the dictates of his own conscience and intelligence, he is lost to the Church of Rome. It is only when a man has entirely silenced, and absolutely killed his intelligence;—it is only when he has become a perfect moral corpse,—that he can believe that his priest, even his drunken priest, has the power to change a wafer, or any other piece of bread into the great God, for whom and by whom everything has been created. It is only when the intelligence of man has become a dead carcass that he can believe that a miserable sinner has the supreme power to force the Son of God to come, in His divine and human person, into his vest or pants' pockets to follow him every-where he wants to go, even to the bar of the low tavern, that He may become his companion of debauch and drunkenness. Do you see, now, why the Church of Rome cannot let her poor young slaves go to your schools? In your schools, the first thing you inculcate to the pupil is that his intelligence is the great gift of God, by which man is distinguished from the brute; that he must enlighten, form, feed, cultivate his intelligence, which is to him what the helm is to the ship, Christ, with His holy Word, being the pilot. You see, now, why the Church of Rome abhors your schools. It is because you want to make *men*, and she wants to make *brutes*. You want to raise men to the highest sphere to which his intelligence can allow him to reach; she wants to keep him in the dust, at the feet of the priests: you want to form free citizens, she wants to form abject and obedient slaves of the priests; you teach man to keep his sacred promises and stand by his oath, she teaches him that the Pope has the right to dissolve the most sacred promises, and to annul all his oaths, even the oath of allegiance to his Queen and his country. You tell your pupils that so long as they will keep themselves within the limits of the laws of their country, they are responsible only to God for their consciences. They tell their pupils that it is not to God but to the priest he must go to give an account of his conscience. You teach your pupils that the laws of God only bind the conscience of man;—they tell them that it is the laws of the Church which means the *ipse dixit* of the pope which binds their consciences. You teach the student that every man has the right to choose his religion according to his conscience. She positively says that no man has the right to choose his religion according to his conscience. It is evident that the Church of Rome would be dead tomorrow, if to-day she would allow her children to attend schools where they would learn to follow the dictates of their conscience, and listen to the voice of their intelligence. But she is too shrewd to avow before the world the real reasons why she wants, at any cost, to prevent her children from attending your schools. And it is here she shows her profound and diabolical cunning. Though she is the most deadly enemy of liberty of conscience, though she has, time after time, anathematized liberty of conscience as one of Satan's schemes, she suddenly steps on, as the great friend and apostle of liberty of conscience, and under that new mark she approaches your legislators with great airs of dignity and says: "We are happy to live in a country where liberty of conscience is secured to every citizen. It is in its sacred name that we respectfully approach your honorable legislature to ask: First, to be exempted from sending our children to the Government schools. Second, to have the money we want from the public treasury in order to support our own schools. For two reasons: First, you read the Bible in your schools, and it is against our conscience to let our children read your Bible. Second, you have some prayers at the beginning and some religious hymns sung at the end of the hours of school, and it is against our conscience to allow the children of the Church of Rome to

join you in those prayers and hymns." The legislators, who for the greater part, are too honourable men to suspect the fraud, are won by the air of candour and honesty of the Roman Catholic petitioners. Considering the great benefit which will come to the country if all the children are taught in the same school, they are soon ready to make any sacrifice in order to have the Roman Catholic and the Protestant children under the Same roof, to receive the same light and the same moral food and same instruction. As true patriots, the legislators understand that if they wish their beloved country to be strong and happy, the first thing they must do is to make the young generation one in mind, in heart. If the Protestants and Roman Catholic children are taught in the same school, they will know each other and love each other when young, and those sacred ties of friendship which will bind them in the spring of life, will be strengthened when their reason will be matured and enlightened by a good education under the same respected and worthy teachers. As Christian men, the legislators would perhaps like to keep the Bible, and have short prayers in the schools; but as patriots they feel that those things, though good and sacred, are an unsurmountable barrier to the Roman Catholic. The delicate conscience of the bishops and priests cannot allow such things in the school attended by their lambs! Through respect for the sacred rights of the Roman Catholic conscience, the legislators throw the Bible overboard, and they say to God: "Please get out from our schools, and do excuse us if we order our school teachers to ignore your existence!" They say to Jesus Christ: "We have not forgotten your sublime and touching words 'Suffer little children to come unto me.' No doubt, you would like to press our dear little ones on your loving heart, and bless them for a moment in the schools; but we cannot allow them to go so near to you in the school, we cannot even allow them to speak to you a single word there. Please be not offended if we turn you out from those very schools where you were so welcome formerly. We are forced to that sad extremity through the respect we owe to the tender consciences of our fellow citizens of the Church of Rome. You know that they cannot allow their children to speak to you together with ours." But when those awful, not to say sacreligious sacrifices have been made by the Protestant legislators to appease the implacable god of Rome,—when, through respect for the scruples of the bishops and priests of Rome, the great God of heaven with His Son Jesus Christ have been unceremoniously turned out from the schools—when the Word of God has been prohibited, and that the Bible is thrown overboard, is the Moloch god appeased?—will the Roman Catholic bishop and priests tell their children that they may unite with yours to go and receive education from the same teachers? No! But assuming, then, a sublime air of indignation, they turn against you as mad dogs, they call your schools *Godless schools!* good only to form thieves, infidels, and atheists! Do you see now that all those dignified scruples of conscience about reading the Bible, praying with you, &c., were only a mask to deceive you, and make you fall into a snare? Do you not perceive now that they did not care a straw for the Bible and the prayers in the schools, but they; wanted your legislators to compromise themselves before the Christian world, loose their moral strength in the eyes of a great part of the nation, divide your ranks, your means, your strength, and beat you on that great question of education. They will take such airs of martyrs when you will try to force their children to your schools that many honest and unsuspecting Protestants will be completely deceived by them. At first they could not, they said, trust the children to your hands, because you read the Word of God, you prayed and blessed God in the school. But now that the Bible and God are turned out from the schools, they baptise them by the most ignominious names which can be given—they call them "Godless schools!" Have you ever seen a more profoundly ignominious and sacreligious trick? Will not your legislators open their eyes to that strange act of deception, of which they are the victims? Will they not come out quickly from the trap laid before them by the bishops and the priests of Rome? Yes! Let us hope that your patriots and Christian legislators will soon understand that they owe a reparation to God and to their country; with unanimous voice they will ask pardon from God for having expelled Him from the very place, where He has most right to reign supremely—the school. For what is a school without God in its midst to sit as a father, and to form the young hearts and evoke the young intellect. What is a boy? what is a girl? what is a woman or a man without God? what is a family, what is a people without God? It is a monstrosity, it is a body without life, it is a world without light, it is a cistern without water. Let us hope that before long your patriotic and Christian legislators, will remember that the Bible is the foundation of the greatness of England. Do not forget it Protestants It is to the Bible that England owes her liberty, her power, her prestige, her strength. It is the Bible that has ennobled the hearts of your heroes, improved the minds of your poets and orators, and strengthened the arms of your warriors; yes! it is because your soldiers have brought with them, everywhere, the Bible, pressed on their hearts, that they have conquered the world. So long as England will be true to the Bible, her glorious banners will flash respected and feared all over the sea and over all the continents of the world. Let the disciples of the Gospel, the children of God, and the redeemed of Christ all over the fair and noble country you inhabit hasten to request their legislators to invite the Saviour of the world to come back and bless their dear children in the school. For it is not only in your homes and your churches that Jesus tells you "Suffer little children to come unto me." It is particularly in the school. Oh! give two or three minutes to those dear little ones that they may press themselves on his bosom, bless Him for having saved them on the cross, and proclaim His mercies by the singing one of

those hymns which they like so much. By the noble act of national reparation you will take away from the hands of the priests the only weapon with which they can hurt you, you will destroy the only argument they use with a true force against your schools when they call them godless schools. Do not fear any more the priests and the prelates of Rome. Do not yield any more and give up your privilege to please them and reconcile them to your schools. You will never be able to reconcile them to your schools—for there is light in your schools—and they want the darkness. There is freedom and liberty in your schools—they want slavery—there is life in your school—and it is only on dead corpses that their church can have a chance to live a few years more. You see by a sad experience that their scruples of conscience against the Bible and true grayer of the school are more hypocrisy just thrown into the eyes of the public. Do not say with some honest, but deluded Protestants: Is it not enough that that child should learn his religion at home? No, it is not enough, for it is in our nature that we want two witnesses to believe a thing. What comes to our mind only through one witness, remains uncertain; but let two good witnesses confirm a fact, and then we accept it. Your child wants two witnesses to believe the necessity of the sacredness of religion. His Christian homo is surely a good witness to your child, but it is not enough; what he has heard from you, must be confirmed by his school teacher. Without this second witness, nine times out of ten your children will be sceptics and infidels. Besides that, the very idea of God brings with it the obligation to bless, love, and adore Him everywhere. The moment you take your child to a place where not only he cannot love, bless, and adore God, but where the adoration and the praise of God are forbidden, you entirely destroy the idea of God from the mind and the heart of your child. You make him believe that what you have told him when at home, of God, is only a fable to amuse and deceive him. Do you see that noble ship in the midst of yon splendid harbour, how she is tossed by the foaming waves, how she is beaten by the furious winds? What does prevent that ship from flying before the storm and running a shore a miserable wreck? What does prevent her from being dashed on that rock? The anchor, yes, the anchor is her safety. But let a single link of the chain that binds the ship to her anchor break, will she not soon be dashed on the rock and broken to pieces, and sink to the bottom of the sea? It is so with your child! So long as his intelligence and his heart is united to God by the anchor of faith, he will nobly stand against the furious waves, he will nobly fight his battles, but let the school teacher be silent about God, and here is a link, and the child will be a wreck. Do not fear the priest, but fear God! Do not try any more to please the priests, but do all in your power to please your great and merciful God, not only in your homes, but also in your schools, and those schools will become more than ever a focus of light, an inexhaustible source of intellectual and moral strength—more than ever your children will learn in the school to be your honour and your glory, and your joy. They will learn that they are not ignoble worms of the dust whose existence will end in the tomb, but that they are immortal as God, whoso beloved children they are. They will learn how to serve their God and love their country. Be not ashamed, but be proud to send your children to schools where they will learn how to be good Christians and good citizens. When you will have finished your pilgrimage, they will be your worthy successors, and the God whom they will have learned to fear, serve, and love in the school will help them to make your beautiful New Zealand, great, happy, and free.

A Romish Bishop's Testimony.

THE *Kankakee Times* publishes the following communication from a member of the Illinios Bar. Though perhaps containing nothing new or strange to those who have studied the matter, the statement made may convince such Protestants as imagine the Church of Rome to be a harmless institution, of their great error. The principles of the Papal hierarchy remain unchanged. The wearer of the Tiara would as readily dispose for simple heresy, any temporal ruler of to-day, as his predecessor, six centuries ago, deposed and deprived of his estates, Count Raymond of Toulouse, for a like crime. Religious liberty is both hated and dreaded by a Church which claims the right of enforcing its spiritual decrees by the assistance of the secular arm:—

In one of your past issues, you told your readers that the Rev. Mr. Chiniquy had gained the long and formidable suit instituted by the Roman Catholic Bishop to dispossess him and his people of their Church property. But you have not given any particulars about the startling revelations the Bishop had to make before the Court, in reference to the still existing laws of the Church of Rome, against those whom they call heretics. Nothing, however, is more important for every one than to know precisely what those laws are.

As I was present when the Roman Catholic Bishop Foley, of Chicago, was ordered to read in Latin, and translate into English those laws I have kept a correct copy of them, and I send it to you with a request to publish it.

The Rev. Mr. Chiniquy presented the works of St. Thomas and St. Liguori to the Bishop, requesting him to say, under oath, if those works were or were not among the highest theological authorities in the Church of Rome, all over the world. After long and serious opposition on the part of the Bishop to answer, the Court

having said he (the Bishop) was bound to answer, the Bishop confessed that those works were looked upon as among the highest authorities, and that they are taught and learned in all the colleges and universities of the Church of Rome as standard works.

Then the Bishop was requested to read in Latin and translate into English the following laws and fundamental principles of action against the heretics, as explained by St. Thomas and Liguori:—

- "An excommunicated man is deprived of all civil communication with the faithful, in such a way, that if he is not tolerated, they can have no communication with him, as it is in the following verse: 'It is forbidden to kiss him, pray with him, salute him, to eat or do any business with him.'"—St. Liguori, vol. 9, page 162.
- "Though heretics must not be tolerated because they deserved it, we must bear them till, by a second admonition, they may be brought back to the faith of the Church. But those who, after a second admonition, remain obstinate in their errors, must not only be excommunicated, but they must be delivered to the secular power to be exterminated."
- "Though the heretics who repent must always be accepted to penance, as often as they have fallen, they must not, in consequence of that, always be permitted to enjoy the benefits of this life When they fall again, they are permitted to repent but the sentence of death must not be removed."—St. Thomas, vol. 4, page 91.
- "When a man is excommunicated for his apostacy, it follows from that very fact, that all those who are his subjects are released from the oath of allegiance by which they are bound to obey him."—St. Thomas, vol. 4, page 94.

The next document of the Church of Rome brought before the Court was the act of the Council of Lateran, A.D., 1215:—

"We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy that exalts itself against the holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith, condemning all heretics, by whatever name they may be known—for though their faces differ, they are tied together by their tails. Such as are condemned are to be delivered over to the existing secular powers, to receive due punishment. If laymen, their goods must be confiscated. If priests, they shall be first degraded from their respective orders, and their property applied to the use of the Church in which they have officiated. Secular powers of all ranks and degrees are to be warned, induced, and, if necessary, compelled by ecclesiastical censures, to swear that they will exert themselves to the utmost in the defence of the faith and extirpate all heretics denounced by the Church, who shall be found in their territories. And whenever any person shall assume Government, whether it be spiritual or temporal, he shall be bound to abide by this decree.

"If any temporal lord, after having been admonished and required by the Church, shall neglect to clear his territory of heretical depravity, the Metropolitan and the Bishops of the province shall unite in excommunicating him. Should he remain contumacious a whole year, the fact shall be signified to the Supreme Pontiff, who will declare his vassals released from their allegiance from that time, and will bestow his territory on Catholics, to be occupied by them, on the condition of exterminating the heretics and preserving the said territory in the faith.

"Catholics who shall assume the cross for the extermination of heretics shall enjoy the same indulgences and be protected by the same privileges as are granted to those who go to the help of the Holy Land. We decree further, that all who may have dealings with heretics, and especially such as receive, defend, or encourage them, shall be excommunicated. He shall not be eligible to any public office. He shall not be admitted as a witness. He shall neither have the power to bequeath his property by will, nor to succeed to any inheritance. He shall not bring any action against any person, but anyone can bring action against him. Should he be a judge, his decision shall have no force, nor shall any cause be brought before him. Should he be an advocate, he shall not be allowed to plead. Should he be a lawyer, no instruments made by him shall be held valid, but shall be condemned with their author."

The Roman Catholic Bishop swore that these laws had never been repealed, and, of course, that they were still the laws of his Church. He had to swear that, every year, he was bound, under pain of eternal damnation, to say in the presence of God, and to read in his Brevarium (his prayer-book) that "God Himself had inspired" what St. Thomas had written about the manner in which the heretics shall be treated by the Roman Catholics.

I will abstain from making any remarks on these startling revelations of that Roman Catholic high authority. But I think it is the duty of every citizen to know what the Roman Catholic Bishops and Priests understand by liberty of conscience. The Roman Catholics are as interested as the Protestants to know precisely what the teachings of their church are on that subject of liberty of conscience, and hear the exact truth, as coming from such a high authority that there is no room left for any doubt.

STEPHEN MOORE, Attorney.

graphic border

PRINTED BY JOHN BRAME, "FREE PRESS" OFFICE, HIGH-STREET, AUCKLAND, N.Z. 1880.

As the Chapels settled upon this Plan will be by reference to the MODEL DEED, it is necessary that one of the printed Copies of this Deed should be kept by the Trustees of every Chapel with their Trust-Deed.

Copies of the MODEL DEED may be had at the Book-Room.

A Summary of the Proceedings of the Committee

Appointed by the Conference to Enquire into the Eligibility of

A Plan for the Settlement of

Methodist Chapels, &c.

With a Correct Copy of the Model Deed

Adopted by the Committee, and

A Precedent of a Conveyance of Freehold Referring to the Model Deed.

London: Published by John Mason, 14, City-Road; Sold at 66, Paternoster-Row. 1847.

London: Printed by James Nichols, Hoxton-Square.

A Summary, &c.

THE necessity for a more efficient mode than any which had hitherto been adopted for the settlement of the numerous chapels in the Methodist Connexion, having been long very generally felt and admitted, and a Plan having been proposed with a view to obviate, for the future, the inconvenience, expense, and insecurity to which Trustees of chapels and the Connexion at large had in many instances been exposed; the Conference held at Sheffield in the year 1829, appointed a Committee to inquire into its eligibility, with power, if they thought fit, to take such measures as might facilitate its execution.

This Committee met in London shortly after their appointment. That they might tread on sure ground, and be perfectly satisfied of the legal security of the proposed Plan, they directed a Case to be prepared and laid separately before four of the most eminent Counsel in London. The gentlemen selected were, Sir Edward Burtenshaw Sugden, His Majesty's Solicitor General; Mr. Bell, Mr. Brodie, and Mr. Atherley. The following "Case," in which the proposed Plan and its objects are detailed, and the questions thereupon framed, with a view to elicit any objection which might exist, or be urged, against it, was accordingly drawn, and four copies of it laid separately before them.

The Case.

IN the early part of the last century, the Rev. John Wesley established a religious Society then and since called "Methodists;" and from time to time appointed many persons from among them to be their Preachers.

In the year 1744, Mr. Wesley invited several of the Preachers to meet him in London, to *confer* upon the doctrines and discipline which they ought to teach and adopt, and upon other measures relating to the Society. Similar meetings for the same purposes were afterwards held annually, and obtained the name of "*The Yearly Conference of the People called Methodists.*"

In order to define this designation, and to perpetuate the "*Conference*," Mr. Wesley executed a Deed Poll, (a copy of which is left herewith,) bearing date the 28th day of February, 1784, under his hand and seal, and enrolled in His Majesty's High Court of Chancery, and thereby declared that "*the Conference of the People called Methodists*" did and should consist of one hundred persons therein named; and he provided, in the said Deed Poll, Rules for their conduct,—for the appointment of Preachers to the various chapels,—and especially for filling up vacancies occasioned by death or otherwise in the said "Conference" for ever.

The Conference continued to hold its sittings annually till Mr. Wesley's death in the year 1791, and ever since to the present year, under the authority and regulations of the above-mentioned Deed Poll.

The vast increase of the Methodist Society has rendered a proportionate addition to the number of their chapels necessary for their accommodation; and for several years past from fifty to eighty have been annually erected.

It has been usual to convey these chapels to the use of Trustees, their heirs and assigns, upon Trust to permit the Preachers appointed by "*the Conference*" to preach, &c., therein, and no others without the consent of one of the Preachers annually appointed by the "*Conference*" and called the "*Superintendent*," with a proviso that no person whosoever shall preach therein any other doctrines than such as are contained in certain publications therein referred to.

In a religious Society so constituted, numerous and perpetuated, it is obviously matter of great moment, to attain uniformity in the Deeds of Settlement and Declarations of Trusts of their chapels; the objects of which are, 1st, Effectually to vest the legal Estate in the Trustees; 2d, To secure the use of the chapels to the Preachers

appointed by the "*Conference*;" 3d, To provide for maintaining and perpetuating the purity of the doctrines preached therein, and to accomplish these objects in a manner most to the mutual security and advantage of the *Trustees*, the "*Conference of Preachers*," and the *People* under their care.

It is therefore proposed to convey (by Lease and Release) a piece of Freehold Ground to the use of Trustees, their heirs and assigns, upon Trust, for the purposes and with the provision above-mentioned, with all such powers, authorities, clauses, and declarations, as a Deed of that nature ought to contain; and after it has been duly stamped, executed, and acknowledged, to cause it to be enrolled in Chancery, pursuant to Statute 9, Geo. II., cap. 36.

And as well to prevent needless expense, as for the purposes before-mentioned, it is also secondly proposed, in all subsequent deeds for the same purpose, to convey the Estate in the land and chapel to be settled in like manner, to the use of Trustees, their heirs and assigns; but instead of going through and inserting the Trusts, powers, clauses, and declarations at length, to declare by sufficient words, that the Trustees, &c., shall hold the premises upon such and the like Trusts, &c., &c., as are expressed, contained, and declared in the first-mentioned proposed deed; referring to the date, parties, and enrolment, so as to identify it. Every such subsequent deed to be stamped with a stamp or stamps sufficient to cover the matter actually contained therein, but not with additional stamps for the matter only referred to; and after due execution and acknowledgment to be enrolled pursuant to the above-named Statute.

Your Opinion is Requested

- WHETHER or not the Trusts, &c., expressed in the Deed to be referred to, can be attached to such subsequent Deeds by *reference only*, without actually transcribing them in such subsequent Deeds; and whether the Trustees, under the subsequent Deeds, will not hold the Estates subject to the Trusts, &c., expressed in the Deed referred to?
- Will a Stamp or Stamps sufficient to cover the matter actually contained in any such subsequent Deed, be sufficient without stamping it with the additional Stamps which would be necessary if the matter referred to were actually transcribed therein?
- Whether or not the Deed referred to and containing the Trusts, &c., at length, will be good Evidence in Court, if required, of the Trusts, &c., upon which such subsequent Estates are settled?
- Will it be necessary or expedient to make the "Superintendant," or any other member of the Conference, as the President for the time being, a party on behalf of the "*Conference*" to all or any of the proposed Deeds or not? And,
- Please to state any difficulties or inconveniences (if any), likely to arise from the adoption of the above Plan, and to advise generally thereon.

The Opinion of Sir E. B. Sugden, in Consultation with Mr. Matthews.

In cases of this kind, it is usual for His Majesty's Attorney or Solicitor General, to be attended in consultation by a junior Counsel.

- WE think they can be so attached; and that the Trustees of the subsequent deeds will hold their Estates subject to the Trusts contained in the Deed referred to.
- We think that a Stamp or Stamps, sufficient to cover the matter actually contained in such subsequent Deeds, will be sufficient.
- We think it will be good Evidence, and that a Court of Equity will enforce the execution of the Trusts contained therein.
- We do not think it necessary; but if it can be uniformly done, it may be as well to do it.
- We have not any further observations upon the subject to offer.

Edward B. Sugden,
Lincoln's Inn.
Feb. 18th, 1830.
Richard Matthews,

4, *Brick-Court, Temple.*

The Opinion of Mr. Brodie.

- It will be sufficient in every subsequent Deed to refer to the original Deed; and the Trustees will hold the Estates comprised in each subsequent Deed upon the Trusts of the original Deed.
- Every subsequent Deed should be stamped only according to the number of words it contains. It will not require additional Stamps for the matter referred to.
- The Deed referred to will be good Evidence of the Trusts referred to, in the subsequent Deed.
- It does not appear to me to be necessary to make the Superintendant, or President for the time being, a party to any of the proposed Deeds.
- Whenever it should be necessary to produce evidence of the Trusts referred to in the subsequent Deeds, the original Deed containing the Trusts referred to, or, in case of the loss of that Deed, an Office Copy of the Inrolment, must be produced.

T. B. Brodie.

Lincoln's-Inn Fields, March 1st, 1830.

THE opinions of Mr. Bell and Mr. Atherley are both to the same effect. On that account, and because they are given at very considerable length, it is thought not necessary to insert them.

Fortified by these concurring authorities, the Committee no longer felt any hesitation to proceed, and, accordingly, forthwith directed Counsel to prepare the Draft of a Deed which might serve as a Model to be referred to by subsequent Deeds in pursuance of the Plan detailed in the Case.

This Draft, together with the Case, and all the Opinions, was submitted to the Conference held in Leeds in the year 1830; when the Conference unanimously adopted the Plan, and re-appointed the Committee with power to complete and carry it into execution.

That the Draft might receive the attention due to so important a measure, the Committee directed it to be printed, and about fifty copies to be sent to various persons, with a request that they would carefully examine and then return them to the Committee, with such remarks and suggestions as in their opinion might tend to render it more perfect.

The observations thus obtained led to several verbal alterations, as well as to the introduction of some new matter; and the Draft having been again considered by the Committee, about the same number of corrected copies were again distributed, and the attention of the persons to whom they were sent, was particularly directed to those points and clauses respecting which, any doubt was still entertained. On the receipt of these second observations, the Draft was again carefully examined, and a few further verbal alterations and an improved arrangement of some of the clauses adopted.

The Committee then directed two fair copies to be made, and laid separately before Mr. Brodie and Mr. Atherley for final settlement; and which, having been revised and finally approved by those gentlemen respectively, corrected printed copies with a letter signifying that approval were again circulated; and the Committee, having waited beyond the time specified for their return, considered themselves fully warranted in adopting the Draft, so settled, without further delay.

In the year one thousand seven hundred and thirty-eight, a few persons in London agreed to meet with the Rev. John Wesley, (formerly of Lincoln College, Oxford, and afterwards of the City Road, London,) Clerk, for the purpose of religious conversation, singing, and prayer; which Society as it was called had increased by the early part of the year one thousand seven hundred and thirty-nine, to about sixty persons, and in April of the same year the said John Wesley being in Bristol, a few persons in that city also agreed to meet weekly, with the same intentions as those who met in London under the advice and religious direction of the said John Wesley, and of his brother the Rev. Charles Wesley; similar meetings were also commenced at Kingswood and Bath; but in the year one thousand seven hundred and forty, a part of the Society in London placing themselves more immediately under the pastoral charge and ministerial direction of the said John Wesley, agreed to meet together in a building called the Foundry, in Moorfields; which he had purchased and converted into a place of religious worship; and the same disposition to place themselves under the pastoral charge and ministerial direction of the said John Wesley, (and his said brother Charles Wesley,) appearing in the Societies before mentioned, at Bristol and other places which the said John Wesley regularly visited for the purposes of preaching the

Rules of the Societies.

Gospel, and giving spiritual advice; a body of Rules was drawn up in the year one thousand seven hundred and forty-three, for the Government of the said Societies, and entitled, "The nature, design, and General Rules of the United Societies, in London, Bristol, Kingswood, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, &c.;" and which Rules were signed by the said John Wesley, and Charles Wesley, and became then, (and continue to be,) the Rules by

which all persons united in the said Societies were (and are) required to conduct themselves; and in default of which, they were to be excluded from the said Societies: And in the manner above mentioned was instituted and established, first in London, and then in other places as aforesaid, the Religious body now generally known by the appellation of, "The people

Society Stewards and Poor Stewards.

called Methodists:" AND WHEREAS, in order that the pecuniary contributions made by the said Societies for religious and charitable purposes might be managed with regularity, one or more of the members of each of the said Societies, was or were from time to time appointed to be a "Steward," or "Stewards," of the Society of which he or they were for the time being a Member or Members; and which Steward or Stewards at first managed all the temporal concerns of the said Societies, but afterwards Stewards for the Society, and Stewards for the poor of the Society; or as they are now commonly called "Society Stewards," and "Poor Stewards," were respectively

Classes and Class-Leaders.

appointed: AND that the objects of the said Societies might be better effectuated, the said John Wesley formed or divided them into small companies, called "Classes," of about twelve persons in each Class; over each of which Classes, one of the members of the said Societies was

Appointment of Preachers by Mr. Wesley.

appointed and called, "The Class-Leader:" AND WHEREAS, the said people called Methodists having rapidly increased in number, and new Societies having been formed as aforesaid in many and various places, the said John Wesley appointed certain persons (some of whom were Clergymen of the Established Church of England, and others of whom were ordained or set apart to the Ministry by himself and other Presbyters of the Church of England) to preach and expound God's Holy Word unto the said Societies, and to form new Societies under his guidance and direction: AND the

Formation of Circuits.

more effectually to promote order and good discipline among the Societies so formed, the said John Wesley from time to time, as occasion required, collected or associated together such of the said Societies as existed in places contiguous or of most convenient access to each other, and which collections or associations of Societies were called "Circuits;" And the said John

Assistants or Superintendants.

Wesley annually appointed one or more of the said Preachers, to Itinerate or travel from place to place in each of the said Circuits, to which he or they were respectively appointed, to visit the various Societies therein, to form new Societies, and to preach, and otherwise exercise his and their office, as Ministers of the Gospel; but under the direction and guidance of him the said John Wesley: And in each of the said Circuits one of the said Preachers so appointed was directed specially to superintend the others or other of them, and to take the chief charge and care of the Societies in the Circuit over which he was so appointed, and who was at first, and during the life-time of the said John Wesley, called, "the Assistant;" but is now generally known amongst the said people called Methodists, by the appellation of "the Superintendant," or "the Superintendant Preacher," of the Circuit to which he is for the time being

Circuit Stewards.

appointed; and in every Circuit there was, or were, from time to time appointed, from among the members of the Societies in each respective Circuit, a Steward, or Stewards, called "the Circuit Steward," or "Circuit Stewards;" whose business it was, to take charge of and to apply to their intended purposes, the various collections of monies made to meet the expenses of such Circuit.

had been any yearly Conference of the said people called Methodists in any of the said places, had always theretofore consisted of, the Preachers and Expounders of God's holy word, commonly called Methodist Preachers, in connexion with, and under the care of, the said John Wesley, whom he had thought expedient, year after year, to summon to meet him in one or other of the said places of London, Bristol, or Leeds, to advise with them for the promotion of the Gospel of Christ, to appoint the said persons so summoned, and the other Preachers and Expounders of God's holy word, also in connexion with, and under the care of, the said John Wesley, not summoned to the said yearly Conference, to the use and enjoyment of the said chapels and premises so given and conveyed upon trust for the said John Wesley, and such other person and persons as he should appoint during his life, as aforesaid; and for the expulsion of unworthy, and admission of new, persons under his care and into his Connexion, to be Preachers and Expounders, as aforesaid; and also of other persons upon trial for the like purposes; the names of all which persons so summoned, by the said John Wesley, the persons appointed, with the chapels and premises to which they were so appointed, together with the duration of such appointments, and of those expelled or admitted into connexion, or upon trial, with all other matters transacted and done at the said yearly Conference, had, year by year, been printed and published under the title of, "Minutes of Conference:"

Further Testatum naming the then yearly Conference.

AND BY THE SAID DEED POLL NOW IN RECITAL IT IS FURTHER WITNESSED, that the said John Wesley did thereby avouch and further declare, that the several persons thereafter named, (that is to say, one hundred persons therein named and described,) then being Preachers and Expounders of God's holy word, under the care of, and in connexion with, the said John Wesley, had been, then were, and did on the day of the date thereof, constitute the members of the said Conference, according to the true intent and meaning of the said several gifts and conveyances wherein the words, "Conference of the people called Methodists," are mentioned and contained; And that the said several persons therein-

Rules for the said yearly Conference.

before named, and their successors for ever, to be chosen as thereafter mentioned, (and as is hereinafter recited,) were, and should for ever be construed, taken, and be, the Conference of the people called Methodists: Nevertheless, upon the terms, and subject to the regulations thereafter prescribed; that is to say,

First. That the members of the said Conference, and their succes-

First Time and place of the yearly assembly.

sors, for the time being for ever, should assemble once in every year, at London, Bristol, or Leeds, (except as after-mentioned,) for the purposes aforesaid; and the time and place of holding every subsequent Conference should be appointed at the preceding one, save that the next Conference, after the date thereof, should be holden at Leeds in Yorkshire, the last Tuesday in July then next:

Second. Act of the majority binding.

Second. The Act of the majority in number of the Conference assembled as aforesaid, should be had, taken, and be, the Act of the whole Conference to all intents, purposes, and constructions whatsoever:

Third. Vacancies to be tilled up.

Third. That after the Conference should be assembled, as aforesaid, they should first proceed to fill up all the vacancies occasioned by death, or absence, as after-mentioned:

Fourth. Forty members, a quorum, except in the case mentioned.

Fourth. No Act of the Conference assembled as aforesaid, should be had, taken, or be, the Act of the Conference, until forty of the members thereof were assembled, unless reduced under that number by death since the prior Conference, or absence, as after-mentioned; nor until all the vacancies occasioned by death or absence, should be filled up by the election of new members of the Conference, so as to make up the number one hundred, unless there were not a sufficient number of persons, objects of such election and during the assembly of the Conference, there should always be forty members present at the doing of any Act, save as aforesaid, or otherwise such Act should be void:

Fifth. Duration of the yearly assembly.

Fifth. The duration of the yearly assembly of the Conference, should not be less than five days, nor more than three weeks, and be concluded by the appointment of the Conference, if under twenty-one days; or otherwise, the conclusion thereof should follow of course at the end of the said twenty-one days; the whole of which said time of the assembly of the Conference, should be had, taken, considered, and be, the yearly Conference of the people called Methodists; And all Acts of the Conference, during such yearly assembly thereof, should be the Acts of the Conference, and none others:

Sixth. Immediately after all the vacancies, occasioned by death or absence, were filled up, by the election of new members, as

Sixth. A President and Secretary to be elected.

aforesaid, the Conference should choose a President and Secretary of their assembly, out of themselves, who should continue such until the election of another President or Secretary, in the next or other subsequent Conference; and the said President should have the privilege

Powers of the President.

and power of two members, in all Acts of the Conference, during his presidency, and such other powers, privileges, and authorities, as the Conference should, from time to time, see fit to intrust into his hands:

Seventh. Members absenting themselves without consent.

Seventh. Any member of the Conference, absenting himself from the yearly assembly thereof for two years successively, without the consent or dispensation of the Conference, and being not present on the first day of the third yearly assembly thereof at the time and place appointed for the holding of the same, should cease to be a member of the Conference, from and after the said first day of the said third yearly assembly thereof, to all intents and purposes, as though he were naturally dead; But the Conference should and might dispense with, or consent to, the absence, of any member from any of the said yearly assemblies, for any cause which the Conference might see fit or necessary; and such member, whose absence should be so dispensed with, or consented to, by the Conference, should not by such absence cease to be a member thereof:

Eighth. Power to expel members, &c.

Eighth. The Conference should and might expel, and put out from being a member thereof, or from being in connexion therewith, or from being upon trial, any person, member of the Conference, or admitted into connexion, or upon trial, for any cause which to the Conference might seem fit and necessary; and every member of the Conference so expelled and put out, should cease to be a member thereof, to all intents and purposes, as though he were naturally dead: And the Conference, immediately after the expulsion of any member thereof as aforesaid, should elect another person to be a member of the Conference, in the stead of such member so expelled:

Ninth. Power to admit persons.

Ninth. The Conference should and might admit into connexion with them, or upon trial, any person or persons whom they should approve, to be Preachers and Expounders of God's holy word, under the care and direction of the Conference; the name of every such person or persons so admitted into connexion, or upon trial, as aforesaid, with the time and degrees of the admission, being entered in the Journals or Minutes of the Conference:

Tenth. The time of probation.

Tenth. No person should be elected a member of the Conference, who had not been admitted into connexion with the Conference, as a Preacher and Expounder of God's holy word, as aforesaid, for twelve months:

Eleventh. What persons the Conference might appoint to the chapels, and for what time to the same place.

Eleventh. The Conference should not, nor might, nominate or appoint any person to the use and enjoyment of, or to preach and expound God's holy word in, any of the chapels and premises so given or conveyed, or which might be given or conveyed upon the trusts aforesaid, who was not either a member of the Conference, or admitted into connexion with the same, or upon trial, as aforesaid; nor appoint any person for more than three years successively, to the use and enjoyment of any chapel and premises already given, or to be given or conveyed, upon the trusts aforesaid, except ordained Ministers of the Church of England:

Twelfth. Power to hold the Conference at any place.

Twelfth. That the Conference should and might appoint the place of holding the yearly assembly thereof, at any other city, town, or place, than London, Bristol or Leeds, when it should seem expedient so to do:

Thirteenth. Provision respecting chapels and Conference in Ireland.

Thirteenth. And, for the convenience of the chapels and premises then already, or which might thereafter be given or conveyed upon the trusts aforesaid, situate in Ireland, or other parts out of the kingdom of Great Britain, the Conference should and might, when, and as often as it should seem expedient, but not otherwise, appoint and delegate any member or members of the Conference, with all or any of the powers, privileges, and advantages, thereinbefore contained or vested in the Conference; and all and every the acts, admissions, expulsions, and appointments whatsoever, of such member or members of the Conference, so appointed and delegated as aforesaid, the same being put into writing, and signed by such delegate or delegates, and entered in the Journals or Minutes of the Conference, and subscribed, as after mentioned, should be deemed, taken, and be, the acts, admissions, expulsions, and appointments, of the Conference, to all intents, constructions, and purposes, whatsoever, from the respective times when the same should be done by such delegate or delegates; notwithstanding any thing therein contained to the contrary:

Fourteenth. Resolutions, &c., to be entered in the journals, and signed.

Fourteenth. All resolutions and orders touching elections, admissions, expulsions, consents, dispensations, delegations, or appointments, and acts whatsoever, of the Conference, should be entered and written in the Journals or Minutes of the Conference, which should be kept for that purpose, publicly read, and then subscribed by the President and Secretary thereof for the time being, during the time such Conference should be assembled; and, when so entered and subscribed, should be had, taken, received, and be, the acts of the Conference, and such entry and subscription as aforesaid, should be had, taken, received, and be, evidence of all and every such acts of the said Conference, and of their said delegates, without the aid of any other proof; and whatever should not be so entered and subscribed as aforesaid, should not be had, taken, received, or be, the act of the Conference; and the said President and Secretary were thereby required and obliged to enter and subscribe as aforesaid, every act whatever of the Conference:

Provision respecting the extinction of the Conference, and appropriation of the chapels, &c., in that case.

Lastly. Whenever the said Conference should be reduced under the number of forty members, and continue so reduced for three yearly assemblies thereof successively; or, whenever the members thereof should decline or neglect to meet together annually for the purposes aforesaid, during the space of three years; that then, and in either of the said events, the Conference of the people called Methodists should be extinguished, and all the aforesaid powers, privileges, and advantages, should cease; and the said chapels and premises, and all other chapels and premises which then were, or thereafter might be, settled, given, or conveyed, upon the trusts aforesaid, should vest in the Trustees for the time being of the said chapels and premises respectively, and their

successors for ever, upon trust that they, and the survivors of them, and the Trustees for the time being, did, should, and might, appoint such person and persons to preach and expound God's holy word therein, and to have the use and enjoyment thereof, for such time and in such manner as to them should seem proper:

Recital of the deaths of Charles Wesley and John Wesley.

AND WHEREAS, the said Charles Wesley departed this life in the life-time of the said John Wesley, and the said John Wesley departed this life in the year one thousand seven hundred and ninety-one:

Of the formation of Districts.

AND WHEREAS, in or about the said year one thousand seven hundred and ninety-one, the said Conference, for the better maintenance of the economy of the said people called Methodists, united into "Districts," the Circuits which had been formed by the said John Wesley, in the kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland; of which Districts, nineteen were formed in England, two in Scotland, and six in Ireland; and each of which Districts, consisted of several adjoining Circuits; and the said Conference have since, from time to time, increased the said Districts in number, and subdivided or otherwise altered the same, as they deemed necessary or expedient: And

Chairman of the District.

in order that the business and affairs of the said Districts might be properly and regularly conducted, the said Conference have annually appointed for

District Committee or Meeting.

each respective District one of the Preachers stationed for the time being in a Circuit within such District, to be "The Chairman of the District;" and a meeting of the Preachers within each respective District, is called, and generally known among the said people called Methodists, by the name of "the District Committee," or, "the District Meeting:"

Recital of Contract for purchase.

AND WHEREAS, the said parties, hereto of the first part, and Joseph Walker, since deceased, having been possessed of certain sums of money, intended to be laid out in the purchase of a piece of ground and hereditaments, and in erecting and building thereon a Chapel, or Place of Religious Worship, with such appurtenances as might be thought proper for the use of the said people called Methodists, to be settled to the use, upon the trusts, and in manner hereinafter declared, and contained, or referred to of and concerning the same, in pursuance of the said intention; contracted and agreed with John Swallow, and Thomas Sladen, hereinafter mentioned, for the absolute purchase of the ground and hereditaments hereinafter particularly described, for the price or sum of eight hundred pounds.

Recital of Conveyance in pursuance of the said Contract.

AND WHEREAS, by Indentures of Lease, and of Release, and Appointment, (attested by two credible witnesses, and duly enrolled in His Majesty's High Court of Chancery within six calendar months from the making thereof,) the Lease, bearing date the day next before the day of the date of the Release and Appointment; and the Release and Appointment bearing date on or about the twenty-fifth day of November, one thousand eight hundred and thirty; and made, or expressed to be made, between William Nicholson, (therein described,) of the first part, John Swallow, (therein described,) of the second part, Thomas Sladen, (therein described,) of the third part, John Sutcliffe, Benjamin Garside, Francis Farnell, Joseph Walker, Robert Turner, and James Murgatroyd, (therein respectively described,) of the fourth part; and the said parties, hereto of the first part, and the said Joseph Walker, of the fifth part, in consideration of the said sum of eight hundred pounds, paid in manner therein mentioned, as and for the full and *bona fide* value of, and in full, for the purchase of the said ground and hereditaments hereinafter described; the same ground and hereditaments, with their and every of their appurtenances, were conveyed and assured, in possession immediately from the making of the same Indenture of Release and Appointment, and without any power of revocation, reservation, trust, condition, limitation, clause, or agreement whatsoever, for the benefit of the Grantors, or either of them, in the said Indenture named; or of any person, or persons, claiming under them, or either of them, unto and to the use of the said parties, hereto of the first part, and the said Joseph Walker, their heirs and assigns for ever, in order that the said ground and hereditaments might be further conveyed and assured by the said parties, hereto of the first part, and the said Joseph Walker, or the survivors of them; to the use, upon the trusts, and in manner, hereinafter expressed, declared and contained, or referred to, of and concerning the same:

Testatum.

NOW THIS INDENTURE WITNESSETH, that in further pursuance of the said intention, and purpose, and in consideration of the sum of ten shillings of lawful English money, by the said James Brown, to the said parties hereto of the first part, in hand paid at or before the sealing and delivery of these presents, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, they the said parties hereto of the first part, (with the approbation of the said George Marsden President for the time being of the yearly Conference of the said people called Methodists, testified by his being a party to and executing these presents,) HAVE, and each and every of them HATH, granted, bargained,

sold, aliened, released, and confirmed, and by these Presents DO, and each and every of them DOTH, grant, bargain, sell, alien, release, and confirm, unto the said James Brown, (in his actual possession, now being by virtue of a bargain and sale to him thereof, made by the said parties hereto of the first part,) in consideration of five shillings, by Indenture, bearing date the day next before the day of the date of these presents, for the term of one whole year, commencing from the day next before the date of the same Indenture of Bargain and Sale; and by force of the statute made for transferring uses into possession, and his heirs and assigns; All that
Parcels.

piece or parcel of ground, formerly part of a close of Ground called the Dye-house Bank, heretofore in the occupation of one Nathaniel Wainhouse; and also parcel of the Lands and Ground belonging to a Messuage called Mearclough Bottom, situate in Skircoat aforesaid, and formerly the Estate and Inheritance of Edward Wainhouse, of Skircoat, aforesaid, Gentleman, deceased; which said piece or parcel of ground, intended to be hereby released and assured, is bounded on or towards the North by the Halifax and Rochdale Turnpike Road, on or towards the South by the Calder and Hebble Canal, on or towards the East in part by a parcel of Land secondly in the said Indenture of Release and Appointment particularly mentioned, and in other parts by Lands and Hereditaments belonging to the Company of Proprietors of the said Calder and Hebble Navigation, and on or towards the West wholly by other Lands and Hereditaments of the said Company, and measures, (as nearly as the shape of the Land will permit the same to be ascertained,) in length from East to West, on the North side thereof, two hundred and fourteen feet and six inches, and on the South side thereof, two hundred and three feet four inches, and in breadth from North to South, at the East end thereof, one hundred and thirty-seven feet five inches, and at the West end one hundred and forty-four feet six inches, and contains in the whole, by admeasurement, three thousand two hundred and twenty-five superficial square yards, or thereabouts, be the same more or less, and the said parcel of Land includes a slip of land towards the North side thereof, which formerly comprised part of the old Turnpike Road from Halifax to Rochdale; Together with all and singular houses, out-houses, edifices, buildings, barns,

General words.

yards, gardens, trees, woods, underwoods, mounds, mines, delfs, quarries, fences, hedges, ditches, sewers, drains, paths, passages, ways, waters, water-courses, lights, liberties, privileges, easements, profits, commodities, emoluments, and appurtenances whatsoever, to the said piece or parcel of ground, messuage, or tenement, and hereditaments hereby granted and released, or intended so to be, belonging, or in anywise appertaining, or with the same or any part thereof respectively, now, or at any time heretofore, held, used, occupied or enjoyed, or intended so to be, or accepted, reputed, deemed, taken, or known, as part, parcel, or member thereof, or of any part thereof, with their, and every of their appurtenances, and the reversion and reversions, remainder and remainders, yearly and other rents, issues, and profits thereof; and all the estate, right, title, interest, inheritance, use, trust, property, profits, possession, claim, and demand whatsoever, both at law and in equity of them the said parties hereto of the first part in, to, out of, and upon, the same premises? and in, to, and out of,

Habendum.

every part and parcel thereof, with their, and every of, their appurtenances: To HAVE AND TO HOLD the said piece or parcel of ground, messuage, or tenement, hereditaments, and all and singular other, the premises by these presents granted and released, or otherwise assured, or intended so to be, with their, and every of their appurtenances, in possession, immediately from the making thereof, and without any power of revocation, reservation, trust, condition, limitation, clause, or agreement whatsoever, for the benefit of the said parties hereto of the first part, or of any person or persons claiming under them, or any of them unto the said James Brown, and his heirs, TO the USE of the said parties hereto of the first part, their heirs and assigns for ever; but, upon the trusts, and to and for the intents and purposes, and with, under, and subject to, the powers, provisoes, declarations, and agreements, in these presents expressed, declared, and contained, or referred to, of and concerning the same, (that is to say,)

Upon trusts following. *Viz.*, To build chapel with appurtenances.

UPON TRUST, that they the said Parties hereto of the first part, and the survivors and survivor of them, and the heirs and assigns of such survivor, or the Trustees, or Trustee, for the time being, acting in the trusts of these presents, shall and do, with and out of the monies now or which may hereafter be possessed by them or him for that purpose, and as soon after the execution of these Presents as conveniently may be, erect and build upon the said piece or parcel of ground, or upon some part thereof, and from time to time, and at all times hereafter, whenever it shall be necessary for the due accomplishment of the trusts of these presents, or of any of them, repair, alter, enlarge, and rebuild, a Chapel or place of Religious Worship, and a dwelling-house, or dwelling-houses, vestry-room, or vestry-rooms, school-room, or school-rooms, and other offices, conveniences, and appurtenances, or with or without any of them respectively as, and in such manner as, the Trustees for the time being of these presents, shall from time to time, deem necessary or expedient:

To permit Preachers appointed by the Conference, (and such other persons as are designated,) to preach, &c., therein.

AND UPON FURTHER TRUST, from time to time, and at all times after the erection thereof, to permit and suffer the said Chapel or place of Religious Worship with the appurtenances, to be used, occupied and enjoyed, as and for a place of Religious Worship, by a congregation of Protestants, of the said people? called Methodists, in the connexion established by the said late John Wesley as aforesaid, and for public, and other meetings, and services, held according to the general rules and usage of the said people called Methodists; and do and shall, from time to time and at all times hereafter, permit and suffer such person and persons as are hereinafter mentioned or designated, and such person and persons only, to preach, and expound God's holy word, and to perform the usual acts of religious worship therein; that is to say, such person and persons, as shall be from time to time approved, and for that purpose duly appointed, by the said Conference of the said people called Methodists, from time to time held under the orders and regulations of the said in part recited Deed Poll; and also such other person and persons as shall be thereunto from time to time duly permitted or appointed, (according to the general rules and usage of the said people called Methodists,) by the Superintendant Preacher for the time being, of the Circuit in which the said chapel or place of religious worship, shall, for the time being be situated; and also such other person and persons, as shall be thereunto from time to time duly appointed, by any authority lawfully constituted by the said Conference, or under or by virtue of these presents, to fill up any vacancy or vacancies, at any time occasioned by the death, removal, or suspension, of a Preacher or Preachers, in or during any interval, between the sittings of the said Conference; but only until the then next Conference, and in no case any other person or persons whomsoever:

Times and manner of the services. Who to conduct the same.

AND it is hereby declared, that, the Times and Manner of the various services and ordinances of religious worship, to be observed and performed in the said chapel or place of religious worship, shall be regulated according to the general rules and usage of the said people called Methodists; and that the officiating Preacher for the time being, whether appointed by the said Conference, or permitted or appointed by the said Superintendant Preacher for the time being, or otherwise permitted or appointed as in these presents is mentioned, shall have the direction and conducting of the same worship, in conformity nevertheless to the said general rules and usage of the said people called Methodists:

Proviso respecting Preachers immoral, erroneous in doctrine, or deficient in ability.

PROVIDED ALWAYS, and it is hereby declared, that, if at any time or times hereafter, the Trustees for the time being of these presents or a majority of them; or if the Stewards and Leaders of Classes for the time being of the Society of the said people called Methodists, worship of Almighty God therein; and in all cases, whether in the said Chapel or place of religious worship or not, under such government, orders, and regulations, as the said Conference have directed or appointed, or shall hereafter from time to time direct or appoint; and also, subject always, to the proviso hereinbefore contained respecting doctrines:

Power to demolish buildings to enlarge the Chapel, &c.

PROVIDED ALWAYS, that, it shall be lawful for the Trustees for the time being of these presents or the major part of them, when and so often as they shall deem the same necessary or expedient, to take down and remove the said chapel, vestry-room, or vestry-rooms, school-room, or school-rooms, dwelling-house, or dwelling-houses, offices, conveniences, or appurtenances to the said Chapel or place of religious worship and premises belonging, or appertaining, or all, or any of them, or any part or parts thereof respectively, for the purpose of rebuilding the said chapel or place of religious worship, or for the purpose of building, or rebuilding, any other vestry-room, or vestry-rooms, school-room, or school-rooms, dwelling-house, or dwelling-houses, offices, conveniences, and appurtenances, or enlarging, or altering the same respectively, or all, or any of them, so as to render the premises the better adapted to, and for, the due accomplishment of the trusts, intents, and purposes, of these presents:

Power to Mortgage.

AND it is hereby declared, that, from time to time and at all times hereafter, it shall and may be lawful to and for the Trustees for the time being of these presents, or the major part of them, to mortgage, and for that purpose to appoint, convey, and assure, in fee, or for any term, or terms of years, the said piece of ground chapel or place of religions worship hereditaments and premises, or any part or parts thereof, respectively, to any person, or persons whomsoever, for securing such sum or sums of money, as may be requisite, or necessary, in, or for, the due execution, and accomplishment, of the trusts and purposes of these presents, or any of them, according to the true

Mortgages to be for the whole debt or debts.

intent and meaning thereof; Nevertheless it is hereby declared, that, no mortgage, or mortgages, nor any disposition whatsoever by way of mortgage, shall at any time hereafter be made, of the said Trust premises, or of any part or parts thereof, under or by virtue of these presents, unless such mortgage, or mortgages, shall in

the aggregate amount to, and cover, the whole debt, or the aggregate amount of the whole of the debts, which at the time of the execution of such mortgage, or mortgages, shall be due and owing, either legally, or equitably, in respect, or on account of, or in relation to, the said Trust premises, or some part, or parts thereof, respectively, or from the said Trustees for the time being, or any of them, for, or on account, or in respect of, the said Trust premises, or some part, or parts thereof, respectively, excepting only, such debt and debts, as may then be accruing due, for, or on account of, the ordinary current expences, of the said chapel or place of religious worship and premises; But it is

Mortgagees not bound to inquire into the necessity, &c., of the Mortgage. hereby declared, that, it shall not be incumbent upon any mortgagee, or mortgagees, or upon any intended mortgagee, or mortgagees, of the said Trust premises, or any part, or parts thereof, to inquire into the necessity, expediency, or propriety, of any mortgage, or mortgages, which shall be made, or be proposed to be made, under or by virtue of these presents, or whether the same is, or are, made, or intended to be made, for the whole amount of the debt, or of the aggregate amount of the debts, which shall be so due and owing as

Mortgage not to prevent Trustees from altering, &c., the Trust-premises except in the cases mentioned. aforesaid; Nor shall any thing in these presents contained, or which may be contained in any such mortgage, or mortgages, extend, or be construed to extend, unless where the contrary shall, with the full knowledge and consent of the said Trustees for the time being or the major part of them, be therein actually expressed, to hinder, prevent, or make unlawful, the taking down, removing, enlarging, or altering, the said buildings and premises, or any of them, respectively, as is in these presents before mentioned and provided for, in that behalf, nor in any manner to hinder, prevent, or interfere with, the due execution of the Trusts or purposes of these presents, or any of them, so long as such mortgagee, or mortgagees, his, her, and their, heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, shall not be in the actual possession, as such mortgagee, or mortgagees, of the hereditaments comprised, or to be comprised, in such mortgage, or mortgages; any thing in these presents contained to the contrary, in any wise notwithstanding:

Trusts to let Pews, Houses, School-rooms, &c. To sell Graves and Tombs.

AND UPON FURTHER TRUST, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, to Let the pews, and seats, in the said chapel or place of religious worship, at a reasonable rent, or reasonable rents, (reserving as many free seats for the poor, where, and as may be thought, necessary or expedient,) and, if there shall be any such dwelling-house, or dwelling-houses, school-room, or school-rooms, or any of them, erected and built as aforesaid, then to let the same, or any of them, at a reasonable rent, or reasonable rents, and also, if there shall be to be a Steward, or Stewards, of the said chapel or place of religious worship, and at their will and pleasure, to remove and to dismiss such Steward, or Stewards, or any of them; and the duty of the Steward, and Stewards, of the said chapel or place of religious worship, shall be, to see and attend to, the orderly conducting of the secular business and affairs, of the said chapel or place of religious worship, under the direction and superintendence, of the Trustees for the time being of these presents, or the major part of them; And also in like manner to appoint any proper person, or persons, to be a Treasurer, or Treasurers, of the funds of the said chapel or place of religious worship and premises, and at their will and pleasure, to remove and to dismiss such Treasurer or Treasurers, or any of them:

Account-Books to be kept.

AND it is hereby declared, that the Trustees and Trustee for the time being of these presents, shall, themselves, or by their Steward, or Stewards, Treasurer or Treasurers, keep a Book, or Books, of Accounts, in which from time to time shall be plainly, legibly, and regularly entered, an account of every receipt and disbursement, by them, him, or any of them, received, or made, and also, of all debts and credits, due to, and owing from or in respect of, the said trust-premises, or any part or parts thereof, and also, of all other documents, articles, matters, and things, necessary for the due and full explanation and understanding, of the same Book and Books of Accounts; and shall also in like manner, keep a Book or Books of Minutes, in which from time to time shall be plainly, legibly, and regularly entered, Minutes of all Trustee meetings from time to time held under or by virtue of these presents, and of the resolutions passed, and of all proceedings acts and business had taken and done thereat, and also of all documents, articles matters and things necessary for the due and full explanation and understanding of the same Minutes, and all other things, done in and about the execution of the trusts of these presents; and shall and will, from time to time, and at all seasonable times hereafter, upon the request of the Superintendant Preacher for the time being, of the Circuit in which the

Books, &c., to be shown to the Superintendant on request.

said chapel or place of religious worship shall for the time being be situated, produce and show forth, to him, and to every person whom he shall desire to see the same, all and every such Book and Books of Accounts and Minutes, documents, articles, matters, and things, and permit and suffer copies, or abstracts of, or extracts from them, or any of them, to be made and taken, by the said Superintendant Preacher, or by any person or persons whom he shall from time to time desire to make and take the same:

Accounts to be audited yearly. Notice of meeting therefore.

AND the said Book and Books of Accounts and Minutes, and all documents, articles, matters, and things, relating in anywise to the said trust-premises, shall, at least once in the year, and oftener if the said Superintendant shall at any time desire, and shall give notice thereof, in manner hereinafter mentioned, be regularly, upon a day to be appointed by the said Superintendant for the time being, or with his concurrence, Examined and Audited, by the Superintendant, and the Circuit Steward, or Circuit Stewards, if more than one, for the time being, of the Circuit in which the said chapel or place of religious worship shall for the time being be situated, at a meeting convened for that purpose; And of every such meeting, Fourteen days' Notice in writing, specifying the time, place, and purpose, of such meeting, shall and may be given under the direction of the said Superintendant for the time being, by any one or more of them, the said Trustees and Trustee for the time being, to each and every the other and others of them the said Trustees and Trustee, Circuit Stewards and Circuit Steward for the time being, and either personally served upon him and them respectively, or left for, or sent by the post to, him and them at his and their most usual place and places of abode or business.

Auditors may appoint deputies.

AND in order to facilitate the Auditing of the said accounts, minutes, documents, articles, matters and things, it shall be lawful for the said Superintendant, Circuit Steward, and Circuit Stewards, for the time being as aforesaid, or either, or any of them, to appoint in writing a Deputy or Deputies, to act therein for them, and him respectively as aforesaid, and for that purpose, any one or more of them, may be the Deputy, or Deputies, of the other or others of them, the said Superintendant, Circuit Steward, and Circuit Stewards; And it

Auditors to sign the Accounts.

is hereby declared, that the Signatures of all of them, the said Auditors, Deputies, and Deputy, or of the aggregate majority of them, written in the said Book and Books of Accounts and Minutes respectively, shall be sufficient evidence, that all the matters and things relating to the said trust-premises which were, up to that time included in the said Books, Accounts, Minutes, and Documents, matters, and things, were duly examined, audited, and approved of unless and except so far as, the contrary shall be therein by them or by the aggregate majority of them, in writing expressed:

Trustee Meetings for special business, notice of.

AND it is hereby declared, that every Meeting, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of making any alteration of, or any addition to, or Mortgage or sale of, the said chapel or place of religious worship, and premises, or any part or parts thereof, or for contracting any debt, upon, for, or on account thereof, (other than for the ordinary current expenses thereof,) or for letting any such house or houses, school-room or school-rooms as aforesaid, or for fixing the rents or prices, or making or altering rules to ascertain the rents or prices, of such graves, tombs, pews, and seats as aforesaid, or for appropriating the funds or any part of the funds of the said chapel, or place of religious worship, (otherwise than for the due payment of the ordinary current expenses thereof,) or, for bringing or defending any action or actions, suit or suits, respecting the said Trust Estates and Premises, or any parts thereof, or any matter relating thereto, or for any one or more of the above purposes, shall be, and shall be deemed and taken to be, a Special Meeting; and of every such Meeting, Fourteen days' Notice in writing, specifying the time, place, and purpose or purposes of such meeting, and signed by at least either two of the Trustees for the time being of these presents, or by the Superintendant Preacher for the time being, shall be given to the other, and others, of them and him, the said Trustees, and Superintendant Preacher, (unless where he himself is the person giving such notice,) and either personally served, upon him and them, or left for, or sent by the Post to, him and them, respectively, at his and their most usual place and places of abode or business.

Trustee Meetings for ordinary business, and in cases of urgent necessity, notice of.

AND, for the purpose of transacting the Ordinary Business relating to the said chapel or place of religious worship and premises, or for any other purpose relating to these presents or the trusts thereof, (except where fourteen days' notice is expressed or required as hereinbefore is mentioned,) a meeting of the Trustees for the time being of these presents, may be held, with the said Superintendant for the time being, as aforesaid, so soon as the same can be conveniently convened, by notice in writing, specifying the time and place of such meeting, given and signed by at least either two of the said Trustees for the time being, or by the said Superintendant for the time being, and either Personally served upon, or left for, or sent by the Post as aforesaid to, the other and others of them respectively at his and their most usual place and places of abode or business:

Meetings valid, though notice does not reach Trustees beyond seas, or who cannot be found.

PROVIDED ALWAYS, and it is hereby declared, that, no meeting held under or by virtue of these presents, shall be invalid, or the resolutions thereof void or impeached, by reason that any such notice or notices as aforesaid, may not, or shall not, have reached any Trustee or Trustees for the time being of these presents, who, at the time of any such meeting, happens to be beyond seas, or who, or whose place or places of abode or business, shall not be known to, and cannot reasonably be found or discovered by, the person or persons who is

or are respectively as aforesaid authorized, to give any such notice or notices as aforesaid:

Who entitled to vote at Meetings for business, &c.

AND it is hereby declared, that, at any meeting held under or by virtue of these presents, or of the trusts hereof, or any of them, the votes of the persons present and entitled to vote, or the votes of a majority of Vote of the Majority binding.

them, shall decide any question or matter proposed at such meeting, and respecting which such Votes shall be given; And in case the Votes

Casting Vote.

shall be equally divided, then the Chairman of such meeting shall give the casting Vote, and which casting Vote he shall have, in addition to the Vote which he shall be intitled to, in his character of Trustee, Superintendant Preacher, or otherwise:

Who shall judge of what is "necessary or expedient"

AND it is hereby declared, that, whenever it shall be thought necessary, or expedient, to do anything in and by these presents directed, authorized, or made lawful to be done, the necessity, or expediency, of doing the same, shall, in like manner be decided by, the persons present, and entitled to vote upon the question to be determined, or by the majority of them, and if there shall be an even division, then by such casting Vote as aforesaid; and all acts and deeds, done and executed in pursuance of any such decision as aforesaid, at any such meeting as aforesaid, shall be good, valid, and binding, on all persons entitled to vote at the meeting, who may be absent, or being present, may be in the minority, and on all other persons claiming, under or in pursuance of these presents; but no person, (unless where the contrary is hereinbefore expressly mentioned,) shall be allowed to vote in more than one capacity, at the same time, or on the same question, although holding more than one office at the same time, in the Society of the said people called Methodists, or in the same meeting:

General Rules and Usage.

AND it is hereby declared, that, the "General Rules and Usage of the said people called Methodists," in these presents mentioned or referred to, are the General Rules Usage and Practice of the whole body of the said people called Methodists throughout Great Britain, as the same General Rules Usage and Practice respectively appear, in and by the Annual Minutes of the said Conference, from time to time printed and published by them, under the authority of the said in part recited Deed Poll, but subject at all times, to the Proviso respecting Doctrines in these Presents contained:

Who shall be the Chairman at Meetings.

PROVIDED ALWAYS, and it is hereby declared, that, excepting where the contrary is in these presents expressly declared or provided for, the Superintendant Preacher for the time being of the Circuit in which the said chapel or place of religious worship shall for the time being be situated, or his Deputy thereunto from time to time by him nominated and appointed in writing under his hand, shall be the Chairman of, and shall preside at, and shall have a Vote as such Superintendant Preacher or Deputy in, all meetings held under or by virtue of these presents; but in case the said Superintendant Preacher for the time being or his deputy to be so appointed as aforesaid, shall at any time neglect to attend at any such meeting as aforesaid, or if the said Superintendant Preacher or his Deputy appointed as aforesaid, shall attend, but shall refuse to act as the Chairman at any such meeting as aforesaid, or if the said Superintendant Preacher shall not attend at any such meeting, and shall neglect to appoint a Deputy as aforesaid, then, and in every and any of the said cases, it shall be lawful for the persons for the time being composing such meeting, and entitled to vote thereat, or for a majority of them, to elect and choose from among themselves, a Chairman to preside for the time being at any such meeting as aforesaid, and every meeting so held upon any such neglect or refusal of the said Superintendant Preacher or his Deputy as aforesaid, shall be as valid and effectual, as if the said Superintendant or his Deputy as aforesaid had been the Chairman thereof, and had presided thereat:

Power for Trustees with the consent of the Conference, to sell and convey.

PROVIDED ALWAYS, and it is hereby declared, that it shall and may be lawful to and for the Trustees for the time being of these presents, with the consent of the said Conference, such consent to be testified in writing under the hand of the President for the time being of the said Conference, at any time or times hereafter, absolutely to Sell and dispose of the said piece of ground, chapel, or place of religious worship, hereditaments, and premises, or of such part or parts of the same, respecting which such consent in writing as aforesaid shall be given, either by public sale, or private contract, and together, or in parcels, and either at one and the same time, or at different times, for the best price or prices, in money, that can be reasonably obtained for the same, and well and effectually to convey and assure the hereditaments and premises so sold, to the purchaser or purchasers thereof, his, her, or their heirs and assigns, or as he, she, or they, shall direct or appoint; and the hereditaments and premises so sold, and conveyed, and assured as aforesaid, shall thenceforth be held and enjoyed by the purchaser or purchasers thereof, his, her, and their heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, freed, and absolutely discharged from these presents, and from the trusts hereby declared, and every of them;

And the

Appropriation of the purchase money.

Trustees and Trustee for the time being, acting in the trusts of these presents, shall Apply the Money which shall arise from every such sale as aforesaid, so far as the same money will extend, to the discharge of all the incumbrances, liabilities, and responsibilities, whether personal or otherwise, lawfully contracted or occasioned by virtue of these presents, or in the due execution of the trusts thereof, or of any of them; and subject thereto, either for or toward promoting the preaching of the gospel amongst the said people called Methodists, in the Circuit in which the said chapel or place of religious worship, shall, for the time being, be situated, or, for the purpose of procuring a larger, or more conveniently or eligibly situated piece of ground, and chapel, or place of religious worship, and premises, in the place or stead of the said piece of ground, chapel, or place of religious worship, hereditaments, and premises so sold and disposed of, to be settled upon the same trusts, and to and for the same ends, intents, and purposes, and with, under, and subject to the same powers, provisoes, and declarations, as are in and by these presents expressed and contained, or such of them as shall be then subsisting, or capable of taking effect:

Further power to sell (in the case mentioned) without consent of the Conference.

PROVIDED ALWAYS, that, if at any time hereafter, the Income arising from the said piece of ground, chapel, or place of religious worship, hereditaments, and premises, shall be inadequate to meet and discharge the interest of all monies borrowed, and then due, and owing upon, or on account of, the said trust-premises, and the various current expenses attending the due execution of the trusts of these presents, and, if the Trustees and Trustee for the time being of these presents, shall desire to retire and be discharged from the burden and execution of the said trusts, and, if no such proper persons as are hereinafter mentioned or described, can be found to take upon themselves the burden and execution of the said trusts, with the responsibility and liability to be thereby incurred, then, and in that case, it shall be lawful for the Trustees for the time being as aforesaid, or the major part of them, of their own proper authority, and without any such consent by the said Conference as aforesaid, to sell and dispose of the said piece of ground, chapel, or place of religious worship, hereditaments, and premises, or of any part or parts of the same respectively, either by public sale, or private contract, and either together, or in parcels, and either at one and the same time, or at different times, for the best price or prices in money, that can be reasonably obtained for the same; and well and effectually to convey and assure the hereditaments and premises so sold, with the appurtenances, to the purchaser or purchasers thereof, his, her, or their heirs and assigns, or as he, she, or they shall direct or appoint, and the hereditaments and premises so sold, and conveyed and assured, as last aforesaid, shall thenceforth be held and enjoyed by the purchaser and purchasers thereof, his, her, and their heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, freed, and absolutely discharged, from these presents, and the trusts hereby declared,

Appropriation of the purchase money.

and every of them; And all the money arising from every such last-mentioned sale, shall be applied, disposed of, and appropriated, as far as the same money will extend, to the purposes, and in the manner hereinbefore directed, with respect to any sale made in pursuance, or in consequence of, such consent, of or by the said Conference, as aforesaid; But it is hereby declared, that no sale shall be made by virtue of this present power or authority, unless the Trustees for the time being as aforesaid, or a majority of them, shall give notice in writing to the said Conference or to the President for the time being of the said Conference, on or before the first day of the then next annual meeting of the said Conference, of their intention to make such sale, and the reasons for the same; nor unless the said Conference shall, for the space of six calendar months next after the said first day of their said annual meeting, refuse or neglect, either to give, grant, or provide, the said Trustees and Trustee for the time being, with such pecuniary or other aid, assistance, and relief as shall enable them and him, to bear, and continue the burden of the execution of the trusts of these presents, or, (as the case may be,) to find and provide other Trustees, who will take upon themselves the burden of the execution of the said Trusts:

Receipts of Trustees to be good discharges.

AND it is hereby declared, that, the Receipt and Receipts of a majority of the Trustees for the time being of these presents, shall, in all cases of payment made to them, or any of them, as such Trustees or Trustee as aforesaid, be a full discharge to the person or persons entitled to such receipt or receipts, his, her, and their, heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, for all mortgage-monies, purchase-monies, or other monies, therein respectively expressed and acknowledged to have been received, by any such Trustees or Trustee, as aforesaid; AND in all cases, except for money paid and received in respect of any mortgage or sale of the said hereditaments and premises, or any part or parts thereof, as aforesaid, the receipt and receipts of any one or more of the Trustees for the time being of these presents, or of any one or more of the Stewards or Treasurers for the time being, by the said Trustees for the time being, or the major part of them, duly authorized to sign and give receipts, shall be a full discharge to the person and persons entitled to such receipt or receipts, his, her, and their, heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, for all monies, (except as aforesaid,) therein respectively

expressed, and acknowledged to have been received by any such Trustee, Steward, or Treasurer, as aforesaid:

Purchasers or Mortgagees not bound to inquire into the premises, nor be answerable for the application of purchase or mortgage monies.

AND it is hereby declared, that, it shall not be incumbent upon any mortgagee, or mortgagees, purchaser, or purchasers, of the said piece or parcel of ground, chapel, or place of religious worship, hereditaments, and premises, or of any part or parts thereof, respectively, to inquire into the necessity, expediency, or propriety, of any mortgage, sale, or disposition, of the said piece of ground, chapel, or place of religious worship, hereditaments, and premises, or of any part or parts thereof, made, or proposed to be made, by the said Trustees or Trustee for the time being, or the major part of them, as aforesaid, or whether any such notice, or notices as aforesaid, was or were duly given, or was or were valid, or sufficient, or whether any Steward or Stewards, Treasurer or Treasurers, was or were duly authorized to sign, and give receipts as aforesaid; Nor shall it be incumbent upon any such mortgagee, or mortgagees, purchaser, or purchasers, or any of them, or for any other person or persons, his, her, or their, heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, paying money to such Trustees or Trustee, or to their Steward or Stewards, Treasurer or Treasurers for the time being, as aforesaid, to see to the application, or to be answerable or accountable for the loss, misapplication, or non-application, of such purchase, or other money, or any part thereof, for which a receipt, or receipts, shall be so respectively given, as aforesaid:?

Trustees not chargeable nor accountable; when.

AND it is hereby declared, that, the Trustees or Trustee for the time being of these presents, shall not, nor shall any of them, their, or any of their, heirs, executors, or administrators, or any of them, be chargeable or accountable for any involuntary loss suffered, by him, them, or any of them, nor any one or more of them for any other or others of them, nor for more money than shall come to their respective hands, nor for injury done by others to the said trust-premises, or to any part or parts thereof:

Trustees with-drawing, or duly excluded, from the Methodist Society for six months, shall cease to act, and, on being indemnified, shall convey the trust estate to the other Trustees.

PROVIDED ALWAYS, and it is hereby declared, that, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, in case any Trustee or Trustees for the time being of these presents, shall voluntarily withdraw, or be duly excluded, from being a member, or members, of the said Methodist Society, and shall continue out of the said Methodist Society, for more than six calendar months then next following, then, and in every such case, upon the request in writing, of the other, and others, of the said Trustee or Trustees for the time being, or a majority of them, but not otherwise, he, and they, the Trustee and Trustees so withdrawing, or excluded from being a member or members of the said Methodist Society, and continuing out of the said Society for the time aforesaid, shall, at the expense of the said trust-fund or estate and premises, and upon receiving such indemnity as is hereinafter mentioned, well and effectually release and relinquish, the trusts by these presents created and declared, and well and effectually convey and assure the said piece of ground chapel or place of religious worship and premises, either unto, or to the use of, the other and others of the Trustees for the time being of these presents, or otherwise, as shall or may be directed or appointed, under or by virtue of any power or authority hereinafter contained, for appointing new Trustees of these presents, or for increasing the number of such Trustees; and shall not, nor will, thenceforth, act in, intermeddle, or in anywise interfere, in, or about, the execution of the trusts of these presents, or of any of them, but shall, and will, thenceforth, permit and allow, all powers and authorities, given or created, in or by these presents, and all and every the act and acts, done, or to be done, under or by virtue thereof, to be exercised, done, and performed, by the other and others of the Trustees for the time being of these presents, or a majority of them; nevertheless, it is hereby expressly declared, that, in every such case, the Trustees or Trustee, so withdrawing or excluded from being a member or members, and continuing out of the said Methodist Society as aforesaid, shall not be required to execute any release, conveyance, or assurance, as last mentioned, unless and until the other Trustees or Trustee for the time being as aforesaid, or the major part of them, shall have tendered to the Trustees or Trustee so withdrawing, or excluded, from being a member or members, and continuing out, of the said Methodist Society as aforesaid, a Bond, in a sufficient penalty, under the hands and seals of such other Trustees or Trustee, or the major part of them, for indemnifying the Trustees or Trustee so withdrawing or excluded from being a member or members, and continuing out, of the said Methodist Society as aforesaid, and every of them, their, and every of their, heirs, executors, and administrators, of, and from, and against the payment of all and every sum and sums of money, costs, charges, and expences, which he, they, or any of them, his, their, or any of their, heirs, executors, or administrators, either separately, or jointly, with any other Trustees or Trustee of the said trust-premises, may be bound, engaged, or liable to pay, in respect of the said piece of ground chapel or place of religious worship and premises, or in, or about the due execution of, the trusts of these presents; or in place of such bond or obligation, shall procure the Trustees or Trustee so withdrawing, or so excluded, from being a member or members, and continuing out, of the said Methodist Society, for the time aforesaid, to be effectually released

and discharged, of, and from, and against the payment of, all such sum and sums of money, costs, charges, and expences, as last aforesaid, and from all liability on account or in respect thereof, or in anywise relating thereto; And after the tender of such bond of indemnity or of such release as last aforesaid, all meetings held, and all acts, deeds, matters and things, done, performed, and executed by the other Trustees or Trustee for the time being of these presents, or a majority of them, shall be as valid and effectual to all intents and purposes whatsoever, as if the Trustee or Trustees so withdrawing, or excluded from being a member or members, and continuing out, of the said Methodist Society, as aforesaid, had actually released and relinquished the trusts of these presents, and every of them, and had actually conveyed and assured the said trust-premises, as last aforesaid, anything in these presents contained to the contrary thereof, in anywise notwithstanding:

Not to prevent his future election, if in other respects eligible.

PROVIDED ALWAYS, that nothing hereinbefore contained, shall be construed to prevent, or disqualify, any person or persons so withdrawing, or excluded as aforesaid, from being at any future time, nominated, appointed, and chosen (if then duly qualified) to be, a Trustee or

Trustees may be appointed, although above, or reduced below the specified number.

PROVIDED ALWAYS, and it is hereby declared, that, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, although the Trustees for the time being of these presents shall not be reduced to the number of five, or if, (through accident, neglect, or otherwise, the appointment of new Trustees shall not be made upon their being reduced to that number and,) they shall be reduced to any less number than five, then, and in either of the said cases, it shall be lawful for the said Superintendant Preacher, and the then surviving Trustees or Trustee, or the major part of them present at any meeting convened in manner as is hereinbefore mentioned and directed respecting Special meetings, to exercise, and execute, the power hereinbefore contained for the nomination, choice, and appointment of new Trustees, and for the then surviving Trustees and Trustee of these presents, to convey, and assure, the said trust-premises as last aforesaid, although the said surviving Trustees shall then either exceed, or shall be reduced to any number below, the said number of five:

Power to increase the number of Trustees.

PROVIDED ALWAYS, and it is hereby declared, that, if at any time or times hereafter, the Trustees, or a majority of them, for the time being of these presents, shall judge it necessary or expedient, to increase the number of the Trustees of these presents, beyond the original number of Trustees, then, and in every such case, it shall be lawful for the said Superintendant Preacher for the time being to nominate, as aforesaid, and for the Trustees for the time being of these presents, or the major part of them, present at such meeting convened as is hereinbefore mentioned and directed respecting Special meetings, to choose, elect, and appoint, in the same manner, as is hereinbefore mentioned and directed for the appointment and filling up of the original number of Trustees, any number of such proper persons as aforesaid, to be Trustees of the said piece of ground chapel or place of religious worship and premises, but so as the Trustees so to be elected and appointed as last aforesaid, together with such of the surviving Trustees as shall continue in the trusts of these presents, shall not in the whole exceed the number of THIRTY persons; And the said piece of ground chapel or place of religious worship hereditaments and premises, and every part and parcel thereof, with the appurtenances, (excepting only such part and parts thereof as shall have been sold and conveyed under or by virtue of the said powers of sale in these presents contained, or either of them,) shall thereupon forthwith, be legally and effectually conveyed and assured to, and vested in, such continuing and new Trustees jointly, or to and in such new Trustees wholly, as the case may be, upon such and the same trusts, and to and for such and the same ends, intents, and purposes, and with, under, and subject to, such and the same powers, provisoes, declarations, clauses, and agreements, as are in these presents expressed, declared, contained, or referred to, concerning the same piece of ground chapel or place of religious worship, hereditaments and premises, or such of them as shall be then subsisting, or capable of taking effect; and to, for, or upon, no other use, trust, end, intent, or purpose, whatsoever, anything in these presents contained to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding:

Power to bring actions and to refer disputes to arbitration.

PROVIDED LASTLY, and it is hereby declared, that, from time to time and at all times hereafter, it shall in all cases be lawful for the Trustees for the time being of these presents, in Special meeting assembled as aforesaid, or the majority of them, to bring, or defend, any action or actions, suit or suits, respecting the said trust estate and premises, in the names or name of the Trustees or Trustee for the time being of these presents; And also, that, if any Difference, Disagreement, or Dispute, shall at any time or times hereafter, happen to arise between the Trustees or Trustee for the time being acting in the trusts of these presents, and any other person or persons whomsoever, touching or relating to any boundary, right, privilege, light, way, drain, easement, or any other matter or thing whatsoever, belonging, or relating, or appertaining, or supposed, believed, or claimed to belong, relate, or appertain, to the said piece of ground chapel or place of religious worship hereditaments and premises, or to any part or parts thereof, and claimed or disputed by the party or parties in difference, disagreement, or dispute, then, and in every such case, it shall be lawful for, but not imperative upon, the Trustees for the time

being of these presents, or a majority of them, in Special meeting assembled as aforesaid, to refer every or any such matter, or difference, disagreement, or dispute, to the arbitration and decision, of two indifferent persons, one to be chosen by the said Trustees for the time being, or a majority of them, and the other by the other party or parties in difference, or disagreement, and the award to be made by the said arbitrators, under their hands, or hands and seals, under such restrictions and conditions, as to time, and other circumstances, as shall have been previously agreed upon in writing, by the said Trustees, for the time being, or a majority of them, and the other party or parties in difference or disagreement, or the award of their umpire to be appointed by the said arbitrators, (subject to such restrictions and conditions as aforesaid,) under his hand, or hand and seal, shall be binding and conclusive, upon all parties, and the same may, if

Release of Freehold Ground

For the Purposes of a Methodist Chapel, with a Declaration of Trusts, &c.

By Reference to the Previous "Model Deed."

Commencement.

This Indenture, made the day of in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-two, between [the Vendor]

Parties.

of the first part, [the Trustees] of the second part, and A. B. (the Superin tendant Preacher for the time being of the Circuit in the Methodist Connexion, in which the piece of ground and hereditaments, hereinafter described, are situate,) of the third part:

Recital of Contract.

WHEREAS, the said parties to these presents, of the second part, being possessed of certain sums of money, intended to be laid out in the purchase of a piece of ground and hereditaments, and in erecting and building thereon, a chapel, or place of religious worship, with such appurtenances as may be thought convenient, for the use of the people called Methodists, to be settled to the use, upon the trusts, and in manner hereinafter declared and contained, or referred to, have, in pursuance of the said intention, contracted and agreed with the said [Vendor,] for the absolute purchase of the piece of ground and hereditaments hereinafter described and released at or for the price or sum of pounds.

Testatum.

NOW THIS INDENTURE WITNESSETH, that in pursuance of the said agreement, and in consideration of the said sum of pounds of lawful English money, by the said persons, parties hereto of the second part, to the said [Vendor,] in hand, paid out of the monies in their hands, as aforesaid, at or before the sealing and delivery of these presents, the receipt whereof he the said [Vendor,] doth hereby acknowledge, and doth hereby admit the same sum to be, the full and *bona fide* value of, and in full for the purchase of, the ground and hereditaments hereinafter particularly described; and from the same sum, and every part thereof, doth hereby acquit, release, and discharge the said parties to these presents of the second part, and every of them, their, and every of their heirs, executors, and administrators, for ever; He, the said [Vendor,] with the approbation of the said A. B. Superintendant for the time being, as aforesaid, testified by his being a party to and executing these presents, HATH granted, bargained, sold, aliened, released, and confirmed; and by these presents DOTH grant, bargain, sell, alien, release, and confirm, unto the said parties hereto of the second part, (in their actual possession now being, by virtue of a bargain and sale to them thereof made, by the said [Vendor,] in consideration of five shillings by indenture bearing date the day next before the day of the date of these presents, for the term of one whole year, commencing from the day next before the day of the date of the same Indenture of bargain and sale, and by force of the statute made for transferring uses into possession,) and their heirs, and assigns, ALL,

Parcels.

&c., [describe accurately the property to be conveyed,] together with all and singular houses, out-houses, General Words.

edifices, buildings, barns, yards, gardens, trees, woods, underwoods, mounds, mines, delfs, quarries, fences, hedges, ditches, sewers, drains, paths, passages, ways, waters, watercourses, lights, liberties, privileges, easements, profits, commodities, emoluments, and appurtenances whatsoever, to the said piece or parcel of ground, messuage, or tenement, and hereditaments hereby granted and released, or intended so to be, belonging, or in anywise appertaining, or with the same or any part thereof respectively, now, or at any time heretofore, held, used, occupied, or enjoyed, or intended so to be, or accepted, reputed, deemed, taken, or known, as part, parcel, or member, thereof, or of any part thereof, with their, and every of their appurtenances, and the

reversion and reversions, remainder and remainders, yearly and other rents, issues, and profits thereof; and all the estate, right, title, interest, inheritance, use, trust, property, profits, possession, claim, and demand whatsoever, both at law, and in equity, of him the said [Vendor,] in, to, out of, and upon, the same premises, and in, to, and out of, every part and parcel thereof, with their, and every of their appurtenances: To HAVE AND TO HOLD the said

Habendum.

piece or parcel of ground, messuage, or tenement, hereditaments, and all and singular other, the premises by these presents granted and released, or otherwise assured, or intended so to be, with their, and every of their appurtenances, in possession, immediately from the making hereof, and without any power of revocation, reservation, trust, condition, limitation, clause, or agreement whatsoever, for the benefit of the said [Vendor,] or of any person or persons claiming under him, Unto, and to the Use of, the said parties hereto of the second part, their heirs and assigns for

Declaration of Trusts, &c., *by reference.*

ever; But nevertheless upon such and the same trusts, and to and for such and the same ends, intents, and purposes, and with, under, and subject to such and the same powers, provisoes, declarations, and agreements as are expressed, contained, and declared, or

Words of Reference.

referred to, in, and by a certain Indenture of Release bearing date on or about the third day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-two, and made, or expressed to be made, between John Sutcliffe, Benjamin Garside, Francis Farnell, John Swallow, Thomas Firth, Robert Wilson, Samuel Naylor, John Fearby Sutcliffe, Thomas Fox Sutcliffe, Charles Swallow, John Swallow the younger, Samuel Morley, Joseph Garside, accountant, William Farnell, and Joseph Garside, wood-turner, therein respectively described, of the first part, the Rev. George Marsden therein described of the second part, and James Brown therein also described, of the third part, and enrolled in His Majesty's High Court of Chancery, on the twenty-fifth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-two; being a Deed made for the Settlement of a piece or parcel of Ground and Chapel, or place of religious worship, with the appurtenances, situate at Skircoat, in the parish of Halifax and county of York, for the use of the People called Methodists, in the Connexion established by the late Rev. John Wesley: And to, for, or upon no other use, trust, intent, or purpose whatsoever; In witness whereof, the said Parties to these Presents have hereunto set their hands and seals, the day and year first above written.

Practical Observations.

It may be as well to observe, that the "Model Deed" is so constructed, as to admit of reference being made to it in the settlement of Copyhold and Leasehold, as well as of Freehold Tenures; but that, though by these means a full and efficient declaration of Trusts, &c., may be secured, by the insertion of a few words of reference, yet neither this nor any other plan can dispense with the requisites necessary to make a good legal conveyance of the property, to the Trustees; or with the strictest compliance with the statutes of Mortmain. Few Cases arise so identical in all circumstances, as to admit of a precedent for one being literally copied for another. The above precedent, therefore, though drawn in as general terms as the subject seems to admit of, will require to be adapted to the particular circumstances of each case; and the operative part varied so as to make it apply to the tenure of the estate (if other than freehold) to be conveyed. The words of reference after the Habendum will, however, in all cases, remain the same. Every Deed of reference must also be executed with the same forms of acknowledgment, attestation, &c., and must be enrolled in Chancery, as in the case of the Model-Deed; and when the conveyance is for a valuable consideration, a receipt for the purchase-money must be indorsed.

Contents.

The End.

London: Printed by James Nichols. Hoxton-Square.

The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance:

A Political Expostulation.

By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1874.

The right of Translation is reserved.

London: Printed by William Clowes and Sons, Stamford Street and Charing Cross.

Contents.

The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance.

I. THE OCCASION AND SCOPE OF THIS TRACT.

IN the prosecution of a purpose not polemical but pacific, I have been led to employ words which belong, more or less, to the region of religious controversy; and which, though they were themselves few, seem to require, from the various feelings they have aroused, that I should carefully define, elucidate, and defend them. The task is not of a kind agreeable to me; but I proceed to perform it.

Among the causes, which have tended to disturb and perplex the public mind in the consideration of our own religious difficulties, one has been a certain alarm at the aggressive activity and imagined growth of the Roman Church in this country. All are aware of our susceptibility on this side; and it was not, I think, improper for one who desires to remove everything that can interfere with a calm and judicial temper, and who believes the alarm to be groundless, to state, pointedly though briefly, some reasons for that belief.

Accordingly I did not scruple to use the following language, in a paper inserted in the number of the 'Contemporary Review' for the month of October. I was speaking of "the question whether a handful of the clergy are or are not engaged in an utterly hopeless and visionary effort to Romanise the Church and people of England."

"At no time since the bloody reign of Mary has such a scheme been possible. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth: when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith; when she has refurbished, and paraded anew, every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history."

'Contemporary Review,' Oct. 1874, p. 674.

Had I been, when I wrote this passage, as I now am, addressing myself in considerable measure to my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, I should have striven to avoid the seeming roughness of some of these expressions; but as the question is now about their substance, from which I am not in any particular disposed to recede, any attempt to recast their general form would probably mislead. I proceed, then, to deal with them on their merits.

More than one friend of mine, among those who have been led to join the Roman Catholic communion, has made this passage the subject, more or less, of expostulation. Now, in my opinion, the assertions which it makes are, as coming from a layman who has spent most and the best years of his life in the observation and practice of politics, not aggressive but defensive.

It is neither the abettors of the Papal Chair, nor any one who, however far from being an abettor of the Papal Chair, actually writes from a Papal point of view, that has a right to remonstrate with the world at large; but it is the world at large, on the contrary, that has the fullest right to remonstrate, first with His Holiness, secondly with those who share his proceedings, thirdly even with such as passively allow and accept them.

I therefore, as one of the world at large, propose to expostulate in my turn. I shall strive to show to such of my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects as may kindly give me a hearing that, after the singular steps which the authorities of their Church have in these last years thought fit to take, the people of this country, who fully believe in their loyalty, are entitled, on purely civil grounds, to expect from them some declaration or manifestation of opinion, in reply to that ecclesiastical party in their Church who have laid down, in their name, principles adverse to the purity and integrity of civil allegiance.

Undoubtedly my allegations are of great breadth. Such broad allegations require a broad and a deep foundation. The first question which they raise is, Are they, as to the material part of them, true? But even their truth might not suffice to show that their publication was opportune. The second question, then, which they raise is, Are they, for any practical purpose, material? And there is yet a third, though a minor, question, which arises out of the propositions in connection with their authorship, Were they suitable to be set forth by the

present writer?

To these three questions I will now set myself to reply. And the matter of my reply will, as I conceive, constitute and convey an appeal to the understandings of my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, which I trust that, at the least, some among them may deem not altogether unworthy of their consideration.

From the language used by some of the organs of Roman Catholic opinion, it is, I am afraid, plain that in some quarters they have given deep offence. Displeasure, indignation, even fury, might be said to mark the language which in the heat of the moment has been expressed here and there. They have been hastily treated as an attack made upon Roman Catholics generally, nay, as an insult offered them. It is obvious to reply, that of Roman Catholics generally they state nothing. Together with a reference to "converts," of which I shall say more, they constitute generally a free and strong animadversion on the conduct of the Papal Chair, and of its advisers and abettors. If I am told that he who animadverts upon these assaults thereby, or insults, Roman Catholics at large, who do not choose their ecclesiastical rulers, and are not recognised as having any voice in the government of their Church, I cannot be bound by or accept a proposition which seems to me to be so little in accordance with reason.

Before all things, however, I should desire it to be understood that, in the remarks now offered, I desire to eschew not only religious bigotry, but likewise theological controversy. Indeed, with theology, except in its civil bearing, with theology as such, I have here nothing whatever to do. But it is the peculiarity of Roman theology that, by thrusting itself into the temporal domain, it naturally, and even necessarily, comes to be a frequent theme of political discussion. To quiet-minded Roman Catholics, it must be a subject of infinite annoyance, that their religion is, on this ground more than any other, the subject of criticism; more than any other, the occasion of conflicts with the State and of civil disquietude. I feel sincerely how much hardship their case entails. But this hardship is brought upon them altogether by the conduct of the authorities of their own Church. Why did theology enter so largely into the debates of Parliament on Roman Catholic Emancipation? Certainly not because our statesmen and debaters of fifty years ago had an abstract love of such controversies, but because it was extensively believed that the Pope of Rome had been and was a trespasser upon ground which belonged to the civil authority, and that he affected to determine by spiritual prerogative questions of the civil sphere. This fact, if fact it be, and not the truth or falsehood, the reasonableness or unreasonableness, of any article of purely religious belief, is the whole and sole cause of the mischief. To this fact, and to this fact alone, my language is referable: but for this fact, it would have been neither my duty nor my desire to use it. All other Christian bodies are content with freedom in their own religious domain. Orientals, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Nonconformists, one and all, in the present day, contentedly and thankfully accept the benefits of civil order; never pretend that the State is not its own master; make no religious claims to temporal possessions or advantages; and, consequently, never are in perilous collision with the State. Nay more, even so I believe it is with the mass of Roman Catholics individually. But not so with the leaders of their Church, or with those who take pride in following the leaders. Indeed, this has been made matter of boast:—

"There is not another Church so called" (than the Roman), "nor any community professing to be a Church, which does not submit, or obey, or hold its peace, when the civil governors of the world command."—'The Present Crisis of the Holy See,' by H. E. Manning, D.D. London, 1861, p. 75.

The Rome of the Middle Ages claimed universal monarchy. The modern Church of Rome has abandoned nothing, retracted nothing. Is that all? Far from it. By condemning (as will be seen) those who, like Bishop Doyle in 1826,

Lords' Committee, March 18, 1826. Report, p. 190.

charge the mediæval Popes with aggression, she unconditionally, even, if covertly, maintains what the mediæval Popes maintained. But even this is not the worst. The worst by far is that whereas, in the national Churches and communities of the Middle Ages, there was a brisk, vigorous, and constant opposition to these outrageous claims, an opposition which stoutly asserted its own orthodoxy, which always caused itself to be respected, and which even sometimes gained the upper hand; now, in this nineteenth century of ours, and while it is growing old, this same opposition has been put out of court, and judicially extinguished within the Papal Church, by the recent decrees of the Vatican. And it is impossible for persons accepting those decrees justly to complain, when such documents are subjected in good faith to a strict examination as respects their compatibility with civil right and the obedience of subjects.

In defending my language, I shall carefully mark its limits. But all defence is reassertion, which properly requires a deliberate reconsideration; and no man who thus reconsiders should scruple, if he find so much as a word that may convey a false impression, to amend it. Exactness in stating truth according to the measure of our intelligence, is an indispensable condition of justice, and of a title to be heard.

My propositions, then, as they stood, are these:—

- That "Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem*, a policy of violence and change in

faith."

- That she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused.
- That no one can now become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another.
- That she ("Rome") has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.

II. THE FIRST AND THE FOURTH PROPOSITIONS.

Of the first and fourth of these propositions I shall dispose rather summarily, as they appear to belong to the theological domain. They refer to a fact, and they record an opinion. One fact to which they refer is this: that, in days within my memory, the constant, favourite, and imposing argument of Roman controversialists was the unbroken and absolute identity in belief of the Roman Church from the days of our Saviour until now. No one, who has at all followed the course of this literature during the last forty years, can fail to be sensible of the change in its present tenour. More and more have the assertions of continuous uniformity of doctrine receded into scarcely penetrable shadow. More and more have another series of assertions, of a living authority, ever ready to open, adopt, and shape Christian doctrine according to the times, taken their place. Without discussing the abstract compatibility of these lines of argument, I note two of the immense practical differences between them. In the first, the office claimed by the Church is principally that of a witness to facts; in the second, principally that of a judge, if not a revealer, of doctrine. In the first, the processes which the Church undertakes are subject to a constant challenge and appeal to history; in the second, no amount of historical testimony can avail against the unmeasured power of the theory of development. Most important, most pregnant considerations, these, at least for two classes of persons: for those who think that exaggerated doctrines of Church power are among the real and serious dangers of the age; and for those who think that against all forms, both of superstition and of unbelief, one main preservative is to be found in maintaining the truth and authority of history, and the inestimable value of the historic spirit.

So much for the fact; as for the opinion, that the recent Papal decrees are at war with modern thought, and that, purporting to enlarge the necessary creed of Christendom, they involve a violent breach with history, this is a matter unfit for me to discuss, as it is a question of Divinity; but not unfit for me to have mentioned in my article; since the opinion given there is the opinion of those with whom I was endeavouring to reason, namely, the great majority of the British public.

If it is thought that the word violence was open to exception, I regret I cannot give it up. The justification of the ancient definitions of the Church, which have endured the storms of 1500 years, was to be found in this, that they were not arbitrary or wilful, but that they wholly sprang from, and related to theories rampant at the time, and regarded as menacing to Christian belief. Even the Canons of the Council of Trent have in the main this amount, apart from their matter, of presumptive warrant. But the decrees of the present perilous Pontificate have been passed to favour and precipitate prevailing currents of opinion in the ecclesiastical world of Rome. The growth of what is often termed among Protestants Mariolatry, and of belief in Papal Infallibility, was notoriously advancing, but it seems not fast enough to satisfy the dominant party. To aim the deadly blows of 1854

Decree of the Immaculate Conception,

and 1870 at the old historic, scientific, and moderate school, was surely an act of violence; and with this censure the proceeding of 1870 has actually been visited by the first living theologian now within the Roman Communion, I mean, Dr. John Henry Newman; who has used these significant words, among others: "Why should an aggressive and insolent faction be allowed to make the heart of the just sad, whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful?"

See the remarkable Letter of Dr. Newman to Bishop Ullathorne, in the 'Guardian' of April 6. 1870.

III. THE SECOND PROPOSITION.

I take next my second Proposition: that Rome has refurbished, and paraded anew, every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused.

Is this then a fact, or is it not?

I must assume that it is denied; and therefore I cannot wholly pass by the work of proof. But I will state in the fewest possible words, and with references, a few propositions, all the holders of which have been *condemned* by the See of Rome during my own generation, and especially within the last twelve or fifteen years. And, in order that I may do nothing towards importing passion into what is matter of pure argument, I will avoid citing any of the fearfully energetic epithets in which the condemnations are sometimes clothed.

1. Those who maintain the Liberty of the Press. Encyclical Letter of Pope Gregory XVI., in 1831: and of

Pope Pius IX., in 1864.

2. Or the liberty of conscience and of worship. Encyclical of Pius IX., December 8, 1864.

3. Or the liberty of speech. 'Syllabus' of March 18, 1861. Prop, lxxix. Encyclical of Pope Pius IX., December 8, 1864.

4. Or who contend that Papal judgments and decrees may, without sin, be disobeyed, or differed from, unless they treat of the rules (*dogmata*) of faith or morals. Ibid.

5. Or who assign to the State the power of defining the civil rights (*jura*) and province of the Church. 'Syllabus' of Pope Pius IX., March 8, 1861. Ibid. Prop. xix.

6. Or who hold that Roman Pontiffs and Ecumenical Councils have transgressed the limits of their power, and usurped the rights of princes. Ibid. Prop, xxiii.

(It must be borne in mind, that "Ecumenical Councils" here mean Roman Councils, not recognised by the rest of the Church. The Councils of the early Church did not interfere with the jurisdiction of the civil power.)

7. Or that the Church may not employ force. (*Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet.*) 'Syllabus,' Prop. xxiv.

8. Or that power, not inherent in the office of the Episcopate, but granted to it by the civil authority, may be withdrawn from it at the discretion of that authority. Ibid. Prop. xxv.

9. Or that the civil immunity (*immunitas*) of the Church and its ministers, depends upon civil right. Ibid. Prop. xxx.

10. Or that in the conflict of laws civil and ecclesiastical, the civil law should prevail. Ibid. Prop. xlii.

11. Or that any method of instruction of youth, solely secular, may be approved. Ibid. Prop, xlviii.

12. Or that knowledge of things philosophical and civil, may and should decline to be guided by Divine and Ecclesiastical authority. Ibid. Prop. lvii.

13. Or that marriage is not in its essence a Sacrament. Ibid. Prop. lxvi.

14. Or that marriage, not sacramentally contracted, (*si sacramentum excludatur*) has a binding force. Ibid. Prop. lxxiii.

15. Or that the abolition of the Temporal Power of the Popedom would be highly advantageous to the Church. Ibid. Prop. lxxvi. Also lxx.

16. Or that any other religion than the Roman religion may be established by a State. Ibid. Prop, lxxvii.

17. Or that in "Countries called Catholic," the free exercise of other religions may laudably be allowed. 'Syllabus,' Prop, lxxviii.

18. Or that the Roman Pontiff ought to come to terms with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization. Ibid. Prop. lxxx.

For the original passages from the Encyclical and Syllabus of Pius IX., see Appendix A.

This list is now perhaps sufficiently extended, although I have as yet not touched the decrees of 1870. But, before quitting it, I must offer three observations on what it contains.

Firstly. I do not place all the Propositions in one and the same category; for there are a portion of them which, as far as I can judge, might, by the combined aid of favourable construction and vigorous explanation, be brought within bounds. And I hold that favourable construction of the terms used in controversies is the right general rule. But this can only be so, when construction is an open question. When the author of certain propositions claims, as in the case before us, a sole and unlimited power to interpret them in such manner and by such rules as he may from time to time think fit, the only defence for all others concerned is at once to judge for themselves, how much of unreason or of mischief the words, naturally understood, may contain.

Secondly. It may appear, upon a hasty perusal, that neither the infliction of penalty in life, limb, liberty, or goods, on disobedient members of the Christian Church, nor the title to depose sovereigns, and release subjects from their allegiance, with all its revolting consequences, has been here reaffirmed. In terms, there is no mention of them; but in the substance of the propositions, I grieve to say, they are beyond doubt included. For it is notorious that they have been declared and decreed by "Rome," that is to say by Popes and Papal Councils; and the stringent condemnations of the Syllabus include all those who hold that Popes and Papal Councils (declared ecumenical) have transgressed the just limits of their power, or usurped the rights of princes. What have been their opinions and decrees about persecution I need hardly say; and indeed the right to employ physical force is even here undisguisedly claimed (No. 7).

Even while I am writing, I am reminded, from an unquestionable source, of the words of Pope Pius IX. himself on the deposing power. I add only a few italics; the words appear as given in a translation, without the original:—

"The present Pontiff used these words in replying to the address from the Academia of the Catholic Religion (July 21, 1873):—

"There are many errors regarding the Infallibility: but the most malicious of all is that which includes, in that dogma, the right of deposing sovereigns, and declaring the people no longer bound by the obligation of

fidelity. This right has now and again, in critical circumstances, been exercised by the Pontiffs: but it has nothing to do with Papal Infallibility. Its origin was not the infallibility, but the authority of the Pope. This authority, in accordance with public right, which was then vigorous, and with the acquiescence of all Christian nations, who revered in the Pope the supreme Judge of the Christian Commonwealth, extended so far as to pass judgment, even in civil affairs, on the acts of Princes and of Nations."

'Civilization and the See of Rome.' By Lord Robert Montagu. Dublin, 1874. A Lecture delivered under the auspices of the Catholic Union of Ireland. I have a little misgiving about the version: but not of a nature to affect the substance.

Lastly. I must observe that these are not mere opinions of the Pope himself, nor even are they opinions which he might paternally recommend to the pious consideration of the faithful. With the promulgation of his opinions is unhappily combined, in the Encyclical Letter, which virtually, though not expressly, includes the whole, a command to all his spiritual children (from which command we the disobedient children are in no way excluded) to hold them.

"Itaque omnes et singulas pravas opiniones et doctrinas singillatim hisce literis commemoratas auctoritate nostra Apostolicâ reprobamus, proscribimus, atque damnamus; easque ab omnibus Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filiis, veluti reprobatas, proscriptas, atque damnatas omnino haberi volumus et mandamus." Encycl. Dec. 8, 1864.

And the decrees of 1870 will presently show us, what they establish as the binding force of the *mandate* thus conveyed to the Christian world.

IV. THE THIRD PROPOSITION.

I now pass to the operation of these extraordinary declarations on personal and private duty.

When the cup of endurance, which had so long been filling, began, with the council of the Vatican in 1870, to overflow, the most famous and learned living theologian of the Roman Communion, Dr. von Döllinger, long the foremost champion of his Church, refused compliance, and submitted, with his temper undisturbed and his freedom unimpaired, to the extreme and most painful penalty of excommunication. With him, many of the most learned and respected theologians of the Roman Communion in Germany underwent the same sentence. The very few, who elsewhere (I do not speak of Switzerland) suffered in like manner, deserve an admiration rising in proportion to their fewness. It seems as though Germany, from which Luther blew the mighty trumpet that even now echoes through the land, still retained her primacy in the domain of conscience, still supplied the *centuria prærogativa* of the great *comitia* of the world.

But let no man wonder or complain. Without imputing to anyone the moral murder, for such it is, of stifling conscience and conviction, I for one cannot be surprised that the fermentation, which is working through the mind of the Latin Church, has as yet (elsewhere than in Germany) but in few instances come to the surface. By the mass of mankind, it is morally impossible that questions such as these can be adequately examined; so it ever has been, and so in the main it will continue, until the principles of manufacturing machinery shall have been applied, and with analogous results, to intellectual and moral processes. Followers they are and must be, and in a certain sense ought to be. But what as to the leaders of society, the men of education and of leisure? I will try to suggest some answer in few words. A change of religious profession is under all circumstances a great and awful thing. Much more is the question, however, between conflicting, or apparently conflicting, duties arduous, when the religion of a man has been changed for him, over his head, and without the very least of his participation. Far be it then from me to make any Roman Catholic, except the great hierarchic Power, and those who have egged it on, responsible for the portentous proceedings which we have witnessed. My conviction is that, even of those, who may not shake off the yoke, multitudes will vindicate at any rate their loyalty at the expense of the consistency, which perhaps in difficult matters of religion few among us perfectly maintain. But this belongs to the future; for the present, nothing could in my opinion be more unjust than to hold the members of the Roman Church in general already responsible for the recent innovations. The duty of observers, who think the claims involved in these decrees arrogant and false, and such as not even impotence real or supposed ought to shield from criticism, is frankly to state the case, and, by way of friendly challenge, to intreat their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen to replace themselves in the position which five-and-forty years ago this nation, by the voice and action of its Parliament, declared its belief that they held.

Upon a strict re-examination of the language, as a part from the substance of my fourth Proposition, I find it faulty, inasmuch as it seems to imply that a "convert" now joining the Papal Church, not only gives up certain rights and duties of freedom, but surrenders them by a conscious and deliberate act. What I have less accurately said that he renounced, I might have more accurately said that he forfeited. To speak strictly, the claim now made upon him by the authority, which he solemnly and with the highest responsibility acknowledges, requires him to surrender his mental and moral freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another. There may have been, and may be, persons who in their sanguine trust will not shrink from this result, and will

console themselves with the notion that their loyalty and civil duty are to be committed to the custody of one much wiser than themselves. But I am sure that there are also "converts" who, when they perceive, will by word and act reject, the consequence which relentless logic draws for them. If, however, my proposition be true, there is no escape from the dilemma. Is it then true, or is it not true, that Rome requires a convert, who now joins her, to forfeit his moral and mental freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another?

In order to place this matter in as clear a light as I can, it will be necessary to go back a little upon our recent history.

A century ago we began to relax that system of penal laws against Roman Catholics, at once pettifogging, base, and cruel, which Mr. Burke has scathed and blasted with his immortal eloquence.

When this process had reached the point, at which the question was whether they should be admitted into Parliament, there arose a great and prolonged national controversy; and some men, who at no time of their lives were narrow-minded, such as Sir Robert Peel, the Minister, resisted the concession. The arguments in its favour were obvious and strong, and they ultimately prevailed. But the strength of the opposing party had lain in the allegation that, from the nature and claims of the Papal power, it was not possible for the consistent Roman Catholic to pay to the crown of this country an entire allegiance, and that the admission of persons, thus self-disabled, to Parliament was inconsistent with the safety of the State and nation; which had not very long before, it may be observed, emerged from a struggle for existence.

An answer to this argument was indispensable; and it was supplied mainly from two sources. The Josephine laws,

See the work of Count dal Pozzo on the 'Austrian Ecclesiastical Law.' London: Murray, 1827. The Leopoldine Laws in Tuscany may also be mentioned.

then still subsisting in the Austrian empire, and the arrangements which had been made after the peace of 1815 by Prussia and the German States with Pius VII. and Gonsalvi, proved that the Papal Court could submit to circumstances, and could allow material restraints even upon the exercise of its ecclesiastical prerogatives. Here, then, was a reply in the sense of the phrase *solvitur ambulando*. Much information of this class was collected for the information of Parliament and the country.

See 'Report from the Select Committee appointed to report the nature and substance of the Laws and Ordinances existing in Foreign States, respecting the regulation of their Roman Catholic subjects in Ecclesiastical matters, and their intercourse with the See of Rome, or any other Foreign Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.' Printed for the House of Commons in 1816 and 1817. Reprinted 1851.

But there were also measures taken to learn, from the highest Roman Catholic authorities of this country, what was the exact situation of the members of that communion with respect to some of the better known exorbitances of Papal assumption. Did the Pope claim any temporal jurisdiction? Did he still pretend to the exercise of a power to depose kings, release subjects from their allegiance, and incite them to revolt? Was faith to be kept with heretics? Did the Church still teach the doctrines of persecution? Now, to no one of these questions could the answer really be of the smallest immediate moment to this powerful and solidly compacted kingdom. They were topics selected by way of sample; and the intention was to elicit declarations showing generally that the fangs of the mediaeval Popedom had been drawn, and its claws torn away; that the Roman system, however strict in its dogma, was perfectly compatible with civil liberty, and with the institutions of a free State moulded on a different religious basis from its own.

Answers in abundance were obtained, tending to show that the doctrines of deposition and persecution, of keeping no faith with heretics, and of universal dominion, were obsolete beyond revival; that every assurance could be given respecting them, except such as required the shame of a formal retractation; that they were in effect mere bugbears, unworthy to be taken into account by a nation, which prided itself on being made up of practical men.

But it was unquestionably felt that something more than the renunciation of these particular opinions was necessary in order to secure the full concession of civil rights to Roman Catholics. As to their individual loyalty, a State disposed to generous or candid interpretation had no reason to be uneasy. It was only with regard to requisitions, which might be made on them from another quarter, that apprehension could exist. It was reasonable that England should desire to know not only what the Pope

At that period the eminent and able Bishop Doyle did not scruple to write as follows: "We are taunted with the proceedings of Popes. What, my Lord, have we Catholics to do with the proceedings of Popes, or why should we be made accountable for them?"—"Essay on the Catholic Claims.' To Lord Liverpool, 1826, p. 111.

might do for himself, but to what demands, by the constitution of their Church, they were liable; and how far it was possible that such demands could touch their civil duty. The theory which placed every human being, in things spiritual and things temporal, at the feet of the Roman Pontiff, had not been an *idolum specûs*, a mere theory of the chamber. Brain-power never surpassed in the political history of the world had been devoted for centuries to the single purpose of working it into the practice of Christendom; had in the West achieved for an

impossible problem a partial success; and had in the East punished the obstinate independence of the Church by that Latin conquest of Constantinople, which effectually prepared the way for the downfall of the Eastern empire, and the establishment of the Turks in Europe. What was really material therefore was, not whether the Papal chair laid claim to this or that particular power, but whether it laid claim to some power that included them all, and whether that claim had received such sanction from the authorities of the Latin Church, that there remained within her borders absolutely no tenable standing-ground from which war against it could be maintained. Did the Pope then claim infallibility? Or did he, either without infallibility or with it (and if with it so much the worse), claim an universal obedience from his flock? And were these claims, either or both, affirmed in his Church by authority which even the least Papal of the members of that Church must admit to be binding upon conscience?

The two first of these questions were covered by the third. And well it was that they were so covered. For to them no satisfactory answer could even then be given. The Popes had kept up, with comparatively little intermission, for well-nigh a thousand years their claim to dogmatic infallibility; and had, at periods within the same tract of time, often enough made, and never retracted, that other claim which is theoretically less but practically larger; their claim to an obedience virtually universal from the baptised members of the Church. To the third question it was fortunately more practicable to prescribe a satisfactory reply. It was well known that, in the days of its glory and intellectual power, the great Gallican Church had not only not admitted, but had denied Papal infallibility, and had declared that the local laws and usages of the Church could not be set aside by the will of the Pontiff. Nay, further, it was believed that in the main these had been, down to the close of the last century, the prevailing opinions of the Cisalpine Churches in communion with Rome. The Council of Constance had in act as well as word shown that the Pope's judgments, and the Pope himself, were triable by the assembled representatives of the Christian world. And the Council of Trent, notwithstanding the pre-dominance in it of Italian and Roman influences, if it had not denied, yet had not affirmed either proposition.

All that remained was, to know what were the sentiments entertained on these vital points by the leaders and guides of Roman Catholic opinion nearest to our own doors. And here testimony was offered, which must not, and cannot, be forgotten. In part, this was the testimony of witnesses before the Committees of the two Houses in 1824 and 1825. I need quote two answers only, given by the Prelate, who more than any other represented his Church, and influenced the mind of this country in favour of concession at the time, namely, Bishop Doyle. He was asked,

Committees of both Lords and Commons sat; the former in 1825, the latter in 1824-5. The References were identical, and ran as follows: "To inquire into the state of Ireland, more particularly with reference to the circumstances which may have led to disturbances in that part of the United Kingdom." Bishop Doyle was examined March 21, 1825, and April 21, 1825, before the Lords. The two citations in the text are taken from Bishop Doyle's evidence before the Commons' Committee, March 12, 1825, p. 190.

"In what, and how far, does the Roman Catholic profess to obey the Pope?"

He replied:

"The Catholic professes to obey the Pope in matters which regard his religious faith: and in those matters of ecclesiastical discipline which have already been defined by the competent authorities."

And again.

"Does that justify the objection that is made to Catholics, that their allegiance is divided?"

"I do not think it does in any way. We are bound to obey the Pope in those things that I have already mentioned. But our obedience to the law, and the allegiance which we owe the sovereign, are complete, and full, and perfect, and undivided, inasmuch as they extend to all political, legal, and civil rights of the king or of his subjects. I think the allegiance due to the king, and the allegiance due to the Pope, are as distinct and as divided in their nature, as any two things can possibly be."

Such is the opinion of the dead Prelate. We shall presently hear the opinion of a living one. But the sentiments of the dead man powerfully operated on the open and trustful temper of this people to induce them to grant, at the cost of so much popular feeling and national tradition, the great and just concession of 1829. That concession, without such declarations, it would, to say the least, have been far more difficult to obtain.

Now, bodies are usually held to be bound by the evidence of their own selected and typical witnesses. But in this instance the colleagues of those witnesses thought, fit also to speak collectively.

First let us quote from the collective "Declaration," in the year 1826, of the Vicars Apostolic, who, with Episcopal authority, governed the Roman Catholics of Great Britain.

"The allegiance which Catholics hold to be due, and are bound to pay, to their Sovereign, and to the civil authority of the State, is perfect and undivided. . . .

"They declare that neither the Pope, nor any other prelate or ecclesiastical person of the Roman Catholic Church . . . has any right to interfere directly or indirectly in the Civil Government . . . nor to oppose in any

manner the performance of the civil duties which are due to the king."

Not less explicit was the Hierarchy of the Roman Communion in its "Pastoral Address to the Clergy and Laity of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland," dated January 25, 1826. This address contains a Declaration, from which I extract the following words:—

"It is a duty which they owe to themselves, as well as to their Protestant fellow-subjects, whose good opinion they value, to endeavour once more to remove the false imputations that have been frequently cast upon the faith and discipline of that Church which is intrusted to their care, that all may be enabled to know with accuracy their genuine principles."

In Article 11:—

"They declare on oath their belief that it is not an article of the Catholic Faith, neither are they thereby required to believe, that the Pope is infallible."

and, after various recitals, they set forth

"After this full, explicit, and sworn declaration, we are utterly at a loss to conceive on what possible ground we could be justly charged with bearing towards our most gracious Sovereign only a divided allegiance."

Thus, besides much else that I will not stop to quote, Papal infallibility was most solemnly declared to be a matter on which each man might think as he pleased; the Pope's power to claim obedience was strictly and narrowly limited: it was expressly denied that he had any title, direct or indirect, to interfere in civil government. Of the right of the Pope to define the limits which divide the civil from the spiritual by his own authority, not one word is said by the Prelates of either country.

Since that time, all these propositions have been reversed. The Pope's infallibility, when he speaks *ex cathedrâ* on faith and morals, has been declared, with the assent of the Bishops of the Roman Church, to be an article of faith, binding on the conscience of every Christian; his claim to the obedience of his spiritual subjects has been declared in like manner without any practical limit or reserve; and his supremacy, without any reserve of civil rights, has been similarly affirmed to include everything which relates to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world. And these doctrines, we now know on the highest authority, it is of necessity for salvation to believe.

Independently, however, of the Vatican Decrees themselves, it is necessary for all who wish to understand what has been the amount of the wonderful change now consummated in the constitution of the Latin Church, and what is the present degradation of its Episcopal order, to observe also the change, amounting to revolution, of form in the present, as compared with other conciliatory decrees. Indeed, that spirit of centralisation, the excesses of which are as fatal to vigorous life in the Church as in the State, seems now nearly to have reached the last and furthest point of possible advancement and exaltation.

When, in fact, we speak of the decrees of the Council of the Vatican, we use a phrase which will not bear strict examination. The Canons of the Council of Trent were, at least, the real Canons of a real Council: and the strain in which they are promulgated is this:—*Hæc sacrosancta, ecumenica, et generalis Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitimè congregata, in eâ præsidentibus eisdem tribus apostolicis Legatis, hortatur, or docet, or statuit, or decernit*, and the like: and its canons, as published in Rome, are "*Canones et decreta Sacrosancti ecumenici Concilii Tridentini*,"

'Romæ: in Collegio urbano de Propaganda Fide.' 1833.

and so forth. But what we have now to do with is the *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesiâ Christi, edita in Sessione tertîâ* of the Vatican Council. It is not a constitution made by the Council, but one promulgated in the Council.

I am aware that, as some hold, this was the case with the Council of the Lateran in A.D. 1215. But, first, this has not been established: secondly, the very gist of the evil we are dealing with consists in following (and enforcing) precedents from the age of Pope Innocent III.

And who is it that legislates and decrees? It is *Pius Episcopus, servus servorum Dei*: and the seductive plural of his *docemus et declaramus* is simply the dignified and ceremonious "We" of Royal declarations. The document is dated *Pontificatûs nostri Anno XXV*: and the humble share of the assembled Episcopate in the transaction is represented by *sacro approbante concilio*. And now for the propositions themselves.

First comes the Pope's infallibility:—

"*Docemus, et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus, Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedrâ, loquitur, id est cum, omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro supremâ suâ, Apostolicâ auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universâ Ecclesiâ, tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in Beato Petro promissam, eâ infallibilitate pollere, quâ Divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definiendâ doctrinâ, de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit: ideoque ejus Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ irreformabiles esse.*"

'*Constitutio de Ecclesiâ*,' c. iv.

Will it, then, be said that the infallibility of the Pope accrues only when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*? No doubt this is a very material consideration for those, who have been told that the private conscience is to derive comfort and assurance from the emanations of the Papal Chair: for there is no established or accepted definition of the phrase *ex cathedrâ*, and he has no power to obtain one, and no guide to direct him in his choice among some twelve theories on the subject, which, it is said, are bandied to and fro among Roman theologians, except the despised and discarded agency of his private judgment. But while thus sorely tantalised, he is not one whit protected. For there is still one person, and one only, who can unquestionably declare *ex cathedrâ* what is *ex cathedrâ* and what is not, and who can declare it when and as he pleases. That person is the Pope himself. The provision is, that no document he issues shall be valid without a seal: but the seal remains under his own sole lock and key.

Again, it may be sought to plead, that the Pope is, after all, only operating by sanctions which un-questionably belong to the religious domain. He does not propose to invade the country, to seize Woolwich, or burn Portsmouth. He will only, at the worst, excommunicate opponents, as he has ex-communicated Dr. von Döllinger and others. Is this a good answer? After all, even in the Middle Ages, it was not by the direct action of fleets and armies of their own that the Popes contended with kings who were refractory; it was mainly by interdicts, and by the refusal, which they entailed when the Bishops were not brave enough to refuse their publication, of religious offices to the people. It was thus that England suffered under John, France under Philip Augustus, Leon under Alphonso the Noble, and every country in its turn. But the inference may be drawn that they who, while using spiritual weapons for such an end, do not employ temporal means, only fail to employ them because they have them not. A religious society, which delivers volleys of spiritual censures in order to impede the performance of civil duties, does all the mischief that is in its power to do, and brings into question, in the face of the State, its title to civil protection.

Will it be said, finally, that the Infallibility touches only matter of faith and morals? Only matter of morals! Will any of the Roman casuists kindly acquaint us what are the departments and functions of human life which do not and cannot fall within the domain of morals? If they will not tell us, we must look elsewhere. In his work entitled 'Literature and Dogma,'

Pages 15, 44.

Mr. Matthew Arnold quaintly informs us—as they tell us nowadays how many parts of our poor bodies are solid, and how many aqueous—that about seventy-five per cent, of all we do belongs to the department of "conduct." Conduct and morals, we may suppose, are nearly co-extensive. Three-fourths, then, of life are thus handed over. But who will guarantee to us the other fourth? Certainly not St. Paul; who says, "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do *all* to the glory of God." And "Whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do *all* in the name of the Lord Jesus."

1 Cor. x. 31; Col. in. 7.

No! Such a distinction would be the unworthy device of a shallow policy, vainly used to hide the daring of that wild ambition which at Rome, not from the throne but from behind the throne, prompts the movements of the Vatican. I care not to ask if there be dregs or tatters of human life, such as can escape from the description and boundary of morals. I submit that Duty is a power which rises with us in the morning, and goes to rest with us at night. It is co-extensive with the action of our intelligence. It is the shadow which cleaves to us go where we will, and which only leaves us when we leave the light of life. So then it is the supreme direction of us in respect to all Duty, which the Pontiff declares to belong to him, *sacro approbante concilio*: and this declaration he makes, not as an otiose opinion of the schools, but *cunctis fidelibus credendam et tenendam*.

But we shall now see that, even if a loophole had at this point been left unclosed, the void is supplied by another provision of the Decrees. While the reach of the Infallibility is as wide as it may please the Pope, or those who may prompt the Pope, to make it, there is something wider still, and that is the claim to an absolute and entire Obedience. This Obedience is to be rendered to his orders in the cases I shall proceed to point out, without any qualifying condition, such as the *ex cathedrâ*. The sounding name of Infallibility has so fascinated the public mind, and riveted it on the Fourth Chapter of the Constitution *de Ecclesiâ*, that its near neighbour, the Third Chapter, has, at least in my opinion, received very much less than justice. Let us turn to it.

"Cujuscunque ritûs et dignitatis pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchicæ subordinationis veræque obedientiæ obstringuntur, non solum in rebus, quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent. . . . Hæc est Catholicæ veritatis doctrina, a quâ deviare, salvâ fide atque salute, nemo potest. . . ."

"Docemus etiam et declaramus eum esse judicem supremum fidelium, et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius posse judicium recurri: Sedis vero Apostolicæ, cujus auctoritate major non est, judicium a nemine fore retractandum. Neque cuiquam de ejus licere judicare judicio."

'Dogmatic Constitutions,' &c., c. iii. Dublin, 1870, pp. 30-32.

Even, therefore, where the judgments of the Pope do not present the credentials of infallibility, they are

unappealable and irreversible: no person may pass judgment upon them; and all men, clerical and lay, dispersedly or in the aggregate, are bound truly to obey them; and from this rule of Catholic truth no man can depart, save at the peril of his salvation. Surely, it is allowable to say that this Third Chapter on universal obedience is a formidable rival to the Fourth Chapter on Infallibility. Indeed, to an observer from without, it seems to leave the dignity to the other, but to reserve the stringency and efficiency to itself. The Fourth Chapter is the Merovingian Monarch; the third is the Carolingian Mayor of the Palace. The fourth has an overawing splendour; the third, an iron gripe. Little does it matter to me whether my superior claims infallibility, so long as he is entitled to demand and exact conformity. This, it will be observed, he demands even in cases not covered by his infallibility; cases, therefore, in which he admits it to be possible that he may be wrong, but finds it intolerable to be told so. As he must be obeyed in all his judgments though not *ex cathedrâ*, it seems a pity he could not likewise give the comforting assurance that, they are all certain to be right.

But why this ostensible reduplication, this apparent surplusage? Why did the astute contrivers of this tangled scheme conclude that they could not afford to rest content with pledging the Council to Infallibility in terms which are not only wide to a high degree, but elastic beyond all measure?

Though they must have known perfectly well that "faith and morals" carried everything, or everything worth having, in the purely individual sphere, they also knew just as well that, even where the individual was subjugated, they might and would still have to deal with the State.

In mediæval history, this distinction is not only clear, but glaring. Outside the borders of some narrow and proscribed sect, now and then emerging, we never, or scarcely ever, hear of private and personal resistance to the Pope. The manful "Protestantism" of mediæval times had its activity almost entirely in the sphere of public, national, and state rights. Too much attention, in my opinion, cannot be fastened on this point. It is the very root and kernel of the matter. Individual servitude, however abject, will not satisfy the party now dominant in the Latin Church: the State must also be a slave.

Our Saviour had recognised as distinct the two provinces of the civil rule and the Church: had nowhere intimated that the spiritual authority was to claim the disposal of physical force, and to control in its own domain the authority which is alone responsible for external peace, order, and safety among civilised communities of men. It has been alike the peculiarity, the pride, and the misfortune of the Roman Church, among Christian communities, to allow to itself an unbounded use, as far as its power would go, of earthly instruments for spiritual ends. We have seen with what ample assurances

See further, Appendix B.

this nation and Parliament were fed in 1826; how well and roundly the full and undivided rights of the civil power, and the separation of the two jurisdictions, were affirmed. All this had at length been undone, as far as Popes could undo it, in the Syllabus and the Encyclical. It remained to complete the undoing, through the subserviency or pliability of the Council.

And the work is now truly complete. Lest it should be said that supremacy in faith and morals, full dominion over personal belief and conduct, did not cover the collective action of men in States, a third province was opened, not indeed to the abstract assertion of Infallibility, but to the far more practical and decisive demand of absolute Obedience. And this is the proper work of the Third Chapter, to which I am endeavouring to do a tardy justice. Let us listen again to its few but pregnant words on the point:

"Non solum in rebus, quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent."

Absolute obedience, it is boldly declared, is due to the Pope, at the peril of salvation, not alone in faith, in morals, but in all things which concern the discipline and government of the Church. Thus are swept into the Papal net whole multitudes of facts, whole systems of government, prevailing, though in different degrees, in every country of the world. Even in the United States, where the severance between Church and State is supposed to be complete, a long catalogue might be drawn of subjects belonging to the domain and competency of the State, but also undeniably affecting the government of the Church; such as, by way of example, marriage, burial, education, prison discipline, blasphemy, poor-relief, incorporation, mortmain, religious endowments, vows of celibacy and obedience. In Europe the circle is far wider, the points of contact and of interlacing almost innumerable. But on all matters, respecting which any Pope may think proper to declare that they concern either faith, or morals, or the government or discipline of the Church, he claims, with the approval of a Council undoubtedly Ecumenical in the Roman sense, the absolute obedience; at the peril of salvation, of every member of his communion.

It seems not as yet to have been thought wise to pledge the Council in terms to the Syllabus and the Encyclical. That achievement is probably reserved for some one of its sittings yet to come. In the meantime it is well to remember, that this claim in respect of all things affecting the discipline and government of the Church, as well as faith and conduct, is lodged in open day by and in the reign of a Pontiff, who has condemned free speech, free writing, a free press, toleration of nonconformity, liberty of conscience, the study of civil and

philosophical matters in independence of the ecclesiastical authority, marriage unless sacramentally contracted, and the definition by the State of the civil rights (*jura*) of the Church; who has demanded for the Church, therefore, the title to define its own civil rights, together with a divine right to civil immunities, and a right to use physical force; and who has also proudly asserted that the Popes of the Middle Ages with their councils did not invade the rights of princes: as for example, Gregory VII., of the Emperor Henry IV.; Innocent III., of Raymond of Toulouse; Paul III., in deposing Henry VIII.; or Pius V., in performing the like paternal office for Elizabeth.

I submit, then, that my fourth proposition is true: and that England is entitled to ask, and to know, in what way the obedience required by the Pope and the Council of the Vatican is to be reconciled with the integrity of civil allegiance?

It has been shown that the Head of their Church, so supported as undoubtedly to speak with its highest authority, claims from Roman Catholics a plenary obedience to whatever he may desire in relation not to faith but to morals, and not only to these, but to all that concerns the government and discipline of the Church: that, of this, much lies within the domain of the State: that, to obviate all misapprehension, the Pope demands for himself the right to determine the province of his own rights, and has so defined it in formal documents, as to warrant any and every invasion of the civil sphere; and that this new version of the principles of the Papal Church inexorably binds its members to the admission of these exorbitant claims, without any refuge or reservation on behalf of their duty to the Crown.

Under circumstances such as these, it seems not too much to ask of them to confirm the opinion which we, as fellow-countrymen, entertain of them, by sweeping away, in such manner and terms as they may think best, the presumptive imputations which their ecclesiastical rulers at Rome, acting autocratically, appear to have brought upon their capacity to pay a solid and undivided allegiance; and to fulfil the engagement which their Bishops, as political sponsors, promised and declared for them in 1825.

It would be impertinent, as well as needless, to suggest what should be said. All that is requisite is to indicate in substance that which (if the foregoing argument be sound) is not wanted, and that which is. What is not wanted is vague and general assertion, of whatever kind, and however sincere. What is wanted, and that in the most specific form and the clearest terms, I take to be one of two things; that is to say, either—

I. A demonstration that neither in the name of faith, nor in the name of morals, nor in the name of the government or discipline of the Church, is the Pope of Rome able, by virtue of the powers asserted for him by the Vatican decree, to make any claim upon those who adhere to his communion, of such a nature as can impair the integrity of their civil allegiance; or else,

II. That, if and when such claim is made, it will even although resting on the definitions of the Vatican, be repelled and rejected; just as Bishop Doyle, when he was asked what the Roman Catholic clergy would do if the Pope intermeddled with their religion, replied frankly, "The consequence would be, that we should oppose him by every means in our power, even by the exercise of our spiritual authority."

'Report,' March 18, 1826, p. 191.

In the absence of explicit assurances to this effect, we should appear to be led, nay, driven, by just reasoning upon that documentary evidence, to the conclusions:—

- That the Pope, authorised by his Council, claims for himself the domain (*a*) of faith, (*b*) of morals, (*c*) of all that concerns the government and discipline of the Church.
- That he in like manner claims the power of determining the limits of those domains.
- That he does not sever them, by any acknowledged or intelligible line, from the domains of civil duty and allegiance.
- That he therefore claims, and claims from the month of July 1870 onwards with plenary authority, from every convert and member of his Church, that he shall "place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another:" that other being himself.

V. BEING TRUE, ARE THE PROPOSITIONS MATERIAL?

But next, if these propositions be true, are they also material? The claims cannot, as I much fear, be denied to have been made. It cannot be denied that the Bishops, who govern in things spiritual more than five millions (or nearly one-sixth) of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom, have in some cases promoted, in all cases accepted, these claims. It has been a favourite purpose of my life not to conjure up, but to conjure down, public alarms. I am not now going to pretend that either foreign foe or domestic treason can, at the bidding of the Court of Rome, disturb these peaceful shores. But though such fears may be visionary, it is more visionary still to suppose for one moment that the claims of Gregory VII., of Innocent III., and of Boniface VIII., have been disinterred, in the nineteenth century, like hideous mummies picked out of Egyptian sarcophagi, in the interests of archaeology, or without a definite and practical aim. As rational beings, we must rest assured that only with a

very clearly conceived and foregone purpose have these astonishing reassertions been paraded before the world. What is that purpose?

I can well believe that it is in part theological. There have always been, and there still are, no small proportion of our race, and those by no means in all respects the worst, who are sorely open to the temptation, especially in times of religious disturbance, to discharge their spiritual responsibilities by *power of attorney*. As advertising Houses find custom in proportion, not so much to the solidity of their resources as to the magniloquence of their promises and assurances, so theological boldness in the extension of such claims is sure to pay, by widening certain circles of devoted adherents, however it may repel the mass of mankind. There were two special encouragements to this enterprise at the present day: one of them the perhaps unconscious but manifest leaning of some, outside the Roman precinct, to undue exaltation of Church power; the other the reaction, which is and must be brought about in favour of superstition, by the levity of the destructive speculations so widely current, and the notable hardihood of the anti-Christian writing of the day.

But it is impossible to account sufficiently in this manner for the particular course which has been actually pursued by the Roman Court. All morbid spiritual appetites would have been amply satisfied by claims to infallibility in creed, to the prerogative of miracle, to dominion over the unseen world. In truth there was occasion, in this view, for nothing, except a liberal supply of Salmonean thunder:—

"Dum flammæ Jovis, et sonitus imitatur Olympi."

Æn. vi. 586.

All this could have been managed by a few Tetzels, judiciously distributed over Europe. Therefore the question still remains, Why did that Court, with policy for ever in its eye, lodge such formidable demands for power of the vulgar kind in that sphere which is visible, and where hard knocks can undoubtedly be given as well as received?

It must be for some political object, of a very tangible kind, that the risks of so daring a raid upon the civil sphere have been deliberately run.

A daring raid it is. For it is most evident that the very assertion of principles which establish an exemption from allegiance, or which impair its completeness, goes, in many other countries of Europe, far more directly than with us, to the creation of political strife, and to dangers of the most material and tangible kind. The struggle, now proceeding in Germany, at once occurs to the mind as a palmary instance. I am not competent to give any opinion upon the particulars of that struggle. The institutions of Germany, and the relative estimate of State power and individual freedom, are materially different from ours. But I must say as much as this. First, it is not Prussia alone that is touched; elsewhere, too, the bone lies ready, though the contention may be delayed. In other States, in Austria particularly, there are recent laws in force, raising much the same issues as the Falck laws have raised. But the Roman Court possesses in perfection one art, the art of waiting; and it is her wise maxim to fight but one enemy at a time. Secondly, if I have truly represented the claims promulgated from the Vatican, it is difficult to deny that those claims, and the power which has made them, are primarily responsible for the pains and perils, whatever they may be, of the present conflict between German and Roman enactments. And that which was once truly said of France, may now also be said with not less truth of Germany: when Germany is disquieted, Europe cannot be at rest.

I should feel less anxiety on this subject had the Supreme Pontiff frankly recognised his altered position since the events of 1870; and, in language as clear, if not as emphatic, as that in which he has proscribed modern civilisation, given to Europe the assurance that he would be no party to the re-establishment by blood and violence of the Temporal Power of the Church. It is easy to conceive that his personal benevolence, no less than his feelings as an Italian, must have inclined him individually towards a course so humane; and I should add, if I might do it without presumption, so prudent. With what appears to an English eye a lavish prodigality, successive Italian Governments have made over the ecclesiastical powers and privileges of the Monarchy, not to the Church of the country for the revival of the ancient, popular, and self-governing elements of its constitution, but to the Papal Chair, for the establishment of ecclesiastical despotism, and the suppression of the last vestiges of independence. This course, so difficult for a foreigner to appreciate, or even to justify, has been met, not by reciprocal conciliation, but by a constant fire of denunciations and complaints. When the tone of these denunciations and complaints is compared with the language of the authorised and favoured Papal organs in the press, and of the Ultramontane party (now the sole legitimate party of the Latin Church) throughout Europe, it leads many to the painful and revolting conclusion that there is a fixed purpose among the secret inspirers of Roman policy to pursue, by the road of force, upon the arrival of any favourable opportunity, the favourite project of re-erecting the terrestrial throne of the Popedom, even if it can only be re-erected on the ashes of the city, and amidst the whitening bones of the people.

Appendix C.

It is difficult to conceive or contemplate the effects of such an endeavour. But the existence at this day of the policy, even in bare idea, is itself a portentous evil. I do not hesitate to say that it is an incentive to general

disturbance, a premium upon European wars. It is in my opinion not sanguine only, but almost ridiculous to imagine that such a project could eventually succeed; but it is difficult to over-estimate the effect which it might produce in generating and exasperating strife. It might even, to some extent, disturb and paralyse the action of such Governments as might interpose for no separate purpose of their own, but only with a view to the maintenance or restoration of the general peace. If the baleful Power which is expressed by the phrase *Curia Romana*, and not at all adequately rendered in its historic force by the usual English equivalent "Court of Rome," really entertains the scheme, it doubtless counts on the support in every country of an organised and devoted party; which, when it can command the scales of political power, will promote interference, and, when it is in a minority, will work for securing neutrality. As the peace of Europe may be in jeopardy, and as the duties even of England, as one (so to speak) of its constabulary authorities, might come to be in question, it would be most interesting to know the mental attitude of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen in England and Ireland with reference to the subject; and it seems to be one, on which we are entitled to solicit information.

For there cannot be the smallest doubt that the temporal power of the Popedom comes within the true meaning of the words used at the Vatican to describe the subjects on which the Pope is authorised to claim, under awful sanctions, the obedience of the "faithful." It is even possible that we have here the key to the enlargement of the province of Obedience beyond the limits of Infallibility, and to the introduction of the remarkable phrase *ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae*. No impartial person can deny that the question of the temporal power very evidently concerns the discipline and government of the Church—concerns it, and most mischievously as I should venture to think; but in the opinion, up to a late date, of many Roman Catholics, not only most beneficially, but even essentially. Let it be remembered, that such a man as the late Count Montalembert, who in his general politics was of the Liberal party, did not scruple to hold that the millions of Roman Catholics throughout the world were co-partners with the inhabitants of the States of the Church in regard to their civil government; and, as constituting the vast majority, were of course entitled to override them. It was also rather commonly held, a quarter of a century ago, that the question of the States of the Church was one with which none but Roman Catholic Powers could have anything to do. This doctrine, I must own, was to me at all times unintelligible. It is now, to say the least, hopelessly and irrecoverably obsolete.

Archbishop Manning, who is the head of the Papal Church in England, and whose ecclesiastical tone is supposed to be in the closest accordance with that of his headquarters, has not thought it too much to say that the civil order of all Christendom is the offspring of the Temporal Power, and has the Temporal Power for its keystone; that on the destruction of the Temporal Power "the laws of nations would at once fall in ruins;" that (our old friend) the deposing Power "taught subjects obedience and princes clemency."

'Three Lectures on the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes,' 1860, pp. 34, 46, 47, 58-9, 63.

Nay, this high authority has proceeded further; and has elevated the Temporal Power to the rank of necessary doctrine.

"The Catholic Church cannot be silent, it cannot hold its peace; it cannot cease to preach the doctrines of Revelation, not only of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, but likewise of the Seven Sacraments, and of the Infallibility of the Church of God, and of the necessity of Unity, and of the Sovereignty, both spiritual and temporal, of the Holy See."

'Three Lectures on the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes,' 1860, pp. 34, 46, 47, 58-9, 63.

I never, for my own part, heard that the work containing this remarkable passage was placed in the 'Index Prohibitorum Librorum.' On the contrary, its distinguished author was elevated, on the first opportunity, to the headship of the Roman Episcopacy in England, and to the guidance of the million or thereabouts of souls in its communion. And the more recent utterances of the oracle have not descended from the high level of those already cited. They have, indeed, the recommendation of a comment, not without fair claims to authority, on the recent declarations of the Pope and the Council; and of one which goes to prove how far I am from having exaggerated or strained in the foregoing pages the meaning of those declarations. Especially does this hold good on the one point, the most vital of the whole—the title to define the border line of the two provinces, which the Archbishop not unfairly takes to be the true criterion of supremacy, as between rival powers like the Church and the State.

"If, then, the civil power be not competent to decide the limits of the spiritual power, and if the spiritual power can define, with a divine certainty, its own limits, it is evidently supreme. Or, in other words, the spiritual power knows, with divine certainty, the limits of its own jurisdiction: and it knows therefore the limits and the competence of the civil power. It is thereby, in matters of religion and conscience, supreme. I do not see how this can be denied without denying Christianity. And if this be so, this is the doctrine of the Bull Unam Sanctam,

On the Bull Unam Sanctam, "of a most odious kind;" see Bishop Doyle's Essay, already cited. He thus describes it.

and of the Syllabus, and of the Vatican Council. It is, in fact, Ultramontanism, for this term means neither

less nor more. The Church, therefore, is separate and supreme.

"Let us then ascertain somewhat further, what is the meaning of supreme. Any power which is independent, and can alone fix the limits of its own jurisdiction, and can thereby fix the limits of all other jurisdictions, is, ipso facto, supreme.

The italics are not in the original.

But the Church of Jesus Christ, within the sphere of revelation, of faith and morals, is all this, or is nothing, or worse than nothing, an imposture and an usurpation—that is, it is Christ or Antichrist."

'Cæsarism and Ultramontanism.' By Archbishop Manning, 1874, pp. 35-6.

But the whole pamphlet should be read by those who desire to know the true sense of the Papal declarations and Vatican decrees, as they are understood by the most favoured ecclesiastics; understood, I am bound to own, so far as I can see, in their natural, legitimate, and inevitable sense. Such readers will be assisted by the treatise in seeing clearly, and in admitting frankly that, whatever demands may here-after, and in whatever circumstances, be made upon us, we shall be unable to advance with any fairness the plea that it has been done without due notice.

There are millions upon millions of the Protestants of this country, who would agree with Archbishop Manning, if he were simply telling us that Divine truth is not to be sought from the lips of the State, nor to be sacrificed at its command. But those millions would tell him, in return, that the State, as the power which is alone responsible for the external order of the world, can alone conclusively and finally be competent to determine what is to take place in the sphere of that external order.

I have shown, then, that the Propositions, especially that which has been felt to be the chief one among them, being true, are also material; material to be generally known, and clearly understood, and well considered, on civil grounds; inasmuch as they invade, at a multitude of points, the civil sphere, and seem even to have no very remote or shadowy connection with the future peace and security of Christendom.

VI. WERE THE PROPOSITIONS PROPER TO BE SET FORTH BY THE PRESENT WRITER?

There remains yet before us only the shortest and least significant portion of the inquiry, namely, whether these things, being true, and being material to be said, were also proper to be said by me. I must ask pardon, if a tone of egotism be detected in this necessarily subordinate portion of my remarks.

For thirty years, and in a great variety of circumstances, in office and as an independent Member of Parliament, in majorities and in small minorities, and during the larger portion of the time

From 1847 to 1865 I sat for the University of Oxford.

as the representative of a great constituency, mainly clerical, I have, with others, laboured to maintain and extend the civil rights of my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. The Liberal party of this country, with which I have been commonly associated, has suffered, and sometimes suffered heavily, in public favour and in influence, from the belief that it was too ardent in the pursuit of that policy; while at the same time it has always been in the worst odour with the Court of Rome, in consequence of its (I hope) unalterable attachment to Italian liberty and independence. I have sometimes been the spokesman of that party in recommendations which have tended to foster in fact the imputation I have mentioned, though not to warrant it as matter of reason. But it has existed in fact. So that while (as I think) general justice to society required that these things which I have now set forth should be written, special justice, as towards the party to which I am loyally attached, and which I may have had a share in thus placing at a disadvantage before our countrymen, made it, to say the least, becoming that I should not shrink from writing them.

In discharging that office, I have sought to perform the part not of a theological partisan, but simply of a good citizen; of one hopeful that many of his Roman Catholic friends and fellow-countrymen, who are, to say the least of it, as good citizens as himself, may perceive that the case is not a frivolous case, but one that merits their attention.

I will next proceed to give the reason why, up to a recent date, I have thought it right in the main to leave to any others, who might feel it, the duty of dealing in detail with this question.

The great change, which seems to me to have been brought about in the position of Roman Catholic Christians as citizens, readied its consummation, and came into full operation in July 1870, by the proceedings or so-called decrees of the Vatican Council.

Up to that time, opinion in the Roman Church on all matters involving civil liberty, though partially and sometimes widely intimidated, was free wherever it was resolute. During the Middle Ages, heresy was often extinguished in blood, but in every Cisalpine country a principle of liberty, to a great extent, held its own, and national life refused to be put down. Nay more, these precious and inestimable gifts had not infrequently for their champions a local prelacy and clergy. The Constitutions of Clarendon, cursed from the Papal throne, were

the work of the English Bishops. Stephen Langton, appointed directly, through an extraordinary stretch of power, by Innocent III., to the See of Canterbury, headed the Barons of England in extorting from the Papal minion John, the worst and basest of all our Sovereigns, that Magna Charta, which the Pope at once visited with his anathemas. In the reign of Henry VIII., it was Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, who first wrote against the Papal domination. Tunstal was followed by Gardiner; and even the recognition of the Royal Headship was voted by the clergy, not under Cranmer, but under his unsuspected predecessor Warham. Strong and domineering as was the high Papal party in those centuries, the resistance was manful. Thrice in history, it seemed as if what we may call the Constitutional party in the Church was about to triumph: first, at the epoch of the Council of Constance; secondly, when the French Episcopate was in conflict with Pope Innocent XI.; thirdly, when Clement XIV. levelled with the dust the deadliest foes that mental and moral liberty have ever known. But from July 1870, this state of things has passed away, and the death-warrant of that Constitutional party has been signed, and sealed, and promulgated in form.

Before that time arrived, although I had used expressions sufficiently indicative as to the tendency of things in the great Latin Communion, yet I had for very many years felt it to be the first and paramount duty of the British Legislature, whatever Rome might say or do, to give to Ireland all that justice could demand, in regard to matters of conscience and of civil equality, and thus to set herself right in the opinion of the civilised world. So far from seeing, what some believed they saw, a spirit of unworthy compliance in such a course, it appeared to me the only one which suited either the dignity or the duty of my country. While this debt remained unpaid, both before and after 1870, I did not think it my province to open formally a line of argument on a question of prospective rather than immediate moment, which might have prejudiced the matter of duty lying nearest our hand, and morally injured Great Britain not less than Ireland, Churchmen and Nonconformists not less than adherents of the Papal Communion, by slackening the disposition to pay the debt of justice. When Parliament had passed the Church Act of 1869 and the Land Act of 1870, there remained only, under the great head of Imperial equity, one serious question to be dealt with—that of the higher Education. I consider that the Liberal majority in the House of Commons, and the Government to which I had the honour and satisfaction to belong, formally tendered payment in full of this portion of the debt by the Irish University Bill of February 1873. Some indeed think, that it was overpaid: a question into which this is manifestly not the place to enter. But the Roman Catholic prelacy of Ireland thought fit to procure the rejection of that measure, by the direct influence which they exercised over a certain number of Irish Members of Parliament, and by the temptation which they thus offered—the bid, in effect, which (to use a homely phrase) they made, to attract the support of the Tory Opposition. Their efforts were crowned with a complete success. From that time forward I have felt that the situation was changed, and that important matters would have to be cleared by suitable explanations. The debt to Ireland had been paid: a debt to the country at large had still to be disposed of, and this has come to be the duty of the hour. So long, indeed, as I continued to be Prime Minister, I should not have considered a broad political discussion on a general question suitable to proceed from me; while neither I nor (I am certain) my colleagues would have been disposed to run the risk of stirring popular passions by a vulgar and unexplained appeal. But every difficulty, arising from the necessary limitations of an official position, has now been removed.

VII. ON THE HOME POLICY OF THE FUTURE.

I could not, however, conclude these observations without anticipating and answering an inquiry they suggest. "Are they, then," it will be asked, "a recantation and a regret; and what are they meant to recommend as the policy of the future?" My reply shall be succinct and plain. Of what the Liberal party has accomplished, by word or deed, in establishing the full civil equality of Roman Catholics, I regret nothing, and I recant nothing.

It is certainly a political misfortune that, during the last thirty years, a Church so tainted in its views of civil obedience, and so unduly capable of changing its front and language after Emancipation from what it had been before, like an actor who has to perform several characters in one piece, should have acquired an extension of its hold upon the highest classes of this country. The conquests have been chiefly, as might have been expected, among women; but the number of male converts, or captives (as I might prefer to call them), has not been inconsiderable. There is no doubt, that every one of these secessions is in the nature of a considerable moral and social severance. The breadth of this gap varies, according to varieties of individual character. But it is too commonly a wide one. Too commonly, the spirit of the neophyte is expressed by the words which have become notorious: "a Catholic first, an Englishman afterwards." Words which properly convey no more than a truism; for every Christian must seek to place his religion even before his country in his inner heart. But very far from a truism in the sense in which we have been led to construe them. We take them to mean that the "convert" intends, in case of any conflict between the Queen and the Pope, to follow the Pope, and let the Queen shift for

herself; which, happily, she can well do.

Usually, in this country, a movement in the highest class would raise a presumption of a similar movement in the mass. It is not so here. Rumours have gone about that the proportion of members of the Papal Church to the population has increased, especially in England. But these rumours would seem to be confuted by authentic figures. The Roman Catholic Marriages, which supply a competent test, and which were 4.89 per cent, of the whole in 1854, and 4.62 per cent, in 1859, were 4.09 per cent, in 1869, and 4.02 per cent, in 1871.

There is something at the least abnormal in such a partial growth, taking effect as it does among the wealthy and noble, while the people cannot be charmed, by any incantation, into the Roman camp. The original Gospel was supposed to be meant especially for the poor; but the gospel of the nineteenth century from Rome courts another and less modest destination. If the Pope does not control more souls among us, he certainly controls more acres.

The severance, however, of a certain number of lords of the soil from those who till it, can be borne. And so I trust will in like manner be endured the new and very real "aggression" of the principles promulgated by Papal authority, whether they are or are not loyally disclaimed. In this matter, each man is his own judge and his own guide: I can speak for myself. I am no longer able to say, as I would have said before 1870, "There is nothing in the necessary belief of the Roman Catholic which can appear to impeach his full civil title; for, whatsoever be the follies of ecclesiastical power in his Church, his Church itself has not required of him, with binding authority, to assent to any principles inconsistent with his civil duty." That ground is now, for the present at least, cut from under my feet. What then is to be our course of policy hereafter? First let me say that, as regards the great Imperial settlement, achieved by slow degrees, which has admitted men of all creeds subsisting among us to Parliament, that I conceive to be so determined beyond all doubt or question, as to have become one of the deep foundation-stones of the existing Constitution. But inasmuch as, short of this great charter of public liberty, and independently of all that has been done, there are pending matters of comparatively minor moment which have been, or may be, subjects of discussion, not without interest attaching to them, I can suppose a question to arise in the minds of some. My own views and intentions in the future are of the smallest significance. But, if the arguments I have here offered make it my duty to declare them, I say at once the future will be exactly as the past: in the little that depends on me, I shall be guided hereafter, as heretofore, by the rule of maintaining equal civil rights irrespectively of religious differences; and shall resist all attempts to exclude the members of the Roman Church from the benefit of that rule. Indeed I may say that I have already given conclusive indications of this view, by supporting in Parliament, as a Minister, since 1870, the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, for what I think ample reasons. Not only because the time has not yet come when we can assume the consequences of the revolutionary measures of 1870 to have been thoroughly weighed and digested by all capable men in the Roman Communion. Not only because so great a numerical proportion are, as I have before observed, necessarily incapable of mastering, and forming their personal judgment upon, the case. Quite irrespectively even of these considerations, I hold that our onward even course should not be changed by follies, the consequences of which, if the worst come to the worst, this country will have alike the power and, in case of need, the will to control. The State will, I trust, be ever careful to leave the domain of religious conscience free, and yet to keep it to its own domain; and to allow neither private caprice nor, above all, foreign arrogance to dictate to it in the discharge of its proper office. "England expects every man to do his duty;" and none can be so well prepared under all circumstances to exact its performance as that Liberal party, which has done the work of justice alike for Nonconformists and for Papal dissidents, and whose members have so often, for the sake of that work, hazarded their credit with the markedly Protestant constituencies of the country. Strong the State of the United Kingdom has always been in material strength; and its moral panoply is now, we may hope, pretty complete.

It is not then for the dignity of the Crown and people of the United Kingdom to be diverted from a path which they have deliberately chosen, and which it does not rest with all the myrmidons of the Apostolic Chamber either openly to obstruct, or secretly to undermine. It is rightfully to be expected, it is greatly to be desired, that the Roman Catholics of this country should do in the Nineteenth century what their forefathers of England, except a handful of emissaries, did in the Sixteenth, when they were marshalled in resistance to the Armada, and in the Seventeenth when, in despite of the Papal Chair, they sat in the House of Lords under the Oath of Allegiance. That which we are entitled to desire, we are entitled also to expect: indeed, to say we did not expect it, would, in my judgment, be the true way of conveying an "insult" to those concerned. In this expectation we may be partially disappointed. Should those to whom I appeal, thus unhappily come to bear witness in their own persons to the decay of sound, manly, true life in their Church, it will be their loss more than ours. The inhabitants of these Islands, as a whole, are stable, though sometimes credulous and excitable; resolute, though sometimes boastful: and a strong-headed and sound hearted race will not be hindered, either by latent or by avowed dissents, due to the foreign influence of a caste, from the accomplishment of its mission in the world.

Appendices.

Appendix A.

The numbers here given correspond with those of the Eighteen Propositions given in the text, where it would have been less convenient to cite the originals.

1, 2, 3. "Ex quâ omnino falsâ socialis regiminis ideâ haud timent erroneam illam fovere opinionem, Catholicæ Ecclesiæ, animarumque saluti maxime exitialem, a rec. mem. Gregorio XIV. prædecessore Nostro *deliramentum* appellatam (eâdem Eucycl. 'Mirari'), nimirum, libertatem conscientiæ et cultuum esse proprium cujuscunque homiuis jus, quod lege proclatnari, et asseri debet in omni recte constitutâ societate, et jus civibus inesse ad omnimodam libertatem nullâ vel ecclesiasticâ, vel civili auctoritate coarctandam, quo suos conceptus quoscunque sive voce sive typis, sive aliâ ratione palam publiceque manifestare ac declarare valeant."—*Encyclical Letter*.

4. "Atque silentio præterire non possumus eorum audaciam, qui sanam non sustinentes doctrinam 'illis Apostolicæ Sedis judiciis, et decretis, quorum objectum ad bonum generale Ecclesiæ, ejusdemque jura, ac disciplinam spectare declaratur, dummodo fidei morumque dogmata non attingat, posse assensum et obedientiam detrectari absque peccato, et absque ullâ Catholicæ professionis jacturâ.'"—*Ibid*.

5. "Ecclesia non est vera perfeetaque societas plane libera, nec pollet suis propriis et constantibus juribus sibi a divino suo Fundatore collatis, sed civilis potestatis est definire quæ sint Ecclesiæ jura, ac limites, intra quos eadem jura exercere queat."—*Syllabus v*.

6. "Romani Pontifices et Concilia œcuinenica a limitibus suæ potestatis recesserunt, jura Principum usurpârunt, atque etiam in rebus fidei et moruni definiendis errârunt."—*Ibid*, xxiii.

7. "Ecclesia vis iuferendæ potestatem non habet, neque potestatem ullam temporalem directam vel indirectam."—*Ibid*. xxiv.

8. "Præter potestatem episcopatui inhoerentem, alia est attributa temporalis potestas a civili imperio vel expressè vel tacitè concessa, revocanda propterea, cum libuerit, a civili imperio."—*Ibid*. xxv.

9. "Ecclesiæ et personarum ecclesiasticarum immunitas a jure civili ortum habuit."—*Ibid*. xxx.

10. "In conflictu legum utriusque potestatis, jus civile praevallet."—*Ibid*. xlii.

11. "Catholicis viris probari potest ea juventutis instituendæ ratio, quæ sit a Catholicâ fide et ab Ecclesiæ potestate sejuncta, quæque rerum dumtaxat, naturalium scientiam ac terrenæ socialis vitæ fines tantummodo vel saltern primarium spectet."—*Ibid*, xlviii.

12. "Philosophicarum rerum morumque scientia, itemque civiles leges possunt et debent, a divinâ et ecclesiasticâ auctoritate declinare."—*Ibid*. lvii.

13. "Matrimonii sacramentum non est nisi contractui accessorium ab eoque separabile, ipsumque sacramentum in unâ tantum nuptiali benedictione situm est."—*Ibid*. lxvi.

"Vi contractus mere civilis potest inter Christianos constare veri nominis matrimonium; falsumque est, aut contractum matrimonii inter Christianos semper esse sacramentum, aut nullum esse contractum, si sacramentum excludatur."—*Ibid*, lxxiii.

14. "De temporalis regni cum spirituali compatibilitate disputant inter so Christianæ et Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filii."—*Syllabus lxxv*.

15. "Abrogatio civilis imperii, quo Apostolica Sedes potitur, ad Ecclesiæ libertatem felicitatemque vel maxime conducere."—*Ibid*, lxxvi.

16. "Ætate hac nostra non amplius expedit religionem Catholicam haberi tanquam unicam status religionem, cæteris quibuscunque cultibus exclusis."—*Ibid*. lxxvii.

17. "Hinc laudabiliter in quibusdam Catholici nominis regionibus lege cautum est, ut hominibus illuc immigrantibus liceat publicum proprii cujusque cultus exereitium habere."—*Ibid*, lxxviii.

18. "Romanus Pontifex potest ac debet cum progressu, cum liberalismo et cum recenti civilitate sese reconciliare et componere."—*Ibid*. lxxx.

Appendix B.

I have contented myself with a minimum of citation from the documents of the period before Emancipation. Their full effect can only be gathered by such as are acquainted with, or will take the trouble to refer largely to the originals. It is worth while, however, to cite the following passage from Bishop Doyle, as it may convey, through the indignation it expresses, an idea of the amplitude of the assurances which had been (as I believe, most honestly and sincerely) given.

"There is no justice, my Lord, in thus condemning us. Such conduct on the part of our opponents creates in our bosoms a sense of wrong being done to us; it exhausts our patience, it provokes our indignation, and

prevents us from reiterating our efforts to obtain a more impartial hearing. We are tempted, in such cases as these, to attribute unfair motives to those who differ from us, as we cannot conceive how men gifted with intelligence can fail to discover truths so plainly demonstrated as,

"That our faith or our allegiance is not regulated by any such doctrines as those imputed to us;

"That our duties to the Government of our country are not influenced nor affected by any Bulls or practices of Popes;

"That these duties are to be learned by us, as by every other class of His Majesty's subjects, from the Gospel, from the reason given to us by God, from that love of country which nature has implanted in our hearts, and from those constitutional maxims, which are as well understood, and as highly appreciated, by Catholics of the present day, as by their ancestors, who founded them with Alfred, or secured them at Runnymede."—*Doyle's 'Essay on the Catholic Claims,'* London, 1826, p. 38.

The same general tone, as in 1826, was maintained in the answers of the witnesses from Maynooth College before the Commission of 1855. See, for example, pp. 132, 161-4, 272-3, 275, 361, 370-5, 381-2, 394-6, 405.

The Commission reported (p. 64), "We see no reason to believe that there has been any disloyalty in the teaching of the College, or any disposition to impair the obligations of an unreserved allegiance to your Majesty.'

Appendix C.

Compare the recent and ominous forecasting of the future European policy of the British Crown, in an Article from a Romish Periodical for the current month, which has direct relation to these matters, and which has every appearance of proceeding from authority.

"Surely in any European complication, such as may any day arise, nay, such as must ere long arise, from the natural gravitation of the forces, which are for the moment kept in check and truce by the necessity of preparation for their inevitable collision, it may very well be that the future prosperity of England may be staked in the struggle, and that the side which she may take may be determined, not either by justice or interest, but *by a passionate resolve to keep up the Italian kingdom at any hazard.*"—The 'Month' for November, 1874: 'Mr. Gladstone's Durham Letter,' p. 265.

This is a remarkable disclosure. With *whom* could England be brought into conflict by any disposition she might feel to keep up the Italian kingdom? Considered as States, both Austria and France are in complete harmony with Italy. But it is plain that Italy has some enemy; and the writers of the 'Month' appear to know who it is.

Appendix D.

Notice has been taken, both in this country and abroad, of the apparent inertness of public men, and of at least one British Administration, with respect to the subject of these pages. See Friedberg, 'Gränzen zwischen Staat und Kirche,' Abtheilung iii. pp. 755-6; and the Preface to the Fifth Volume of Mr. Greenwood's elaborate, able, and judicious work, entitled 'Cathedra Petri,' p. iv.

"If there be any chance of such a revival, it would become our political leaders to look more closely into the peculiarities of a system, which denies the right of the subject to freedom of thought and action upon matters most material to his civil and religious welfare. There is no mode of ascertaining the spirit and tendency of great institutions but in a careful study of their history. The writer is profoundly impressed with the conviction that our political instructors have wholly neglected this important duty: or, which is perhaps worse, left it in the hands of a class of persons whose zeal has outrun their discretion, and who have sought rather to engage the prejudices than the judgment of their hearers in the cause they have, no doubt sincerely, at heart."

LONDON. PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

The Christian Patriot. A Sequel to "True Patriotism."

A Sermon,

Delivered in the Wesleyan Church,

Manners Street Wellington,

By the Rev. James Buller,

On Sunday Evening, November 15th, 1857.

Wellington, n. z. Printed by George Watson, and Published by W. Lyon, Lambton Quay. 1857.

Price Sixpence.

Advertisement.

THE following sermon is a sequel to that on "True Patriotism." In both, the author believes he gives utterance to sentiments which are in accordance with Holy Scripture. To fair criticism, he has no objection. Candid, sober enquiry is entitled to respect. But the idle conceits of the *stage actor* and the contemptible effusions of the *anonymous scribbler* are beneath his condescension. Paltry insinuations have no effect upon the writer. He has no sympathy with that squeamish timidity which shrinks from the expression of right views lest offence be taken. He has no fear of offending those whose esteem is of any value. Lewdness, infidelity, and bigotry may combine against the truth. But still truth Is truth! Some *reverend* "Civis" failing to extract a single passage for critical display, may discover "a *conscious* party purpose." Though a man pretend to be a "discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart," it does not follow that *he is so*. There have been many tirades against the sermon already published. Are they sustained by proof? From eighteen closely printed pages exception has been taken to only one passage, viz.—"What is commonly called a radical, either in religion or politics, is a dangerous character." This sentence has been wrested from the context, submitted to a forced construction, and made to say what it does not express. Of "radical reformers" not a word is spoken throughout the sermon: nor did the preacher know that any party in this town had assumed that title until, on the following day, he was so informed by a letter which contained an "impertinent" request for the manuscript notes of the sermon. Whether that designation is appropriate to those who boast of it, it is not for him to determine. Nor is he at all concerned to meet the objection of his unworthy accusers. It is for the sake of others, who are not accustomed to examine into the meaning of words, he feels it right to make the following explanation. The word *radical*, as every scholar knows, is derived from the Latin word *radix*, the root, and signifies primitive or original. Such is its grammatical meaning. In political language it is an *ultra democrat*. This is the signification of the word as a noun absolute. When, as an adjective, it serves to qualify some other noun, it may convey another meaning, as modified by the noun itself. That it is employed in its naked sense, as an anarchist, an uprooter, a leveller, in the sermon in question, must be evident to every impartial reader. If men will attach a meaning to a word which it does not bear, and then make an application of it to themselves, the preacher cannot help it. He is responsible only for his own utterances—not for the perverseness or ignorance of other men. "I am a Radical," said an honest man, the other day. "And pray, friend, what is a Radical?" was the rejoinder. Listen to the reply! "A radical is one who is straightforward, who pays his way, who maintains his rights!" Well would it be if all men were such radicals as this supposes I Were this the object of the so-called "Radical Reform," it would find no more "determined advocate" than

The Writer.

Wellington,

December 1, 1857.

The Christian Patriot.

A Sequel to "True Patriotism."

PSALM CXXII. 6—9.

"Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces. For my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, peace be within thee. Because of the house of the Lord our God, I will seek thy good."

THE choice of ray subject to-night will not excite your surprise. A fortnight ago I felt it my duty to preach a sermon suggested by the events of the day. You are aware that an unusual notoriety has been given to that circumstance. Sermons, I allow, are fair subjects for criticism. I wish this was more commonly the case. It is a right spirit only that is required. It would benefit both preachers and hearers. No truth or precept should be received on the mere *ipse dixit* of any man. The preacher is not so much to think for others, as to stimulate and assist their own thinking. I confess that I hail the most virulent opposition as far better than a cold, a stolid indifference. I might complain of the unprincipled use which has been made of ray sermon: but I have more reason to be thankful to my accusers than to be offended with them. By their instrumentality a wider circulation will be given to the sentiments I uttered;—sentiments, of which I am by no means ashamed: and which I cannot modify, until they are proved to be wrong by the only admitted standard of appeal, the Word of God. I have said that sermons are fair subjects of criticism. But there must be some authorized rule of criticism or judgment.

That cannot be the opinion of man. "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of any man's judgment." To be misrepresented and vilified cannot deeply affect the upright mind. Perhaps a Christian minister, in the discharge of his duty, cannot wholly escape this. It is the penalty of faithfulness. Christ and his apostles endured it. "The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household." The good opinion of evil men is not necessary to the Christian's comfort. "For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God we have had our conversation in the world." Any amount of vituperation can be endured by the honest man. On a good conscience, it cannot have the weight of a feather. In the review of my sermon, I enjoy the approbation of my own judgment. I ask only that it may be "weighed in the balances of the sanctuary." This I claim for all my preaching. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." By this, to "try the spirits whether they are of God," is the duty of all Christians. The apostles commended it. The Bereans "were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." Could I, by my ministry, but lead my hearers to do the same, I should feel I had done much. It would be an ample compensation for all the obloquy and reproach on the part of men who are "sensual having not the spirit." To-night, then, I invite you, my brethren, to pay special attention to all that I may say. You cannot do me a greater favour than thoroughly to sift every word—to test every sentiment in the crucible of truth. If any present have come from mere curiosity, I ask them only to hear with candour. I engage not to give to any man an understanding: but I do engage to declare only what I believe to be "the mind of the spirit."

My subject to-night is similar to that of my published sermon. That was to exhibit the principles of "True Patriotism:" this is to sketch the character of the "Christian Patriot." Such a man was the writer of this inspired song. That it was penned by David appears from internal evidence. Its date was certainly anterior to the rending of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah under Rehoboam and Jeroboam. This is evident from the fourth verse. The deep attachment of King David to his country is apparent. It has been objected to religion that it is unfavourable to patriotism. The very contrary is the case. The history of the world furnishes not such noble instances as do the annals of the Church. In proof of my assertion, I might quote from Scripture—I might refer to modern history—or I might mention those on whose graves the sod is yet fresh. The man that loves God supremely will love his neighbour best. The greatest depth of particular affection is found with the widest latitude of genuine benevolence. The evangelical prophet who exulted in the glorious vision of a regenerated world would "give the Lord no rest until He create *Jerusalem* a praise in the earth." We shall never love our country less by loving the whole world more. The pious Briton regards all the world as a platform for redeemed humanity; but, like the devout Israelite, he looks on the land of his nativity as the "perfection of beauty—his chief joy," He will pray "for all men," but he will especially "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem."

I fear I have been too tedious in my preliminary remarks. Permit me now to call your attention to this portraiture. It reveals the "Christian Patriot" in his *object*, his *conduct*, his *motive*.

I. *Object*. This is prominent in the text. He aims at the public good. He seeks the prosperity of Jerusalem. This is the ostensible object of all Patriots. It is the only aim that justifies the pretension. Where not sincere, it must be simulated. The barbed hook must be concealed by an alluring bait. We have an instance of this in the history of David's reign. You will find it in 2 *Samuel* xv. 2—6: "And Absalom rose up early, and stood beside the way of the gate: and it was so, that when any man that had a controversy came to the king for judgment, then Absalom called unto him, and said, of what city art thou? And he said, Thy servant is of one of the tribes of Israel. And Absalom said unto him, See thy matters are good and right; but there is no man deputed of the king to hear thee. Absalom said moreover, oh that I were made judge in the land, that every man which hath any suit or cause might come unto me, *and I would do him justice!* And it was so, that when any man came nigh to him to do him obeisance, he put forth his hand, and took him and kissed him. And *in this manner* did Absalom to all Israel that came to the king for judgment: *so Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel.*" I like a true patriot, David sought the welfare of his people—he loved Jerusalem. Absalom, his son and would-be parricide, under the shew of patriotism, aimed at a selfish end. Human nature is still the same. All *mere* party objects have selfishness for their basis. I say *mere* party objects, for party itself is not wrong. It is perhaps indispensable both in Church and State. To act *with* party and *for* party, are two widely different things. The former is consistent with Patriotism—the latter is the path of ambition, of covetousness, or both. This it is which has so defaced the fair form of religion. I have no sympathy with affectation of regret at the sectional divisions of the Church. I believe them not only inevitable, but within certain limits necessary. Unity in diversity is God's law. It is seen in creation—in providence—in grace. In the works of God we behold the uniform operation of established laws in an endless variety of applications. I cannot stay to illustrate this. Your own information will supply you with a multitude of instances. It is the principle of unity, not of uniformity.

Uniformity is of man. It is unnatural; it is forced: it is death. Life cannot be held within its limits. The human sculptor produces a work of extraordinary genius. You justly admire it;—the symmetry of its proportions, the delicacy of its finish, the elegance of the whole, is perfect. It is all uniform, but it is all cold and lifeless. It is inert matter. The Divine Creator brings forth a living agent, a moral being, an intelligent mind—"fearfully and wonderfully made." Here is life. It is unfolded in all its diversified manifestations. There is unity of nature, identity of feeling, universality of law, but unlimited diversity of operation. Spiritual life is not less the vital principle of Christianity, than is sentient life that of the animal creation. In one case and in the other it exists under manifold embodiments. It is the man of narrow views and selfish purposes, who can see nothing good beyond his own pale. This is the religious bigot—the very antipodes of religion itself. The Christian is a man of greater soul, of liberal mind, of expansive charity. He glories in Christ—*the Life*. He says—"Not with standing every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached, I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." This holds equally good in man's civil relations. It is not the union with party for public ends, but for personal or party objects, that is to be condemned. The Christian Patriot will, in his secular capacity, as well as in his church relationship, "seek the peace of the city." He embraces the welfare of the whole community when he saith: "Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces. For my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, Peace be within thee. Because of the house of the Lord our God I will seek thy good."

This includes *internal union*; *public prosperity*; and *religious progress*.

1. *Internal Union*. "Peace be within thy walls." The original is more comprehensive than the English word "peace." It signifies much more, but nothing less, than union. External peace is a national blessing. War is, in itself, an unmixed evil. By the Christian patriot it will ever be deprecated. He will not cease to pray in the beautiful language of the Liturgy of the Church of England, "Give peace in our time, O Lord." But internal union is of more importance than external peace. The former is the only security for the permanence of the latter. A country is strong only in its own unanimity. Britain need never fear a foe while there is "peace within her walls;" but "a house divided against itself cannot stand." No calamity is equal to that of anarchy within the State. The case of India naturally suggests itself at the present moment. The most callous cannot but weep over the barbarities which, by a popular tumult, have been perpetrated on our unhappy countrymen in that bloodstained portion of the British empire. Nor can we think, but with horror, on the fearful but just retribution which awaits the brutal murderers of lovely women and innocent babes! Scenes of rebellion and bloodshed too have taken place in this land. They were, it is true, of an unspeakably milder character. Hardly have they passed from the recollection of many whom I address to-night. Thank God we are no longer exposed to dangers such as these. But there are other discords than the clash of arms. Religious animosities, political agitations, social antagonism, are all prejudicial to the "peace of the city." Unholy strife, from whatever cause it may arise, cannot agree with Christian character, or public interest. Peace is the necessary platform for prosperity, "Peace within thy walls" in order to "prosperity within thy palaces." This implies not an entire agreement of opinion, but an agreement of purpose. There may not be a union of judgment on all things, but there should be a union of feeling. Unhappily, when political questions agitate the public mind, this feeling is grossly violated, "It is," says the learned and excellent Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, "not only that men are not well informed on political subjects, but that the whole spirit with which they turn to them is faulty: they do not regard them as a matter of solemn duty, they bring to them not their better mind, but their worst: either their lightest, or their most passionate and unscrupulous. The temper of most men, I fear, in reading a newspaper, or in talking or acting about political subjects, is the very most unlike to that with which they could say their prayers, or consider any practical question of duty in common life, or perform acts of charity." Next to the delightful picture of a church united, through out its several sections, for one great object, is the moral beauty of a civil community animated, from its head throughout all its members, with one feeling, and that feeling the public weal. "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem, they shall prosper that love thee."

2. *Public prosperity*. As the first requisite is "peace within thy walls" in order to security, so the next is "prosperity within thy palaces," in order to advancement. "Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces." It has been well observed by an ancient commentator on this passage that—"peace without prosperity is but a secure possession of misery: and prosperity without peace is but a dubious and uncertain felicity." The former refers to the community at large; the latter more particularly to the regularly constituted authorities. The mutual dependence of these is very intimate. Nothing can affect the one that does not concern the other. Every country is deeply interested in the character of its government, and the government must be influenced by the state of the people. A country writhing under a corrupt, a feeble, or an oppressive government cannot have "peace within its walls." Nor can there be "prosperity in her palaces" if there be discord within her borders. Moral influence is the basis of true power. A firm government must be sustained by the weight of its own character: it must rest on the respect, the confidence, the support of an intelligent and upright people. Let this mutual relation be established and there will "be no complaining in our streets." The Christian Patriot aims at this. In proportion as he fulfils the great end of Christianity—with or without any economic theory or scheme of

worldly policy—he will rescue men from the dominion of ignorance and vice; he will implant principles of the soundest and holiest nature; and by being instrumental in preparing them for a glorious immortality, he will be promoting the temporal good of society by qualifying them for the duties of the virtuous citizen, as included in that of the true Christian. Such men make the best subjects and the best rulers. It is the influence of lofty intelligence and moral rectitude which promotes "peace within our walls," and by the practical regard of God's command to Moses, to "provide out of all the people, able men such as fear God, men of truth and hating covetousness, and place such over them to be rulers," shall we have "prosperity within our palaces."

3. *Religious progress.* "Because of the house of the Lord our God I will seek thy good." It is religion which plants the "tree of life," the leaves of which are "for the healing of the nations." It is the balm of social maladies—the remedy of public evils—the bond of peace! It offers the best security for the peace of the people and the prosperity of the nation. It enlightens the mind, sanctifies the heart, regulates the life. It is more powerful than the laws of man. Human laws may restrain by addressing our fears: religion speaks to the conscience, and commands respect to justice, which is the principle of law. Human laws can impose penalties which men may evade or despise: religion is clothed with the sanction of the divine authority from which none can escape. Human laws punish crime: religion destroys crime. Human laws may compel a sullen compliance with established order: religion produces a cheerful acquiescence in providential allotments. Human laws may irritate while they restrain the unruly: religion subdues and sanctifies the passions of men. In the possession of this moral lever lies the strength of the Christian Patriot. In upholding the religious institutions of his country he is seeking her good. Take away the moral influence of Christianity, and you must substitute physical force. Let every church in this city be closed, and we need not the prescience of a prophet to foretell the certain consequence. But let the "house of the Lord our God" be the object of general regard—in other words, let all be influenced by a sincere love to the worship of God, and the requirements of His word, then shall there be "peace within our walls and prosperity within our palaces." Then shall be fulfilled the prediction of a future age: "I will make thine officers peace, and thine exactors righteousness. Violence shall no more be heard in the land, wasting nor destruction in all thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise."

II. We have been looking at the *object* of the Christian Patriot. Let us now see by what means he seeks it. His *conduct* will be adapted to the end. It matters not what relative position he may fill—he may be high or low. "Every man in his own order." All cannot be exalted to honour, but all should be patriots. In private life, as well as in public office, every man is under this obligation. "A civilized community may be regarded as a family on a large scale, and every member thereof should feel and act as though the responsibility of the whole rested on himself." For "every man has a part to act, and the whole community will be better or worse for every individual." Each one is a living stone in the social edifice, "No man liveth to himself." For good or evil, all have influence: that of the *Christian Patriot* is for the good of his country.

1. *He is a man of prayer.*

He will "pray for the peace of Jerusalem." Without prayer no man can be a Christian. I am not going to consider the philosophy of his great duty. Prayer is natural. There is no nation or people that do not pray to their gods. When the runaway Jonah was overtaken by a "mighty tempest in the sea so that the ship was like to be broken," the heathen "mariners were afraid and cried every man unto his god." How instinctively does the reckless sinner pray in the hour of sudden danger! But the Christian prays not from a feeling of terror, but from a conviction of duty. He delights in the exercise. He will "pray without ceasing,"

*"Prayer is the Christian's vital breath,
The Christian's native air."*

"Prayer is the wealth of poverty—the refuge of affliction—the strength of weakness—the light of darkness." And all can pray—the poor as well as the rich—the illiterate as well as the learned—the lowly as well as the great, "God heareth the prayer of the righteous." Every patriot of Scripture was a man of prayer. Think of Abraham, of Moses, of Joshua, of Samuel, of David, of Daniel,—the image of each rises up before you as a man who "prayed to God alway," and who had "power with God and did prevail." Shall I refer to others. I might challenge a host. Take the excellent Wilberforce, or look at Sir Fowell Buxton—that noble, massive, upright, manly character—a type of the thorough Englishman—a model of a statesman—and an earnest, simple-minded christian patriot. "He could not get on without prayer." His son and biographer writes that "he was in the constant habit of communicating his cares to his heavenly Father." To use his own words, "prayer is throwing up the heart to God continually—everything leads me to prayer, and I always find it answered both in little and great things." What a blessing it would be if all our public men were men of prayer! Then would they be mighty indeed. "Prayer moves the hand that moves the universe," An interesting incident is recorded of the philosopher Franklin. At the conclusion of the American war of independence, great difficulties

surrounded the settlement of a constitution. In his own forcible manner, he arose to remind the delegates that they had neglected to seek God's blessing by prayer. This rebuke was acknowledged. Prayer was made to God, and in a little while, writes the historian, their deliberations were harmonious, and within a short time the constitution was completed. Prayer is a duty founded on reason as well as on Scripture. God is the source of all wisdom and strength. He can give plenty, or send famine. He can turn the counsel of the wise into foolishness. He "frustrateth! the tokens of the liars, and maketh diviners mad." And "happy is the man who hath the God of Jacob for his help." Then "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem."

2. *A man of earnestness,*

Nothing is more opposed to Christianity than indolence or vacuity. In the Christian Patriot there will be an energy, a force of character sanctified by grace, which will be felt. Not in noisy uproar, but by a "patient continuance in well doing" will his influence impress itself. Religion brings into play all the activities of man's nature. It teaches him his value. By fixing the stamp of immortality upon him, it connects his present conduct with eternal consequences. It makes time pregnant with results. He redeems it. His language is, "I will *now* say." By diligent application he will be "always abounding in the work of the Lord." His is the earnestness of principle, not of passion: of conviction, not of impulse: of moral obligation, not of selfishness: "for my brethren and companions' sakes I will now say, Peace be within thee." There is no cure for idleness—that bane of a family or a country—like religion. Its rule is, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it *with all thy might*." Slothfulness is a crime which religion abhors. It was this which constituted the wickedness of the unfaithful servant in the parable of the talents. Its command is, "Be not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." The Christian Patriot will earnestly address himself to all the duties of his calling. He will be "full of good works."

3. *A man of genuine benevolence.*

Men often claim the honour of patriots because they seek the territorial enlargement of their country; its success in arms; or the glory of its name. The Christian patriot will not be indifferent to his country's honour; the prestige of a powerful name; or the extension of her dominions. But he will more particularly "seek her good" by instructing the ignorant, by relieving the oppressed, and by reclaiming the lost. Such a man may say with Job: "Because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me: and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. I put on righteousness and it clothed me: my judgment was as a robe and a diadem. I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the poor: and the cause which I knew not I searched out." To him the appeal of injured humanity will not be made in vain. His manly voice will ever be uplifted in behalf of the poor, and the destitute, and the oppressed. Corruption and vice, of every form, will meet in him an unflinching foe. Poverty and distress will hail him as their benefactor. In good men he has a special interest—they are his "Brethren and companions"—but he has a benevolent regard to all. He relies more for national glory on the condition of the masses, the creation of peaceful hearts and happy homes, than on foreign conquest or accumulated wealth. "Happy is that people that is in such a case, yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord."

III. I shall not dwell long on the remaining end last part of my subject;—*the motive* of the Christian Patriot. Man is a free-agent. His will is determined by motive. His conduct is good or bad, according to the motive by which it is governed. "God looketh at the heart." The ruling motive of unconverted man is the love of self, in some form or another. That of the Christian man is the love of God. Subordinate to this supreme principle of conduct he will manifest:—

1 *A zeal for religion.*

What is often called religious zeal is a worthless thing. It is zeal for an opinion, or for a party, or for a name—it is no better than political zeal—than partizanship. A true zeal for religion arises from the love of God. "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." But where the love of God exists zeal will manifest itself in a right spirit. "Because of the house of the Lord our God, I will seek thy God." Indifference to religious progress cannot be the spirit of a Christian. It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing. The Christian Patriot will be glad when they say unto him, "Let us go into the house of the Lord."

2. *A love to all good men.*

"Every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him." The mere zealot can love those only who pronounce his own *Shibboleth*. The Christian esteems all who love the Lord Jesus Christ. He is more intent on articles of agreement than on points of difference. He is what Binney says of Buxton—"More than a good churchman, or a good dissenter, or a good methodist, he is a good man—a liberal, large-souled thorough christian man." It will be well for the interests of religion in particular, and for those of society in generally when this character shall be more prevalent in New Zealand—when less shall be thought of the distinctive names and creeds, and forms—of Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Wesleyan, or the like;—and more of that "love which is the bond of perfectness," which embraces the whole household of faith" and aims at the

conversion of the world, not merely to church systems, or creeds, or symbols, but to "the truth as it is in Jesus."

3. *A regard to his best interests.*

It may seem very philosophic to talk about disinterestedness. There is no such thing on earth. Every man possesses an interest in doing right. Sinful human nature takes an inverted view of moral relations. It dates man's interest from himself and thus upholds the dominion of selfishness. Sanctified humanity takes the right view: it sees its interest comes from God, and thus chains himself to the throne of the Eternal. Man's true interest is in doing the will of God. This is the element of human happiness, of man's prosperity. "They Shall prosper that love thee." Not always with respect to worldly prosperity—but invariably, if prosperity includes man's highest welfare. This can never fail the righteous, for "all things work together for good to them that love God," and "whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." I now beg your attention for a few minutes while I observe:

I. *Every man should be a Patriot—a Christian Patriot.*

This is only saying that every man should "do his duty." The humblest man can serve the interests of his country. Only ten righteous men would have saved the cities of the plain from destruction. On this subject I will offer an extract from Dr. Chalmers in his "Christian and economic polity of a nation." Speaking of the individual he says:—

"He could not, by his own solitary strength advance the little stone into a great mountain, but the worth and the efficacy of his labours, will be sure to recommend them to the imitation of many: and the good work will spread, by example from one individual and from one district to another: and though he may be lost to observation, in the growing magnitude of the operations which surround him, yet will he rejoice, even in his very insignificance, as the befitting condition for one to occupy, among the many millions of the species to which he belongs, and it will be enough for him that he has added one part, however small, to that great achievement, which can only be completed by the exertions of an innumerable multitude, and the fruit of which is to fill the whole earth."

II. *Man needs conversion.*

No man can be a Christian Patriot unless he be "born again." He is either in the flesh or in the spirit. By the former is meant a state of nature; by the latter a state of grace. It is the office of the gospel to turn men from "darkness to light." We must despair of "true Patriotism" until men become "true Christians." It is readily admitted that there may be many personal virtues without conversion. Outwardly the man of cultivated manners may seem to surpass the man of christian grace. But the principle on which each acts is widely different—the one from love of self, the other from love of God. Compare, for instance, the life of Sir Samuel Romilly with that of Sir Fowell Buxton. One was the counterpart of the other, except in one thing, and that was the "one thing needful." The christian patriot is upheld by a principle within, rather than by any thing without him. How fitful is the tide of popular applause! The man that is the idol of the mob to-day, may be the execration of the multitude to-morrow! How uncertain the standing place of the man who lives on the breath of popularity! Hainan basks in the sunshine of royalty, "and all the king's servants bowed and revered Haman." Haman falls beneath his monarch's frown, and "so they hanged Haman on the gallows which he had prepared for Mordecai." But how little is the christian man affected by such reverses! Take Moses, David, Daniel, Paul: How fearlessly, how calmly, how nobly could they look upon the surge—on whose buoyant wave they had just been wafted to the highest elevation—as it rolled away from beneath their feet, and then, recoiling in all its fury, returned to engulf its victims! Firm in his principle, the Christian meekly says, "none of these things move me." He has the love of God in his heart; the testimony of God in his conscience; the glory of God in his eye!

III. *Man is accountable.*

The consequences of our present conduct will follow us into another world. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." It is beautifully conceived by Professor Hitchcock, author of the "Religion of Geology"—and he supports his reasoning by analogies supplied by science—that every volition of the human mind produces an influence which, through some subtle medium, shall vibrate to the remotest extremities of the universe of God. Only think of, not only every word, but every thought, in the day of judgment, as a living witness, confronting the sinner at the bar of God! What appeal from their evidence to Him who shall judge "the secrets of all hearts!" How tremendously fearful to the evil man! This is the "worm that dieth not." But gloriously shall the fruits of a holy life eternally develop themselves. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, for they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them."

G. Watson, Printer, Lambton Quay, Wellington, N.Z.

Canterbury Sunday Observance League.

Second Address.

Subject—*The Connection between Sabbath Observance and Temporal Prosperity*,

By Rev. James Buller,

J. H. Twentyman, Esq., in the Chair.

[Extract from the Report of Public Meeting, held in the Wesleyan Schoolroom, Christchurch, on Friday, 27th November, 1874.]

My subject assumes the duty of Sabbath observance. This is of universal and of perpetual obligation: but it is not for me now to prove it; nor am I to say bow the Sabbath should be observed; this will be modified by surrounding conditions. The true principle of Sabbath keeping is to be applied to the circumstances of Christians at the present day. Rest and religion are the objects of this institution. I join these, because without religion there can be no rest. We owe the Sabbath to religion, and it is by religion we retain it. But I do not discuss this aspect of the question. Our physical, moral, and social interests are bound up with it. The Canterbury Sunday Observance League seeks the protection of this day of rest. As the platform for Sabbath observance there must be rest from week-day toil and care—rest for the body; liberty for the mind. The busy hum of traffic must be hushed on "the first day of the week." It should not be a dull day. If anyone be more jubilant than another it is the Sunday, for "this is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it." Our Saviour gave no sanction to austere practices. For the hungry to pluck the ears of corn—for the ass or the ox to be pulled out of the pit—for to do good to the bodies or the souls of men—are all lawful on the Sabbath day. It gives me great pleasure to say that in Canterbury the day is observed as well as in any place I know, and better than in most of them. The recent opening of the Museum I hold to be a mistake; and it is the object of this League to check further inroads of that sort. The line between a day of rest and religion, and one of drudgery and dissipation, is its sacredness. Destroy this; take the seventh of our time out of the one hand to which peer and peasant bow, and it will share the lot of all the rest. Man's right rests upon God's right. Let the working man know that but for religion, this day would not be his, but his master's. The moral and religious advantages will be the subject of a future address. I confine myself to the connection of Sabbath observance with temporal prosperity. I do not mean by this the simple grasp of wealth; the glare and glitter of imposing sights; the flaunting of showy garments, or the like: all this may be, as in ancient Rome, when a worm is gnawing at the heart of the public weal, and, in the delirium of a hollow joy, the people are rushing to a dismal doom. By temporal prosperity let us understand the well-being of a man, or of a people, as the outcome of those principles of conduct which produce health, diligence, and sobriety in the individual, in the family, and in the community.

1. THE INDIVIDUAL.—Good health is the groundwork of all earthly comfort. This requires a regular rest from work, both of body and mind. The nocturnal sleep is not enough. Work your horse every day, without intermission, and soon you will have no horse to work. The late Sir Robert Peel used to say that he never knew a man to escape failure, in either mind or body, who worked seven days in a week. The Sabbath is God's sanatorium for the sons of toil. It sprinkles reviving dews on the brow of industry. Health is nourished not only by the rest it provides, but also by the habits of order, of cleanliness, and cheerfulness, which it forms. I am speaking of a Sabbath sacredly kept. Give the day to amusement, and the idea of a Sabbath is destroyed. Nothing is more fatiguing than the dissipations of pleasure. By the orgies of a Sunday holiday man is less fitted for a working Monday. But the Sabbath-rested man goes to his weekly labor with renewed energy. Physical benefits are often the prelude to moral blessings. Cleanliness leads the way to other virtues. But for the Sabbath millions would not change their clothes. Repose, meditation, converse—to say nothing of religious worship—brace up the powers for recurring tasks. "The savings bank of human existence is the weekly Sabbath." Compare the man who makes conscience of this day with him who gives it to money making, to pleasure taking, to sensual indulgences. You will find in the former what is lacking in the other—the best guarantee for success in life. His feet tread the earth, his brow fronts the sky. In the best sense of the words, he is heir to temporal prosperity.

Hail, Sabbath! thee I hail, the poor man's day.

The pale mechanic now has leave to breathe

The morning air, pure from the city's smoke;

While, wandering slowly up the river side,

He meditates on Him whose power he marks

In each green tree that proudly spreads the bough,

Or in the tiny dew-bent flowers that bloom

Around the roots; and while he thus surveys,

With elevated joy, each rural charm
He hopes (yet fears presumption in the hope)
To reach those realms where Sabbaths never end.

2. THE FAMILY.—God is the author of the family constitution, and the homes of men are the centres of nearly all the light and warmth of the social world. If you would find the highest degree of domestic felicity, seek it not in the halls of the great, but in the abodes, however lowly, where they "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." There it is "the pearl of days." But for this those who "in the sweat of the face eat bread" would have no time for the loving interchange of thought and feeling. To this large section of the "million" the Sunday clothes, the Sunday gathering, and the Sunday meal, when "sanctified by the Word of God and prayer," represent the idea of

Domestic bliss: the only paradise that hath survived the fall.

Here tempers are evoked which help largely in the formation of virtuous character. Take, for example, the charming picture drawn by the pen of a "Laborer's daughter" in the wilds of Scotland:—

"Our Sabbaths were our happiest days. We were near no place of public worship; not so near at least as to permit any of the children often to attend. As soon as we were dressed and had breakfasted, family prayer was attended to, and then our father would point out some hymn or passage of scripture which he wished us to learn, when we would sally forth, book in hand, in different directions; one to stretch himself upon the soft grass in the field close by, another to pace backward and forward on the pleasure walk or to find a seat in the bough of an old bushy tree. While another would seek a little summer-house our father had made of heather, and seated round with the twisted boughs of the glossy birch, each reading aloud, till the allotted lesson was thoroughly fixed upon the mind. If the day was wet, or if it was the winter season, we would gather around the table by the window. During the afternoon mother would read to us, or all of us, father and mother included, read by turns; questions were then asked, and conversation entered into about what we had been reading.

Happy parents and happy children,
The holy Sabbath thus to spend.

How blessed is the retrospect of such a day! Contrast it with another, alas, too common, where the Sunday is a day of mere animal pastime. Late sleep, late meals, late dressing; squallor in the house and tawdry show abroad. Is this a Sabbath? "There is no rest, saith my God to the wicked." Who has not read and admired the beautiful poem of Burns on the "Cottar's Saturday Night," the eve before the Sabbath. Where the day is observed there will be happy anticipation of it, and timely preparation for it. That will not be left for the Sunday morning which, can be done on the Saturday evening. When the the six days' work are finished:—

The toil-worn cottar frae his labor goes,
This night his weekly moil is at an end, Collects his spades, his mattocks, and his hoes,
Hoping the morn in ease and rest to spend, And weary o'er the moor, his course doth homeward bend.
At length his lonely cot appears in view,
Beneath the shelter of an aged tree;
Wi' expectant wee things toddin, stacher thro'
To meet their dad, in flickerin' noise and glee.
His wee bit ingle, blinkin' bonnily,
His clean hearth-stane, his thriftie wife's smile,
The lisping infant prattling on his knee,
Does a' his weary kiaugh and care beguile,
And makes him quite forget his labour and his toil.
The cheerful supper done, wi' serious face
They round the ingle form a circle wide.
The sire turns o'er with patriarchal grace, The big ha' Bible, ance his father's pride;
His bonnet rev'rently is laid aside, His lyart haffets wearing thin and bare.
Those strains that once did sweet in Zion glide,
He wales a portion with judicious care;
And, "Let us worship God," he says, with solemn air.
From scenes like these old Scotia's grandeur springs,
That makes her lov'd at home, rever'd abroad.

Princes and lords are but the breath of kings;
An honest man's the noblest work of God.

In this, our "Britain of the South," may the land enjoy her Sabbaths. I love to think of

The blessed homes of England,
How softly in their bowers
Is laid the holy quietness
That breathes from Sabbath hours.
Solemn, yet sweet, the church bells chime,
Floats through the woods at morn,
All other sounds, in that still time,
Of breeze and leaf are born.

3. THE COMMUNITY.—Show me a land of Sabbath-keeping homes and I will show you a people strong in the elements of national stability, growth, and greatness—a people sober, intelligent, and industrious; a people among whom peace and content, if not plenty, dwells. Between Sabbath observance and public morals there is a close bond. Even if there be excess, it is better on the side of severity than of laxity. History tells us that a puritanical Sunday is to be preferred to that of the "Book of Sports" on behalf of the general good. A God-fearing, a man-honoring, and a law-abiding people, must prosper. And our national character and glorious institutions will go down into the grave that entombs our Sabbaths. To say nothing of the blessing that cometh directly from the Lord of the Sabbath, a well kept Sunday must lead to a well ordered community. The late Dr Norman McLeod (who was not at all tight-laced on this question) said:—

"It is impossible to estimate the blessed effect produced upon a nation's health and happiness, when, on the return of each Sunday, millions are thus set free from toil; when the ledger is closed on the desk, when the hammer rests upon the anvil, and the wheel in the factory, when the mine sends forth its crowds into the light and glory of the new-born day, and when men can rest their wearied frames, or tread the green earth or hoary mountain, and breathe the fresh air, and look calmly upon the blue sky overhead, or listen to the sounding stream or beating sea wave; and when the very dumb cattle partake of the universal blessing, though as unconscious as many of their masters, of the loving hand which has bestowed it."

The striking contrast between a British Sabbath and a French Sunday is notorious. It will be a sad day for the grand Old Country we still call "Home, sweet home," if it copy the example of the latter. A Sabbathless nation in the face of an age of fierce competition, must be a nation without leisure for love or thought—a nation without rest and without homes. God save Great Britain from such a curse! For a Sunday holiday is as great a curse as the Sabbath is a blessing. The artisan returns from the carnival physically and morally unfitted for his daily work. But the frame of mind which a sacred observance of the day sustains is itself a valuable antidote to worldly griefs, while it enhances the value of all innocent pleasures. We cannot trifle with its sanctity but at our peril. Wayland in his "Elements of Moral Science" says

"The violation of this duty by the young is one of the most decided marks of incipient moral degeneracy. Religious restraint is fast losing its hold of that young man who, having been trained in the fear of God, begins to spend his Sabbath in idleness or in amusement; and so also of communities. The desecration of the Sabbath is one of the most evident indications of that criminal recklessness, that insane love of pleasure, and that slavery to the passions, which forebodes the 'beginning of the end' of social happiness and of true national prosperity."

The testimony of Sir Matthew Hale is endorsed by the experience of his successors on the Judicial Bench, and in that of chaplains of gaols. It is this:—

"Of all persons who were convicted of capital crimes while he was on the bench, he found a few only who would not confess, on enquiry, that they began their career of wickedness by a neglect of the duties of the Sabbath."

It is a hackneyed saying that men are not to be made moral by Acts of Parliament. Granted. But on the other hand, all legislators are false to their trust who either by the enactment of laws, or by their own example, lessen in any way the reverence due to that day which God hath set apart for himself. Take away the moral influence of the Sabbath, and you loosen the bonds of society. But Sabbath-keeping, by the habits it induces, will imbue the mind with sound views of relative duties and build up mutual respect in the fear of God. Such a community will never be the congenial sphere for either demagogue or despot. The Sabbath is a test of moral bias. It does more, even now, than magistrates, prisons, and other legal terrors, to strengthen our civil, our

social, and our religious privileges. Take away this barrier and you open the floodgates of vice and irreligion upon a godless people. But let it be "called a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable," then will "our sons be as plants grown up in their youth, and our daughters as cornerstones, polished after the similitude of a palace—and there will be no complaining in our streets." Who will not say—"Happy is that people that is in such a case, yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord?"

I will close with one of Mrs Hemans' sonnets. It was the last she composed, and it was on her last Sabbath upon earth, when lying on her death bed. Then she dictated these lines:—

How many blessed groups this hour are bending,
Through England's primrose meadow-paths their way
Towards spire and tower, midst shadowy elms ascending,
Whence the sweet chimes proclaim the hallow'd day!
The halls, from old heroic ages gray,
Pour their fair children forth, and hamlets low,
With whose thick orchard-bloom the soft winds play.
Send out their inmates in a happy flow,
Like a freed vernal stream. I may not tread
With them those pathways—to the feverish bed
Of sickness bound—yet, O my God! I bless
Thy mercy, that with Sabbath peace hath fill'd
My chasten'd heart, and all its throbbings still'd
To one deep calm of lowliest thankfulness.

Printed at the Offices of the "Press" Company [Limited], Cashel Street, Christchurch.
The Cat Let out of the Bag, By Howard C. Thurston.

Twenty years ago,
While smoking my pipe, the thought occurred to me that I ought to make known, by writing a little book, the discovery that I had just then made.
But, knowing what a dreadful thing it is to fall into the hands of "avenging" Christians, made me somewhat skittish, and I began to calculate the amount of probability that existed for my being roasted alive,
The answer I got
From my twenty years figuring is:—
That no Christians are known to be living at the present day.
But no doubt
Many of the saints
Will arise, as soon as this little book makes its appearance, in order to shower their heavenly blessings upon my earthly head.
Cosmopolitan Commonsense Publishing Co., London.
Sydney: H. R. Woods and Co., General Machine Printers, 13 Bridge Street.

The Cat Let out of the Bag.

He who will not reason is a bigot,
He who cannot is a fool,
And he who dares not is a slave.

—SIR WILLIAM DRUMMOND.

NOW as bigots, fools, and slaves are so scarce in these days, I need have no fear of this book falling into such hands. The only thing that I see any fear about is, that some of my readers may be at a loss for words to express their so-called christian love for me.

Now Christianity is either a great fact or a great lie, and not so much as a shadow of a doubt crossed my mind as to the truth of the Christian religion, till after my thirtieth year. But that is easily accounted for; my parents being very religious, myself of a religious disposition—why! as a matter of course, I sucked in all the ridiculous nonsense, impossibilities, wicked and obscene stories, which go to make up this so-called Word of

God, just as kindly as I did my mother's milk. In fact, the rot that was taught me became as much a part of my nature as the food that I eat.

Well, as time passed on, the day came when I was to leave my home and country; and well I remember, even unto this day, my mother telling me that although my stock of money was small, yet I was rich, as I possessed that which money could not purchase, namely, the fear of God and the love of Christ which I had in my heart. It was a fact my stock of money was rather small, but treasures of another kind I had in abundance. For instance, my Bible I valued more than all my luggage; again I had all the collects in the prayer-book off by heart. Psalms I could sing like the son of a clergyman. Verses bearing upon the love and blood of Christ, I could repeat by the chain. Horrible stories of infidels I could tell by the score, which I had read in religious books, or heard told from the pulpit.

I had also been taught a great deal concerning God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. For instance, I had been taught that God the Father was one, and that God the Son was one, which made two ones, but did not make two; and that God the Holy Ghost was another one, but these three ones did not make three, as one would suppose. As it was well-known and understood by the faithful that these three were only one, I understood it all (of course) as I was one of the faithful.

Now the discovery I made was in this wise: on my arrival in Brazil in 1860, from the United States I became acquainted with an English engineer who then held an appointment under the Brazilian Government. This gentleman was keeping bachelor's hall, and invited me to join with him, I gladly accepted the invitation, as I was very soon to take an appointment under the same government, and being a stranger to the ways of the people and unacquainted with their language nothing could have suited me better.

In the evening my friend invited me to take a walk with him; I declined with thanks, as I preferred to remain by myself and read the Bible. In fact, up to this time of my life, about ninety per cent, of my thoughts had been about religion. On the evening of the third day, the rain coming down in torrents prevented my friend from leaving the house. He therefore asked me to take a hand at cards. I was at the time reading the Bible. I replied that I never played cards nor looked upon them but as the books of the Devil, invented to deter people from reading the Word of God.

My friend said: "How long is it since you took to reading the Bible?"

"Ever since I was taught to read," said I.

"Which of the two stories of the creation given in the Bible do you believe?" asked my friend.

"There is only one account of the creation given in the Bible," said I.

"Is it possible," said my friend, "that you have been reading that Book for the last twenty years and have not noticed that two different accounts of the creation are given, and which contradict each other in almost every line?"

Now, when I heard my friend say the Bible contradicted itself, I felt terribly cut up. I no longer felt safe in the house. A man who did not believe in the Bible was no company for me. A man who did not believe in the Word of God was to me a monster, capable of committing any crime.

For instance, as soon as I knew my friend did not believe in the Bible, I felt certain that he would not hesitate to take my life in the night. These thoughts, unjust as I now know them to have been, were the natural outcome of what I had read in religious works, and from what I had been taught from the pulpit. I had heard it stated in the pulpit that he who did not believe in the Word of God was the greatest monster on earth—was one who had not a grain of anything human in his whole composition. Therefore, to be in such company was to me like being in the company of the Devil himself.

It happened that the rain which had prevented my friend from leaving the house, had no such effect upon me, so I thought I would leave at once feeling sure the Devil was there. I told my friend that it was impossible for the Word of God to contradict itself.

"I know nothing about a Word of God," said my friend, "but I know the Book called the Bible contradicts itself a hundred times over. Will you be so kind as to read the twentieth and twenty-first verses of the first chapter of Genesis?"

"With pleasure," said I, and I at once uttered a prayer to Almighty God that the reading of His holy Word might break the stony heart of this child of the Devil. I then read Genesis i., 20, 21.

"And God said, let the *waters* bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven, and God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good."

My friend said, "Do not those two verses tell us that the animal kingdom was made from the waters?"

"Yes," said I, "but I see no contradiction."

"To see that you must read the nineteenth verse of the second chapter," said my friend.

I then read Genesis ii., 19:—"And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and

every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof."

As soon as my eyes rested on the words, "and out of the *ground* the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air," the shock that I experienced, the awful change I felt, could not have been greater or more sudden had I been shot.

"Is that not a contradiction?" asked my friend; but I could make no answer, as my state of bewilderment was as uncontrollable as an earthquake.

My friend then asked me to read the twenty-seventh verse of the first chapter of Genesis and the fifth verse of the second chapter. I then read Genesis i., 27. "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." Also Genesis ii., 5:—"And every plant of the field before it grew: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground."

"Now is it not both absurd and contradictory to be told that a man was made as we are told he was in this twenty-seventh verse, and then immediately after to be told that there is no man in existence?" asked my friend.

I made no answer, as I felt the scales which had been planted over my eyes when a child, the roots of which had gone down such a terrible depth, were beginning to give way, and light had begun to dawn.

Then my friend said, "It is very evident to me that you were always turned out to grass on the orthodox side of the hedge; suppose you take a feed on the other side": and at the same time he gave me a book, the contents of which I knew nothing about.

But no sooner had I began to read than I became deeply absorbed with the good sense and self-evident remarks of the writer.

To my surprise and astonishment I saw the Bible did contradict itself just as stated in this book, as I referred to the passages quoted by the author.

At this time my bladder of faith, which had just been pricked by what my friend had pointed out to me, was flying off at a tangent and at a velocity, that had all the clergy who ever subscribed to the thirty-nine articles been there with the Bishop of Canterbury to help them, all their faith and animal power combined would have been as naught in checking the bladder from becoming empty.

The stench from the cat which my friend's book let out of the bag was such that it was impossible not to feel disgusted.

Now after I had been reading some considerable time, I saw the name of Thomas Paine in the book. I could not believe 'till after I had asked my friend some questions that the book had been written by Tom Paine, the so-called infidel, because I had always been given to understand that his book was a tissue of abominable lies. But as I had always been given to understand everything from the orthodox side of the hedge (as my friend said), why it was quite in keeping with the other lies which had been taught me.

When I discovered that Mr. Paine's book was as far from being what the clergy and religious writers represented, and they had been my teachers, as it was possible for falsehood to make it, I could come to only one conclusion, which was, that they (the clergy and writers) were either entirely ignorant as to the contents of the book or were guilty of wilfully misrepresenting it. Though I can vouch that my parents knew nothing about this gross misrepresentation of Paine, that is more than I can do for the clergy.

As soon as I could fully realize the discovery I had made, if ever a man felt ashamed of himself, if ever a man felt conquered, if ever a man felt that he had been terribly deceived, if ever a man felt himself injured—I was that man.

I sprang to my feet and said to my friend, "What a contemptible thing I must have appeared to you, seeing that I was such a fool as to know no better than waste my time in reading a mass of horrible stories which are to be found in the Bible, where we are told of all women that were found with child being ript up, and of daughters making their father drunk and then getting into bed with him?"

"It is impossible," said I, "that the injury which I feel the church has done me can ever be redeemed. How was it that I did not see the absurdity of calling the Bible the word of an all wise and good God."

"I will tell you," said my friend, "you never had the use of your reason when thinking or reading upon that subject. Where there is reason, there is no religion; and where there is religion, there is no reason. All forms of religion are neither more nor less than superstition founded upon ignorance."

The first story of the creation given in this so-called Word of God begins at the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis and breaks off at the third verse of the second chapter.

The second story begins at the fourth verse of the second chapter.

According to the first story, everything was made before the man, but according to the second story the man was the first thing that was made—or, in other words, according to the first chapter the man was made last; while according to the second chapter the man was made first.

The first story distinctly tells us that all and every fruit was given to man for food; while the second story just as distinctly tells us it was not.

The first story tells us that the whole earth was given to man.

The second story tells us that only a garden was given him.

The first story tells us the man was blessed.

The second story tells us the man was cursed.

In the second chapter and seventh verse we are told the Lord God made a man; the next verse tells us the Lord God put the man in a garden; the eighteenth verse tells us the Lord God said it was not good for the man to be alone, and in consequence a woman was made to keep him company.

Now, the reason given for making the woman is not very flattering to the ladies, I must confess, so no doubt they will be glad to learn that the second verse of the fifth chapter places them on a par with the man, since we are told as plain as language can speak, that the man and woman were made at the same time—Genesis v., 2 says: "Male and female created He them, and blessed them, and called *their* name Adam, in the day when they were created."

Now, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am not finding fault with the religion of any person in existence, as I am not supposed to know anything about other people's religion. It is none of my business to know. I shall do no more than state what was once my religion, what I was taught, and what the Bible says, the Book I was told to read.

Should it happen that others have been taught the same as I was, that is their business not mine.

WHAT I COULD BELIEVE WHEN A CHRISTIAN.

It might be taken as an act of charity on my part (I have no doubt), if I point out some of the peculiar advantages which the religion taught me possesses over other forms of religion:—

For instance, I could believe the animal kingdom was made from the *waters* as stated in the first chapter of Genesis, or believe it was made from the *ground*, as stated in the second chapter of Genesis.

I could believe the animal kingdom was made before the man, as stated in the first chapter, or believe the man was made before the animal kingdom, as stated in the second chapter.

I could believe the man and woman were made at the same time, as stated in the first chapter, or believe they were made at different times, as stated in the second chapter.

I could believe the man was given charge of the whole earth, as stated in the first chapter, or believe he was only given charge of a garden, as stated in the second chapter.

I could believe all fruit was given to man, as stated in the first chapter, or believe it was not all given to him, as stated in the second chapter.

I could believe King David paid Oman fifty shekels of silver for his threshing floor and oxen, as stated in the second book of Samuel xxiv., 24, or believe he paid six hundred shekels of gold, as stated in the first book of Chronicles xxi., 25.

I could believe Noah took clean beasts into the ark by sevens, as stated in Genesis vii., 2, or believe he took only two, as stated in Genesis vii., 8, 9.

I could believe that God had never been seen, as stated in John i., 10, or believe that more than seventy persons had seen him, as stated in Exodus xxiv., 9, 10.

I could believe Solomon had forty thousand stalls for horses, as stated in the first book of Kings iv., 26, or believe he had only four thousand, as stated in the second book of Chronicles xviii., 3, 4.

I could believe Judas repented and took back the pieces of silver, and that the priests bought the potter's field with the money, as stated in the book of Matthew xxvii., 5, 6, 7, or believe that Judas did nothing of the kind but bought a field for himself, as stated in Acts i., 18.

I could believe Abaziah began to reign when twenty-two years old, as stated in the second book of Kings viii., 26, or believe he did not begin to reign 'till he was forty-two years old, as stated in the second book of Chronicles xxii., 2.

I could believe the son would be punished for the acts of his father, as stated in Exodus xx., 5, or believe he would not, as stated in Ezekiel xviii., 20.

All Christians can here take their choice which of the above statements they believe; surely they are not expected to believe all of them.

I need scarcely say these advantages were unknown to me during the whole time I was a Christian. Why the clergy do not make these advantages known to their lambs is best known to themselves. For I will venture to say that no other system of religion possesses such advantages; and although I must have heard in the days that I was a Christian not less than from fifteen hundred to two thousand sermons preached, yet I have not the least recollection of ever hearing either a clergyman or a bishop point out any of these advantages which I have mentioned; namely, that if a Christian does not choose to believe what is stated in one part of the Bible, he can

believe what is stated in some other part. As it is only when he tries to believe both statements that he finds himself in trouble.

We are told in the first book of Chronicles xxi., 1, that the devil provoked King David to number Israel; while in the second book of Samuel xxiv., 1, we are told it was the Lord.

But what is the use of pointing out these absurd contradictions when the clergy have told us so often that they are not contradictions?

They are only "seemingly contradictions," or "apparent discrepancies," say the clergy. Now, if it is as these rev. gentlemen say, why then the difference between the Devil and the Lord is only apparent.

In Genesis iii., 20, we are told, "and Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living." What! the mother of all living; that is strange, since we are told in Genesis ii., 22, that Eve was the last that was made. In fact it was only when the Lord discovered that it was not good for Adam to be alone that she was thought of, and was then only turned out as a second-hand article. Now if Eve was the mother of all living as Adam said she was, of course she *was* the mother of all living, or Adam would not have said she was, why then it follows as a matter of course that she was Adam's mother. There is nothing plainer in all the Bible; if Eve was the mother of all living, she must have been the mother of Adam, and consequently Adam had his mother for his wife. But the strangest part of this affair is that Adam's mother was younger than himself, since she was not made till it was found out that a bachelor's life did not suit Adam's constitution.

ABSURD THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS.

Now, as some persons may object to my way of reading the Bible, I will for their benefit, give a sample of the way in which theologians read it.

In the seventh chapter of Solomon's song and fourth verse, we find these words: "Thy neck is as a tower of ivory; thine eyes like the fish-pools in Heshbon, by the gate of Bathrabbim; thy nose is as the tower of Lebanon which looketh towards Damascus."

Now the first question is, what does the above quotation tell us? So far as I am able to judge, without having subscribed to the thirty-nine articles, we are told neither more nor less than some one (Solomon if you like) compared some lady's neck to a tower of ivory, her eyes to fish-pools, and her nose to the tower of Lebanon. But theologians who first looked through a few thousands a year, say the lady's nose is typical of the genius, sagacity and learning of the church's most famous theologians. Who ever would have thought it? Why there is not as much as the shadow of a hint in the whole chapter that can in any way apply to a theologian; no, not if he had the sagacity of all the dogs in Constantinople.

Had some infidel given this signification to the lady's nose, all the clergy of Christendom would have taken it as a slur thrown at themselves.

In the seventh chapter of Solomon's song, and second verse we find these words, "Thy navel is like a round goblet, which wanteth not liquor." This part of the lady which is compared to a round goblet, "signifies the cup in the Lord's supper," say these rev. gentlemen.

Now the power of scent which the theologians must be endowed with to have enabled them to sniff up the scent which led to the discovery of this sublime signification, must be far more acute than that possessed by all the hounds and dogs in the world.

In the same verse mentioned above we find these words,—"Thy belly is like a heap of wheat set about with lilies." Now theologians inform us upon their word and honour that the lady's belly signifies; "The rejection by Protestantism of purgatory, of masses for the dead, of the merit of works." Comment on this would be worse than useless!

In the seventh chapter of Solomon's Song and third verse we find these words: "Thy two breasts are like two young roes that are twins." The Church's most famous theologians say the lady's breasts "signify the two chief agencies for the promotion of holiness, the evangelical word, and the blessed sacrament." Why did they not tell us the lady's breasts were typical that some women would have twins?

In the first chapter of Solomon's Song, and seventeenth verse, we find these words:—"The beams of our house are cedar, and our rafters of fir." Now we are told by some theologians that the beams and rafters spoken of "signify the magnificent architecture of the mansions on high." Talk about infidel works causing the people to disbelieve the Bible to be the word of God, for my part I do not believe a single person would be found in a whole country believing in a Word of God at all, if they knew what the clergy dish up for Gospel. It will be seen that theologians do not ask us to believe what the writers of the Bible state; we are only asked to believe what theologians think fit to say the writers of the Bible *did* state.

In the second chapter of Solomon's Song and twelfth verse we find these words: "And the voice of the turtle is heard in our land." The expounders of the Bible tell us that the voice of the turtle "signifies the joyous

shout of the nations at the arrival of the Messiah," though with all due respect to these expounders of the Bible, I believe the braying of an ass has just as much to do with the arrival of the Messiah as the voice of the turtle.

In the second chapter of Solomon's Song, fourth and fifth verses, we find these words: "He brought me to the banqueting house, and his banner over me was love. Stay me with flagons, comfort me with apples: for I am sick of love." The above verses inform us that a female was taken to a banqueting house, and that she asked for something to eat and drink. This, theologians tell us, "signifies the Church clamouring for the sacramental wine." In the name of Solomon I would ask what next will these gentlemen say the Bible means. Why did they not tell us it was typical of some old maid's cat clamouring for milk?

In the seventh chapter of Solomon's Song and fourth verse, we find these words: "Thy neck is as a tower of ivory, thine eyes like the fishpools in Heshbon, by the gate of Bathrabbim." Now we are told by theologians that the gate of Bathrabbim, "signifies the throat of the preacher, through which doctrine of the purest orthodoxy passes."

Now these few samples I have given of the way theologians read the Bible, show very clearly they do not believe what is stated in that book. Whether these rev. gentlemen believe in their own expoundings is more than I can say. But one thing is certain, that theologians do not believe in each others' expoundings, as no two are known to expound alike. But if any one sect of Christians had the power, they would make the rest of mankind swallow their expoundings, and no doubt by using the fagot and dungeon as a lubricator, they would succeed in forcing down the throats of their unfortunate victims some of their own madness.

A SANGUINARY CODE.

When the Church (say these reverend gentlemen) used the faggot and dungeon it mistook the letter of God's law as given to us in His blessed Word. Oh! did it? Well, now allow me to inform you that the church was carrying out God's law to the very letter when it put to death some forty thousand persons for witchcraft in England alone. One of the laws in the twenty-second chapter of Exodus given by God Himself forbids us to suffer a witch to live, and the divines who say the church was not acting according to the law as stated in the Bible are either insane or dishonest. But oh, says another divine, we are living under a new dispensation, the Bible was given to the Jews only. Now Christ Himself gives the lie direct to that assertion—Matthew v., 17: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." But it is not what Christ said or God either that these reverend gentlemen preach. This army of locusts (I mean the clergy of course), have preached and still are preaching every conceivable thing to their dupes, except what is stated in the Bible and common sense.

It is only this army of locusts that is supposed to be able to lead us where we can partake of pastures fresh and green; yes there is a great deal of green about it till the orthodox spectacles fall from one's eyes and then lo! and behold all is chaff. What can these reverend gentlemen know about the Bible any more than any one else who can read it? But as we are told by these divines that the mention of a lady's nose and the Tower of Lebanon signify their genius, sagacity, and learning, I will take for granted that they are ripe, and full of it. But of what does their learning consist? All that a divine can possibly learn in reference to his trade, is to make himself acquainted with the writings of Christian authorities, which I admit will take many years of study, as this I know from my own experience; and what is it he will then be acquainted with? He will then be acquainted with the disputes that took place between the Jews themselves, then between the Jews and Christians, and then between the Christians themselves as to which writings were the Word of God and which were not. This will form about one-half of his education, and the other half will consist of being acquainted with the mad and hellish disputes which have taken place between Christians themselves as to the meaning of these writings after they had accepted them as being the Word of God.

Now out of a catalogue of some two hundred sacred writings given in Du Pin's History of the Canon and Writers of the Old and New Testaments, I can only find 66 in my Bible. Yet we have it on the authority of the church's most famous theologians that all these writings have been taken by Christians for the Word of God; while on the other hand, every one of these writings (which include our Bible, of course), have been pronounced spurious and rejected by some Christians as not being the Word of God.

The same, for instance, as the Protestants are doing to-day—they reject some of these writings and swear they are not the Word of God; while the Roman Catholic Church accepts them and swears just as hard that they are the Word of God.

There are two classes of persons that believe the Bible to be the Word of God. One class believes it because it is paid for doing so, the other class believes it because it knows no better.

Contradictions.

I am well aware the clergy say the above are not contradictions. I am just as well aware that when they say so they do not speak the truth.

"The book of Matthew gives c. 1, v. 6, a Genealogy by name from David, up, through Joseph, the husband of Mary, to Christ, and makes there to be twenty-eight generations. The book of Luke gives also a Genealogy by name from Christ, through Joseph, the husband of Mary, down to David, and makes there to be forty-three generations, besides which, there are only the two names of David and Joseph that are alike in the two lists. I here insert both Genealogical lists and for the sake of perspicuity and comparison have placed them both in the same direction that is from Joseph down to David."

MADE A FOOL OF!

In the days when I was a Christian, I was like a man I once saw under the influence of mesmerism,—who was given a potato and told it was an apple. The person began to eat the potato believing it to be an apple. But as soon as he had the use of his reason, to his disgust he found that he had been made a fool of. That was my case exactly. I was told the Bible was the unerring word of an all wise and loving God. It was represented to me that just as sure as a ship without ballast would be swampt in the ocean; so would mankind be swampt in his own wickedness without the Bible. I was told the Bible contained all that it was necessary for man to know. I was told to let the Bible be my guide. I was told the Bible was the fountain whence all good sprang, and without the Bible there would be no good in the world. Good gracious me! What a dolt I must have been not to have seen (reading the Bible every day) that the book was exactly the contrary; and I feel the blush of shame upon my poor old wrinkled brow when I think of the state of lunacy I must have been in at the time not to have seen the lie.

BIBLE DECENCIES.

I can only give the chapter and verse of the indecent parts of the Bible; the matter itself not being fit for the pages of this little book.

IT WAS ALL A DELUSION!

When I was a Christian, I was under the delusion that my religion was of divine origin, and that all other forms of religion were nothing but a mass of superstitious mummery. I was fool enough to believe that a God had given me a religion; while nine-tenths of mankind had none. I was simple enough to believe I had the word of a God for ray guide, while nine-tenths of the world were being led by impostors (such as Mahomet for instance who the Christians say was an impostor). I do not remember how I reconciled that, as my Bible told me that God was no respecter of persons.

Now having had the use of my reason ever since the Holy Ghost went out of me; for of course I could not have the use of both at the same time, since it is well-known (or ought to be by this time), that reason is sudden death to the Holy Ghost; as he, she, or it, has no more chance to live where there is reason than moschettos have where there is frost.

Yes, I have found out since the Holy Ghost left me, that instead of my religion being made of heavenly materials, as I was given to understand, that it was made up from the rags of other religious systems. But my being under the influence of the Holy Ghost at the time, and it being presented to me in the shape of hash, why, as a matter of course, the pepper and salt and the Holy Ghost disguised the fraud. I was like poor Joseph—sold.

CHRISTIANITY AND PAGANISM ONE AND THE SAME.

Now to any person not under the influence of the Holy Ghost, it must appear very strange that buildings erected by the Pagans to perform their superstitious mummery in, should be the very identical kind of buildings required by the Christians in which to carry out their religion, and which they say was ordained by God Himself.

One would think that a religion established by an Almighty God! would be something so different from the superstitious mummery of that poor animal, man, that no part of one would fit into the other. Yet we find the Christian religion sitting in the Pagan Temples as comfortably as the child sits in its mother's lap. As some of the finest Christian Churches were once Pagan Temples.

In the thirtieth chapter of Exodus Mr. Moses tells us that, the Lord instructed him how to build an altar, how to make incense, and in what way it was to be used. What! the Lord came all the way from heaven, did he? to tell Moses how to build an altar and make incense?—why the Pagan priests knew how to build altars and make incense long before Moses floated in his ark of bulrushes.

The Pagans placed vessels of holy water at the entrance of their Temples, to sprinkle themselves with. Two vessels for that purpose, one of gold, the other of silver, were given to the Temple of Apollo, at Delphi.

To-day the Christians place vessels of holy water at the entrance of their churches for the same purpose.

The Pagan priests had a sprinkling brush.

The Christian priests to-day use a sprinkling brush.

The Pagan priests flavoured their holy water with salt.

The Christian priests to-day do exactly the same.

A boy always attended on the Pagan priests at the altar, with a box containing the incense.

To-day a boy attends on the Christian priests at the altar, with a box containing the incense.

Herodotus tells us the Pagans had a yearly festival called the "lighting up of candles."

The burning of candles to-day by Christians forms no small part of their religious ceremony.

The Pagan priests preserved what they said was the rod of Romulus, with which he performed his auguries.

The Christian priests to-day pretend to show the rod of Moses, with which he performed his miracles.

The Pagans tell us that the rod of Romulus was untouched by the flames when the Temple was burnt.

The Christians to-day believe the same in reference to the image of our Saviour in St. John Lateran, over which the flames had no power though the church itself has been twice destroyed by fire.

Millions of Christians to-day believe that the image of the virgin reprimanded Gregory the Great for passing her too carelessly, and that a crucifix spoke to St. Bridgith, and that another Madonna spoke to the sexton in commendation of the piety of one of her votaries.

The Pagans tell us their image of Fortune spoke twice in praise of those matrons who had dedicated a temple to her.

Millions of Christians to-day believe the image of our Saviour, which for some time before the sacking of Rome wept so heartily that the good fathers of the monastery were all employed in wiping its face with cotton.

The Pagans declare that the statue of Apollo wept for three days and nights successively.

Millions of Christians to-day believe that one of their images bled very plentifully from a blow given it by a blasphemer.

Now that is nothing more than what was said of the images in the Temple of Juno, since we are told all the images in that temple were seen to sweat blood.

The Pagans had a strong man called Hercules.

The Christians have a strong man called Samson.

Christians do not believe the stories told by the Pagans about Hercules, neither do I believe the stories told by the Christians about Samson, and I defy all the bishops in Christendom to prove that the Christians are not just as deserving of damnation for not believing the stories told about Hercules as I am for not believing the stories told about Samson.

What difference can it make to a story whether told by a Pagan or a Christian? Is not a Pagan image just as likely to break a blood-vessel as a Christian image?

WHO WAS MOSES?

"Bacchus was found on the waters in an ark." (Lempriere's Classical Dictionary.)

"Moses was found on the waters in an ark." (Exodus xxii.)

"Bacchus was called Moses, because he was drawn up from the waters." (Hymn of Orpheus.)

"Moses was called by that name for the same reason." (Exodus ii. 10.)

"Bacchus was styled the lawgiver." (Orphic Hymn.)

"Moses is styled the lawgiver." (Exodus xiv. 12.)

"Bacchus had two mothers, his own and Thyos his nurse." (Pomey, p. 71.)

Moses had two mothers, his own and Pharaoh's daughter" (Exodus ii. 10.)

"Bacchus was represented with horns,"
With golden horns, supremely bright,
You darted round the bending light."

—(Hor. Ode to Bacchus, Francis Tran., p. 223.)

"Moses is said to be double horned; and he knew not that his face was horned from the conversation of the Lord." (Douay version, Exodus xxxiv., 29.) To which the following foot-note is appended:—"Horned, that is, shining, and sending rays of light like horns."

"Bacchus had snakes sacrificed to him." (Hor. Ode.)

"Moses erected the serpent in the wilderness." (Num. xxi., 9)

"Bacchus had Anubis, the dog star for a companion." (See the Abbe Pluche, vol. 1, p. 23).

"Moses had Caleb for a companion, which, in Hebrew, signifies dog. Caleb was the son of Jephunneh, which signifies beholding, or spying. Caleb was sent to spy out the land, like Anubis the dog-star, who is also called the spyer."

"Bacchus dried up the rivers Orontes and Hydaspes, and passed through them dryshod, as Moses passed through the red sea." (Non. in Diom. i., 23, 35.)

"Bacchus struck water out of the rock with his rod." (Eurip. in Bacchus, Hor. Ode).

"Moses struck water out of the rock." (Exodus xvii., 6.)

"Bacchus' rod was turned into a dragon." (Non. Bach, in can. i., 23, 25, 45.)

"Moses turned his rod into a serpent." (Exodus vii., 10.)

"Bacchus covered the Indians with darkness." (Non. vos Bach.)

"Moses covered the Egyptians with darkness."

"Bacchus is called Osaraph, which means the valiant," (Plutarch, Isis, and Osiris).

"Moses is called Arsaph." (Josephus i., 26.)

"Bacchus married Zipporah, a name of Venus, and one of seven planets."

"Moses married Zipporah, one of seven daughters."

"Bacchus is called Jehovah Nisi." (Boyce on the Gods, p. 136.)

"Moses raised an altar to Jehovah Nisi." (Exodus xvii., 15.)

"Bacchus received his education on Mount Nisi, hence his name Dio Nisi, *i.e.*, God Nisi," (Ross's Mystagogus, p. 40.) "By transposing one letter, Nisi becomes Sini, the mountain upon which Moses received his instructions from Jehovah."

"Bacchus, during the giants' war, distinguished himself greatly by his valour in the form of a lion." (Boyce on the Gods.)

"Moses led an army against the Anakim, which signifies giants in Hebrew."

"Bacchus was sent to destroy a sinful nation." (Hor. Ode.)

"Moses was sent to destroy an idolatrous nation."

Christian writers are anxious to prove that the story of Bacchus is copied from that of Moses; but Bacchus and his exploits were known to all the nations of antiquity, and not one of their poets or historians has said anything of Moses.

"Cadmus is said to have been the father of Semele, the mother of Bacchus."

Cadmus is represented as a giant, and Nonnus says that he planted in Greece a colony of giants—hence the Cadmians were styled Anakis and Anaktos, and the temple of their Gods Anaktoria. These terms were imported from Egypt and Canaan, see Numbers xiii., 28.

By turning to the Bible we find that the father of Semele is mentioned in Genesis xv., 19, from a district called after him in the time of Abraham, consequently we have another proof of the antiquity of the story of Bacchus 400 years, according to bible chronology before the time of Moses. The Jesuit Pomey, who composed a work on the history of the heathen gods for the instruction of the Dauphin of France, informs us, (we quote the translation of this work by the Rev. A. Took, Head-master of the Charter House, p. 21), where he says: Mount Harmon (mentioned in Deut. xv., 29) was called after the wife of Cadmus and mother to Semele, the mother of Bacchus, and so it came to pass that the wife of Cadmus had the name of Hermione, from the same mountain. Cadmus is also alluded to in the 19th verse, where the Kadmonites are mentioned: "In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying, unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river Euphrates unto the river of Egypt, the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites," &c. Here then we have Cadmus on the stage of existence prior to the days of Abraham, inasmuch as there was a tribe of people called after him.

"The history of the Egyptian God Bacchus is miraculous; the history of the Jew Moses is miraculous: therefore they are not within the bounds of probability."

Paine said regarding miracles: "Nature has changed her course, or men have told lies." Quoted from "Moses and Bacchus" by Myles McSweeney

Bishop Faustus says,—*"It is an undoubted fact, that the New Testament was not written by Christ himself, nor by his apostles, but a long while after their time, by some unknown persons, who lest they should not be credited when they wrote of affairs they were little acquainted with, affixed to their works the names of apostles, or of such as were supposed to have been their companions, and then said that they were written according to them."*

"It was in Egypt," says the great ecclesiastical historian, Mosheim, that the morose discipline of Asceticism took its rise; and it is observable, that that country has in all times, as it were by an immutable law or disposition of nature, abounded with persons of a melancholy complexion, and produced, in proportion to its extent, more gloomy spirits than any other parts of the world. It was here that the Essenes dwelt principally, *long before the coming of Christ.*"

The Essenes, in addition to their monopoly of the art of healing, professed themselves to be Eclectics. Lactantius, says—That Christianity itself *was the Eclectic Philosophy* inasmuch as that "if there had been any one to have collected the truth that was scattered and diffused among the various sects of philosophers and divines into one, and to have reduced it into a system, there would indeed be no difference between him and a Christian." Quoted from the Rev. Robert Taylor's "Diegesis."

Most of the best things which Jesus taught were borrowed from Heathen Theology.

Confucius 500 years before the Christian era—taught,—Do unto another what thou would he should do unto you; and do not unto another what you would not should be done unto you. Thou only needest this law alone; it is the foundation and principle of all the rest." Jesus taught,—*"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets."* Ah, so it turns out that this much vaunted piece of Christianity, which Christians do so love to brag about, was taught by a Chinaman at least 500 years before the Jew called Jesus was heard of. The precept (perhaps) is as lofty a one as was ever taught. But in the name of truth, why call it the word of God when we know it to be the words of a Chinaman?

Confucius says—"Desire not the death of thine enemy; thou wouldest desire it in vain; his life is in the hands of heaven, but never revenge injuries."

Jesus says,—*"Love your enemies, bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you."* The similarity is very striking.

The model prayer, called the *Lord's Prayer*, with which Jesus furnished His followers, He evidently borrowed from Jewish literature. The few instances of verbal differences between it and the following translation of a part of the Jewish Euchologues, made by a *reverend and pious Christian*, may be the result of a little alteration effected by time, either in the Christian or Jewish prayer, or even in both; or may have arisen either from Jesus's imperfect recollection of the Jewish prayer, or from the imperfect manner in which His repetition of it was reported by the evangelists. The principal difference, however, is caused by Jesus's omission of several words found in the Jewish prayer, which would indicate that he knew it but imperfectly. But even now, at this distant time, when each has undergone a translation from a dead language, they are so much alike that they furnish ample internal evidence of their identity. The Jewish prayer runs thus: "Our Father, which art in heaven, be gracious to us O Lord, our God; and hallowed be Thy name, and let the remembrance of Thy name be glorified in heaven above, and upon earth here below. Let Thy kingdom reign over us, now and for ever. The holy men of old said, remit and forgive unto all men whatsoever they have done against me, and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil thing. For Thine is the kingdom, and Thou shall reign in glory, for ever and for evermore." (The works of the Rev. John Gregorie, p. 168. Lond. 1685.)

"Well might Basnage (Hist, des Juifs, tom. 6 p. 374) say that the Jews had an ancient prayer called the Kadish, precisely like Jesus's prayer; and Wetstain remark that it is a curious fact that the Lord's Prayer may be reconstructed almost verbatim out of the Talmud."

"From Jewish lore also we find that Jesus borrowed the absurd doctrine—"Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on," (Matthew vi., 25-34.) Indeed the whole of Jesus's "Sermon on the Mount" is a collection of aphorisms taught by different nations long before his time."

The doctrine of being "born again," which Jesus endeavoured to teach to Nicodemus (John iii., 1-13), and which modern Christians call regeneration, is clearly borrowed from the heathens. It is a very prominent doctrine in the religion of the Brahmins, and pervades the Institutes of Menu, of which their learned and pious translator, Sir William Jones, says, in his preface to them, that they are "really one of the oldest compositions existing," and fixes their date "1580 years before the birth of our Saviour," making them "older than the five books of Moses," while the Brahmins themselves make them many thousands of years older.

On the subject of the second birth Jesus says:—"Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God,"—"Except a man be born of water, and of the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again."

The same doctrine is taught by Chrishna, in his Dialogue with Arjoon, in the Bhagvat-Geeta, p. 67,—a portion of the sacred books of the Indians, translated from the Sanscrit by Mr. Charles Wilkins, and published in 1785.

The same doctrine was taught by Pythagoras, more than 500 years before the Christian era, and by all ancient moralists who believed in transmigration; and there is little doubt that it was this transmigration which

Jesus meant in speaking of being *born again or anew*:—There is in the Indian Divine Book—the Bhagat—Geeta, already mentioned, a great number of expressions identical with phrases found in the Gospels attributed to Jesus. For instance, the incarnate God, Chrishna, who is said to have been on earth some thousands of years before the Christian era—who was the son of Devaci, born of a virgin—whose birth was concealed through fear of the tyrant Cansa, to whom it had been prophesied that a child, about this time, would be born, and would destroy his family—who during the time he was hidden from Cansa, when he had ordered all new-born male children to be massacred, was miraculously preserved—who raised many from the dead—who descended into hell—who was immaculately holy—who was most meek and lowly—who preached the most sublime morality—and who is represented as the creator of all, the beginning and the end—but who was despised in human form.

The Brahmin priests had a crook or staff, like Elisha, and like our bishops, wore the hides of beasts, girdles of leather, and mantles, like Elijah and John the Baptist, shaved their heads like the Nazarenes and the tonsured Christian priests, were to have no land like the Levites, and Christian priests begged like the mendicant Christian monks, and were not to be put to death for any crime, nor to pay toll, thus having the Christian "Benefit of clergy." This law also prescribed sacrifices and adorations; allowed plurality of wives; permitted a man to raise seed for his deceased brother; pronounced hogs and animals with uncloven feet unclean; prescribed lunar days; sacrifices at new moons; water purifications, fasts and feasts; all of which the Jews imitated. It had a heaven and a hell; taught the doctrine of a future state and a resurrection; and had a third heaven like the Apostle Paul. It taught that a man's sins would visit his posterity, like the Hebrew scriptures. It is most singular that the Jews, who boasted that they had the Deity for their King and lawgiver, had no regulations but what other nations had practised many hundreds, if not thousands, of years before they had any existence as a nation." ("The Prophet of Nazareth," by Evan Powell Meredith.)

There is scarcely a breath of what passes for Christianity that is not of Pagan origin. Yes, even to saying grace before and after meals.

The first article of the Church of England, is taken from the Hindoo Bible:—In the sixth volume, page 422, of the works of Sir William Jones, will be found the following quotation:—

"*Veda*, and 1st article of our church."

"There is one living and true God, everlasting without body, parts or passion, of infinite power and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, both visible, &c., &c."

Now it will be seen from the above, that the very first thing the clergy swear they believe in, when entering into holy orders, is Paganism.

Yet these very men would, if they had the power, send the first man to gaol who dares to hint that their so-called divine religion is not of divine origin.

These rev. gentlemen are either ignorant as to where their religion came from, or they are dishonest.

But in the name of truth I would ask what do these rev. gentlemen mean by taking their oath that they believe, and will teach that God is without body, or parts; when at the same time they must know that the Lord told Mr. Moses that he might see his back parts, "and I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts?" Exodus xxxiii., 23.

Now were I to admit that the Bible is the Word of God, would that help the case any? No. The book gives an account of shedding of so much blood, that it would be happiness to know, the slaughtering mentioned had never taken place.

The battles fought (according to the Bible) by the God of the Jews, whom they carried about in a box, make all modern battles appear nothing more than slight skirmishes.

We are told in the sixth chapter of Genesis, the sons of God took the fair daughters of men for wives. I suppose there is nothing strange for women to have young Gods for husbands? But, by the way, if I remember right, when I was a christian I was taught that Jesus was God's only begotten son.

The seventh chapter tells us, that every living substance was destroyed except Noah and his family. This is bad news, and the less one reads about a drowning world the better he will sleep. When I was a christian, I thought the people deserved to be drowned, and saw nothing cruel or unjust about it. Now it appears to me the most horrible affair I ever heard of.

What in the name of common-sense could smiling babies, and laughing children have done that it was necessary to drown them?

How absurd and contradictory it is to believe that a good God would go on, making human beings for 1656 years; according to the Hebrew text—or 1307 years according to the Samaritan text;—or 2242, according to the Septuagint text; knowing all the while that He would drown them.

Had the writers of this story told us that ten thousand devils had drowned the world, that would have been sufficiently absurd. But much less so than the way it is now told.

Now God having washed out everything that was bad, Noah had a clean start. But almost the first thing he

did was to get drunk, "and was uncovered within his tent." On waking up he learned that one of his sons had seen him in this beastly state, and instead of being ashamed of himself he cursed his son.

It is fortunate for Noah that he is not living at the present time, as he would soon find himself in the lock-up. But absurd as this story may be about Noah it is a thousand times more so to call it the Word of God.

It was 292 years, according to the Hebrew text from the Deluge to the birth of Abraham, 942 according to the Samaritan text, and 1072 according to the Septuagint text. But what signifies a blunder of a few hundreds of years to those who have faith?

The only news we get between the Deluge and the birth of Abraham (except being told how old Mr. Peleg, and a number of other celebrities were at the time their first sons were born), is that the people commenced to build a tower, whose top was to reach unto heaven. There is no doubt in my mind, but a man would get to heaven just as soon by building a tower as any other way.

Absurd Repetitions.

According to this so-called divine revelation Abraham had two concubines, Jacob had two concubines.

Abraham had two favourite sons, Jacob had two favourite sons.

Abraham leaves the land of his nativity, Jacob leaves the land of his nativity.

Abraham leaves Haran, Jacob leaves Haran.

Abraham removes from Sichem, Jacob goes up from Sichem.

Abraham journeyed southward, Jacob moved southward.

Abraham goes into Egypt, Jacob goes into Egypt.

Jacob marries his cousin, Isaac marries his cousin.

Jacob had two favourite sons, Isaac had two favourite sons.

Jacob blesses his younger son, Isaac blesses his youngest son.

Jacob and Esau were not able to dwell together, Isaac and Abimelech were not able to dwell together.

Sarah is extremely beautiful, Rebecca is extremely beautiful, and Rachel is extremely beautiful.

Sarah is greatly loved by her husband, Rebecca is greatly loved by her husband, Rachel is greatly loved by her husband.

Sarah is barren, Rebecca is barren, Rachel is barren.

Sarah obtains a son in her old age, through the merits and prayers of her husband.

Rebecca obtains a son after twenty years' barrenness, through the merits and prayers of her husband.

Rachael obtains a son, after fourteen years' barrenness, through her own and her husband's prayers.

Sarah, seeing herself childless, said to Abraham—"I pray you go in unto my maid."

Rachel, seeing herself childless, said to Jacob—"Behold! my maid, Bilhah; go in unto her."

Abraham said of his wife, "She is my sister." Abimelech reproves Abraham for his duplicity in saying that Sarah was not his wife.

Isaac said of his wife, "She is my sister." Abimelech reproves Isaac for his duplicity in saying that Rebecca was not his wife.

"Abraham excuses himself by saying that he feared the men of the place would slay him on account of his wife,—Sarah was at the time an old woman of 90!"

"Isaac excuses himself by saying that he feared the men of the place would slay him on account of his wife,—Rebecca at that time was upwards of 70!" (Foundation of Christianity by G. B. Jackson, A.B.)

The above repetitions might be prolonged *ad infinitum*.—As the book of Genesis consists of little else than repetitions, more or less modified, of a few primary anecdotes.

But what benefit can it be to me or any one else, to know that Abraham and Isaac told lies about their wives? and the rest of the hard old stories told in this so-called Word of God, about these gentlemen?

A GROSS ERROR.

Christians not only consider all those who disbelieve the Bible to be the Word of God, bad and wicked, but are under the impression that it is in consequence of those persons being wicked that they doubt. A greater mistake was never made.

Suppose I do not believe the worthless matter stated in the the fourteenth chapter of Judges, headed "Samson's riddle," is it because I am wicked? No. It is because I cannot believe that an allwise and good God had any more to do with "Samson's riddle" than he has with the riddles of school-boys.

Again we are told,—"*Then went Samson to Gaza, and saw there an harlot; and went in unto her, and Samson lay till midnight, and arose at midnight, and took the doors of the gate of the city, and the two posts, and went away with them, bar and all*"

Now what have I to do with Samson, the harlot, or the gateposts either? Oh, by the way, I forgot the "bar."
The clergy have led their dupes to believe that all morality is drawn from the Bible:—Hence their poor victims conclude that every man and woman who does not believe in the Bible must be immoral. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I am well aware that a few moral precepts are recorded in the New Testament, said to have been uttered by Jesus. But they had been taught long before his time.

Were there more of the moral precepts to be found in the Gospels, which had been taught by the Pagans long before the Christian era, and less of the absurd sayings of Jesus, the New Testament would be a more valuable book.

Jesus says, "Take therefore no thought for the morrow." "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body what ye shall put on."

Now what could be more absurd? or what could have a more demoralising tendency than the above precept?

Again Jesus says, "Resist not evil." "But whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

Commentators try to persuade us that all that is to be understood by "resist not evil," revenge not evil by a malicious retaliation.

If there was nothing wrong, there would be nothing for commentators to amend.

If Jesus said one thing and meant something else, as these commentators make out that he did, then I trust if Jesus comes again to preach, that he will say what he does mean, so that Christians may not have to *bum and dungeon* each other in order to get at the meaning of what he might happen to say.

A Few Questions and Answers.

Why do you believe in the existence of a Creator? There must have been a Creator to have created the world;

The word world is intended to mean all existence and all phenomena.

that is self-evident. But what I wish to get at is, Why do you believe in the existence of a Creator?

The world having been created is positive proof of the existence of a Creator, hence my belief.

Your belief is really no belief at all. Your taking for granted the world was created leaves you no choice. For instance, it is impossible for me to believe in a creator, as I do not believe in creation. While on the other hand, it is just as impossible for you to doubt the existence of one so long as you believe in creation.

You say you do not believe in creation. Then you must believe the world came by chance or that it created itself.

I do not believe in any such ridiculous nonsense as things coming by chance or making themselves.

Then how do you think the world came?

I do not think it came at all. I believe the world always existed. Never began to be, but always was.

It is impossible the world with all its wonders could have existed unless it had been created.

Which would be the most wonderful a created world, or the creator of that world?

There can be no doubt, but the creator would be the most wonderful.

If so, there is greater reason to say he could not have existed unless he had been created, than to say the world could not have existed, unless it had been created.

It does not follow. The creator is self-existent.

So would anything else that had always existed. It is absurd to say that that which you believe has always existed, is self-existent. As no reason or cause can be given for the existence of that which always existed, all reasons and causes would come too late.

That which was always in existence did not and could not exist, in consequence of anything, and that which did not exist in consequence of anything, could not exist for any purpose.

There is a class of men (I will not mention their profession) who do not hesitate to pronounce every person a fool, who believes the world always existed, when, at the same time, they themselves believe that something far more wonderful always existed. They act like a person who after saying that one cubic foot cannot contain two cubic feet of space; would swear that it could contain three.

Is there any degree between something and nothing? No. Then the world could not have come into existence by degrees, and to come into existence without occupying time, it would have to be something and nothing at the same time.

It is more reasonable to believe the world always existed than to imagine the existence of some imaginable something and then to imagine that that imaginable something created the world out of nothing.

As man cannot conceive non-existence, it is impossible for him to conceive the world as being non-existent. Hence the world's existence is one reason for believing it has always existed, and as we cannot conceive the world as being non-existent, is a very good reason for believing it has always existed.

No matter how difficult it may be to imagine the world without a beginning, it will be found still more so to imagine a time when the world began.

It is the same as to space, as difficult as it may be to imagine space without end, it will be found more difficult to imagine an end to space.

The same as to time, if it is difficult to imagine time without a beginning, it will be found far more so to imagine a time, when time began.

There is an old Dutch argument known at the present day as Paley's design argument, which I admit is quite argument enough for those who allow, and in some cases pay others to think for them. But the position of those who believe in a designer, is identical with those who believe in a creator.

Those who take for granted that the world was created, are thereby compelled to believe in a creator—as creation implies a creator. Just so with those who take for granted that the world exhibits marks of design, are in like manner compelled to believe in a designer.

So it will be seen the creator a man believes in is of his own creating. Also the designer a man believes in is of his own designing.

The designer of the world always makes his appearance where the knowledge of man ends.
graphic border

H. R. Woods and Co., Printers, 13 Bridge-street, Sydney.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST

"Orangeism and its Slanderers:"

A Lecture

Delivered at the Request of Members of the Orange Institution of New South Wales,

By the Rev. Dr. M'Gibbon,

In the Masonic Hall, York St., Sydney,

On Monday, 19th June, 1871.

Sydney: PUBLISHED AT THE "PROTESTANT STANDARD" OFFICE, 377 PITT STREET, SYDNEY. 1871.

Second Edition.

THE Author is gratified that the following Lecture has been so well received. When delivered in the Masonic Hall, there was a large audience, consisting of many of the most respectable of the citizens of Sydney. A request was immediately made that it should be published, and one gentleman gave Five Pounds towards the expenses. Of the first edition 1500 were printed, and that issue having been sold out, a second is now offered to the public without alteration. The Author has only further to remark that, while the Romish organ in Sydney, and two "Accommodating Protestants" have nibbled at some of the statements, no reply has appeared to the lecture.

Hauraki Orange Lodge no. 6

Orangeism and its Slanderers.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—I shall have to draw a little on your patience and attention while dealing with the subject now before us. All of us, I believe, will admit its importance; and if we are able to set out the truth concerning the Institution in whose welfare we are interested, our time this evening will not be unprofitably spent, and my labor in preparing this lecture for the public will be amply rewarded.

Let us clearly understand, then, what I have to do. I propose to discourse to you on "Orangeism and its Slanderers." I have to deal with a system, and with those who oppose it. I shall look at its origin and principles—its aims and spirit, and then consider the objections of those who either oppose it, or avow that they are its enemies. There are four things then, which we shall regard as the heads of the following remarks:—*First*, the origin of this system; *secondly*, its principles; *thirdly*, the objections to it; and, *fourthly*, we shall conclude with an appeal to all Orangemen who wish well to their Institution, who love it, who honor it, who are truly imbued with its spirit, who heartily concur in its aim, and who wish to commend it to the outside public, as to what is their duty in their special circumstances.

To proceed, then, we begin with the origin of "Orangeism." In order to trace out this we must go back to the England of 1688. At that time there was a King upon the throne whose name is held, by all true-hearted

Britons, in perpetual abhorrence. He was James II. It is almost enough to say of this man that he was "one of the Stuarts," and *perhaps the worst of the detestable line*. But there is so much to be said of him, that even an *outline* of his baseness, intrigues, and unfaithful undoings of the Constitution which he had sworn to uphold and protect, would fill many volumes. When as yet he was only the Duke of York, and his brother Charles was on the throne, England saw what was the struggle which was approaching. The "Exclusion Bill," by which the Commons sought, in a desperate manner, to avoid the miseries most surely to be anticipated from the ascent of a Romish King to the throne, was the proof how the people of England were preparing for the struggle. The religion of Charles was the worthless profession of a man whose highest virtue was *hypocrisy*. His morality was so low that his profession of *any* religion at all was a reproach rather than an honor; and his Court and his policy were alike any dishonor to any church which would claim him as a member. Fast and loose he played with everything. A Papist at heart, he professed to be a Protestant *only to wear the crown*; and up to the last *and especially at the last*, he revealed the hollowness and falseness of his character. You all know the scandalous circumstances death-bed scene of this nefarious hypocrite: how, on the night before the fatal stroke—it was a Sunday night—he sat in his palace toying with his three titled mistresses, while the galleries were crowded with gamblers and black-legs; how, the next day, while he lay on his bed, a dying man, his favorite mistress hung over him with the fondness and familiarity of a wife; how, when the Protestant Bishops urged him to repentance and preparation for his end, the King said nothing how, when they offered him the sacrament, in testimony that he died in the communion of the Protestant Church, the King refused; how, on the suggestion of his titled concubine, a Romish priest was sent for, to reconcile the King to the Romish Church; how James, who was just about to succeed to the throne, secretly admitted the priest that the King might be shriven and made safe for purgatory; and how, thus, when the nation of England had been mocked and deceived, the so-called "Head of the Protestant Church," and defender of the liberties of a Protestant people betrayed his country, and went down to the grave with a lie in his right hand! You know all this; and such flagrant immorality, and treacherous subserviency to the will of a Church which is the natural enemy of all England's liberties, were enough to rouse every patriotic heart throughout the kingdom, and join heart to heart for the coming struggle.

Charles died, and James immediately was proclaimed the King. The suddenness of the event gave James the advantage of getting to the throne without being hampered by those special securities for the civil and religious liberties of the kingdom, about which the Commons had so long been anxious. Within a quarter of an hour after his brother's decease, James, as King, presided at a meeting of the Privy Council. He was now a professed Papist; had been a Papist for several years; and had only a few days ago assisted, in the most scandalous manner, with a concubine and a priest, to make his brother, the dying King, a Papist too. Yet, when he now was at the head of affairs—when the summit of his ambition had now been reached—when all dangers as to his succession were now passed—he pretended so well to be fair and faithful, that he deceived the councillors who heard his first words and promises *as King*; for, while he promised to "maintain the established Government, both in Church and State; to defend the laws and Church of England; and to support the just liberties of all in the kingdom," not very long after he attempted to explain his promises away, and to apologise for his language as having been used "without due consideration!"

A reign thus commenced—commenced in falsehood and deceit—commenced as if some Jesuit priest had suggested the course—was not long in yielding some of its legitimate fruit. Feeling that he had triumphed over those who had sought his exclusion from the throne because of his religion—feeling that he had now the power to crush his enemies—he no longer observed the modesty and reserve with which he had practised his Romish worship; and, therefore, while, *as a Prince*, he had had his private chapel, where he performed his adorations out of the sight of men, he now, *as a King* and as the head of the Protestant Church of England, went in state to his Romish oratory, threw open its doors to invite the attention of visitors to the palace, and required his ministers to worship with him! Not only this, but, in an ostentatious manner, James resolved on making "Popery" the religion of the court. When Lent came he had a pulpit erected in one of the chief rooms of the palace, where Popish divines preached their sermons about holy fasting; and then, when Passion week came. James did defiance to all the kingdom, and publicly made false his promises to "maintain the established religion," by going in all the grandeur and pomp of royalty to *hear mass* from a priest, just as his predecessors had gone to Protestant services! And not only this: the designs of James were soon made apparent in another most convincing proof of his duplicity; for, in view of the ceremony of his coronation, he so altered and abridged the usual ritual that his plan to release himself, at some future time from troublesome obligations, could scarcely be doubted by a watchful people; for example, the Communion service was not read at the ceremony; nor was a copy of the bible presented to him, with the usual exhortation, that he should study it as the rule of both faith and practice, and as the source of the rights and liberties of England!

But other movements, still more significant, and of a different kind, speedily revealed to the real friends of the nation, that their fears about the succession of a Popish King were too soon to be realized. Like all tyrants and despots James had an unconquerable love of arbitrary power, and an instinctive hatred of constitutional

rule. He could not bear to be dependent upon his people. He had a horror of the discussions and inquiries and votes of the Commons. He therefore commenced, from the very outset of his reign, a violent struggle for kingly power. Basely he accepted the gold of Louis, the King of France, to help him to degrade his own Parliament and people. That his Commons should be corrupted by French money was quite acceptable to him. He wanted to have the control of the purse. He wanted to have power to raise money without the will of Parliament. He wanted to have unlimited power to dispense with the laws, that his illegal objects might be accomplished *under the protection of law*. And by dint of unbending pursuit of his scheme he attained to a marvellous degree of success. The famous, or rather infamous, Jeffries, was his right hand man; and other traitors (who are never far off when baseness is purpled and seated upon the throne) in great numbers, encouraged the king to pursue his course of ruining the laws and liberties which he had sworn to defend. His first success lay in the first election of a new House of Commons. By the most disgraceful management and corruption a House was elected which removed all anxiety from the mind of the King. He spoke of it as "*exactly the sort of Home which he would himself have appointed*" It was servile enough, indeed, at its meeting; but even that servile House could not help protesting against the King's most arbitrary will, in dispensing with the laws, violating the constitution in raising money without authority, and in setting aside those religious safeguards *which the nation had approved of* to protect the constitution of both Church and State. Even the House of Lords was more noble and manly than the House of Commons, in condemning the course which the King had followed; it was impossible, thought the patriots, to submit to such despotic power; by such encroachments the liberties of England were not secure for a day; and, therefore, in rage and disappointment, James sought his refuge in the dissolution of the Parliament.

This check to the progress of tyranny and Popery on the part of the King did not come too soon. The exuberant loyalty which had greeted him on the day of his ascension to the throne was already well nigh spent. The nation had been disposed to hope for the best. Although the dark background of the bloody reign of the Popish Mary was still quite manifest in the nation's remembrance, it was willing to hope that the Popish James would respect the oath and promises which he had given; and, therefore, while there were many who feared that the worst would happen, and that the usual curse of priests and Popery would soon be experienced in oppressions throughout the kingdom, those "fearers of evil" were not popular at first, and they were obliged to keep quietly their unpopular views. But the worst that was feared soon began to be realised. The best judges of the *future* were those who most faithfully had studied the *past*. The miserable Tories who had set themselves to worship the rising sun, when James was about to ascend the throne—the equally miserable trimmers who thought that they could be equally loyal to a Romish and a Protestant King—and the still more senseless crowd, who are always in favor of something new, and whose opinions upon questions in which principle is involved, are much like the changing of fickle wind, were found to have trusted to a broken reed; they proved their ignorance of what Popery is; and they realised their folly when they saw themselves deceived; but the real patriots were those who had judged that a Popish King *could* not be bound by oaths, and that treason and treachery were as natural to him, *in reference to everything which a Protestant nation would esteem as liberty*, as that a tiger or a lion should love the taste of blood! What was the fact? Why, that this Popish James was no sooner on the throne than he set himself deliberately to undermine and destroy the civil and religious liberties of the people. Not only did he set up the mass in the palace, and make priests and confessors his advisers and keepers; but he sent to Rome *an envoy* to make his humble submission to the Pope, and to "pave the way for the re-admission of heretical England to the Romish Church." He did this immediately after he had solemnly sworn to protect the establishment of the Protestant Church! Then he claimed to be able to raise money for the Government, independently of the will and vote of his Parliament. Then he raised an army and appointed Papists to the chief command. Then he remodelled corporations, so that they might be more subservient to his plans and purposes. Then he sought to repeal the "Habeas Corpus Act"—one of the grandest protections of our civil freedom. The Courts of Justice he corrupted or overawed, so that legal questions and criminal prosecutions might be decided in his favor. Then he suspended the *Test Act*, by which it was required that holders of important offices should be members of the Protestant Church; and this suspension was made that those important offices might be conferred upon favorites of the Romish Church. Then, in defiance of all law most expressly laid down, he appointed a Court of Ecclesiastical Commission, and put the infamous Jeffries at its head, for the trial of the clergy who might dare to show their Protestant zeal against the treason which was publicly developing; and it is one of the glories of our country, at that time, that that infamous and illegal court got something to do in the trial of Bishops and other individuals, who dared to speak out on behalf of the truth, and in defence of the *Church of Protestant England!*

And, truly, it was necessary that some should thus be loyal to God and to his truth. For it was the King's purpose, by a steady undermining of the Protestant Establishment, and by unprincipled inroads upon the civil constitution, to make himself an irresponsible King, and to re-establish the Romish Church as the Church of the Kingdom. Already he had appointed some priests of Rome to some Protestant benefices. Already he had shown

that the *path to preferment* was by apostacy to Romanism. Already he had shown that the high offices of state were the reward of zeal for the Romish religion. In Scotland, in Ireland, and in England the same policy was pursued; Protestants were dismissed and Romanists were appointed. Every position of power thus changed hands. Romanists swarmed in every direction. "A small junta of Romanists, with the King's confessor at their head, took the management of all matters upon themselves." And, in the insolence of the priests and the Popish instruments of arbitrary power, the Protestants saw, with alarm and anxiety, that their country was on the brink of total ruin, or on the eve of miseries even greater and more terrible than any through which it had ever passed!

Well now, let all these circumstances be brought clearly into your view. Let us realise the sufferings and fears of our noble forefathers, as the subjects of a traitor so base as James. They had a Church which was betrayed and mocked in its nominal and temporal Head. They had rights and liberties which were trampled under foot, *and remonstrance was the way to ensure condemnation*. The prisons were filled with the best of the people. The vilest and most insolent rose highest in place. In Scotland, the most ferocious laws were passed against liberty. For example, "whoever preached in a conventicle with a roof, or should attend, as a preacher or a hearer, a conventicle in the open air, was punished with death and confiscation of goods." Under this ferocious law thousands of the pious and noble of Scotland laid down their lives. They were hunted on mountain and moor as a sort of pastime and sport. And they were driven by the force of their sufferings, and the galling oppressions under which they groaned, to rise in bloody and fatal rebellion, in which the Earl of Argyle (the ancient head of that "Clan Campbell," now so honored by alliance with the throne of our illustrious Sovereign, Queen Victoria, was cruelly executed, with hundreds of others who had gallantly fought with him for their country and their religion. In Ireland, too, the Protestants were oppressed and goaded beyond all human endurance. It was there that James thought he could do *just as he liked*. As the majority of the people were one with him in religion, as the priests were there the rulers of a violent, ignorant, and superstitious people, he counted on being able to crush out all opposition that might come from the Protestants. Accordingly, all authority and power was transferred from the Protestants to the hands of Romanists. Protestant officers in the army were superseded by Romish officers. Protestant magistrates, judges, and councillors were dismissed or removed to make way for those who would serve the King. Protestant heads of departments were sent about their business to strengthen the cause which the King had at heart. Even common soldiers, to the number of some thousands, known to be Protestants, were dismissed the army, and thrown out almost naked to starve upon the streets. Protestants, who were known to have arms, were ordered to deliver them up on the false pretence that the action was necessary for the preservation of the peace. And then, when the Protestants were thus made helpless, they were robbed, and plundered, and insulted by the Popish mobs, who were ready for anything which would please the King; and the barbarous conspiracy of King and priests justified the fear that plans had been laid for the renewing of the massacres of a former period!

What, now, was to be thought of such a king? In four short years he had reduced every glory of Protestant England to the most desperate state. He had made Scotland a shambles of the most deserving in the land. He had prepared Ireland for the ravages of wild and murderous hordes. He had made every court in the three kingdoms corrupt. He had made the army an *enemy to the nation*, and had put traitors at the head of it. He had put his Popish heel on the neck of *that loyal Church* which had brought him to the throne, and raised the apostate Church of Rome to be virtually established. He had overawed the Universities, degraded the Bishops, and made the Dissenters his tools to accomplish his own objects. There was scarcely a law which he had not violated. There was scarcely a principle of the Constitution which he had not sacrificed. Treason against the State he had boldly perpetrated in a thousand forms. And thus the glorious country he had been called upon to rule—a country free and noble even in her wrongs—a country mighty in her patience, and still more mighty when roused from her depths—was already *manacled with Popish chains*, and lay bleeding at his feet!

There was some who saw the crisis had come. There were some whose hearts heaved with indignation that a Popish despot should thus rob them of their liberties, and hurry their Church and country to ruin. The trial of the bishops, which had stirred the country to its depths, made many of the Tories in the Church and State reconsider the doctrine of "passive resistance." Many who had rejected the "Exclusion Bill," and had made themselves officious and ridiculous *in avowing their devotion to the throne, however corrupt and however unconstitutional*, now began to feel that there were reciprocal obligations between kings and subjects, and that "extreme oppression" would *justify resistance*. The trial of the bishops, after their unlawful imprisonment, was an event which cast a wondrous light upon this interesting question. The new view spread fast through the nation. In the army, in the navy, in the court, in the Church, and among the country nobility it spread and was accepted almost as a revelation. And, *under the influence of this view*, the eyes of the nation began to turn across the sea, in the hope that from the shores of Holland a deliverer might come *who would hurl the Popish tyrant from the throne*, and avenge at once *the injured Church, and the trampled down nation!* The nation knew of one who was living there in whom the utmost confidence could be placed. He was a prince of the royal blood, and was married to the heiress apparent of the throne. His right was not diminished by the birth of a son

in the household of James, which the nation repudiated *as a trick of the Jesuits*. He was a thorough Protestant. He was the hero of a hundred battles—battles really in the interest of the faith, and battles in which he had conquered the French, the cruel murderers of thousands of Protestants. The little, thin, wiry Stadtholder of the Hague was a great warrior, and a great ruler. By his heroic spirit he had saved his own country, Holland, and by the power of his arms he had rolled back its enemies from its walls and gates *when it was reduced to almost the last extremity*. To this imperturbable, unconquerable prince, the English now began to look. They knew his character, they knew his principles; they knew his courage; and they were now convinced that if ever England was to rise from the disgrace in which she now lay—if over she was to become, what she was entitled to become, "great, glorious, and free"—if ever her laws, liberties, and institutions were to be vindicated and established—the Popish despot who was now on the throne must *at last "be excluded,"* and the sceptre must be put into the hands of the prince who was now their hope—whose name, "of blessed memory," deserves to be held, and will be held, by all honest-hearted and intelligent Britons throughout the world in everlasting remembrance—"William of Nassau, Prince of Orange."

This state of feeling existing in England was speedily made known to William in Holland. When the news came to him, "*Now or never*" he said, as he foamed his resolution. Friends, in secret, immediately took up his cause. While he himself proceeded with consummate skill, to prepare arms and forces for a descent upon England, a few patriots in London, with equal skill, prepared to give him suitable support and a national welcome. They formed the famous "Orange Confederation." They held their meetings in different places, and their *pass-words* of admission were "Orange" and "Nassau." Russell, Shrewsbury, Danby, Sidney, Compton, the Bishop of London, and a few others *constituted the little band of original Orangemen*. And on the very day when the Bishops were acquitted, after a lengthened trial, to the immense disgust of the infuriated James, and when the nation was in a ferment of holy enthusiasm for the Protestant cause, that little "lodge of loyal Orangemen" signed and despatched an invitation to William, assuring him that *if he came to English soil*, engaging to uphold the "Protestant religion," and engaging "to conserve the rights and laws and liberties of the whole people," *the throne and crown would be instantly made his by the will and vote of the whole nation*. Noble men, who thus stood in the gap! Noble men, who thus spoke for the nation! Noble men, who thus interpreted the longings and prayers of the people! Noble Orangemen, again we say, who thus struck the blow when the iron was hot, and risked their lives, their estates and their all that their country might be freed from the ignominious thralldom of a Popish traitor!

Such, then, is the undoubted beginning of the "Orange Institution." I have been thus lengthened and particular so that the exact nature and circumstances of the institution might be truly known. For, just as it had its origin in loyalty to law, loyalty to truth, loyalty to liberty, and loyalty to England, so in all its movements and spread from that day until now, unwaveringly it has sought and supported the very same objects. *The first Orange confederates were England's most faithful friends*. Not one of them sought else but England's good. And who were they who afterwards joined them? Who were they who formed sister confederacies in all the chief towns to welcome William, when it was known that he was coming? Who were they who rallied to his standard, when this was the glorious motto which it unfurled, "The Protestant religion and the liberties of England I will maintain"? Who were they who first drew up and signed the rules and principles which are unchangeably the rules and principles of the Orange Institution—"We who have hereunto subscribed our names, who have now joined the Prince of Orange for the defence of the Protestant religion, and for the maintaining of the ancient Government, laws, and liberties of England, Scotland, and Ireland, do engage to Almighty God, to His Highness the Prince, and to one another, to stick firm to this cause, in the defence of it, and never to depart from it till our religion, laws, and liberties are secured by a free Parliament"—who, I say, were all these who thus stood up on the side of William? Were they rebels or assassins, as some have alleged? Were they disturbers of the peace of England, as James complained? Were they the enemies of God and man, as some have had the infinite baseness to say? No: but they were the flower of the country, and the lovers of law, and of truth, and of righteousness—they were genuine Protestants—they were loyal Orangemen.

I need scarcely detain you to tell you how Orangeism, *thus commenced*, spread like wildfire through the three kingdoms. In Scotland, where the people had risen up againse their fiendish oppressors, the minions of James, there was a loyal burst from one end of the country to the other in favor of William and Protestant-ism—the whole nation became a nation of Orangemen. And in Ireland, where thousands of Romanists were ready to fight for James and the Pope, the cause of William found among Protestants a unanimous support. Everywhere Orange associations were formed "for self-defence, for securing the Protestant religion, lives, liberties, and properties, and the peace of the kingdom, disturbed by Popish and illegal councillors and abettors." While the creatures of James attempted to raise armies of half savage Irish to fight for James, the loyal Irish united for William. From the very first they suffered for the sake of William. They were few, *but they were resolute*. The Popish rulers of the country oppressed and threatened them in every conceivable way, But they were not dismayed; they stood shoulder to shoulder; their cause was one of liberty

and truth, they banded for law, order, and good government; they were "Orangemen" *because* the Prince of Orange had promised to administer law and justice according to the Constitution of the United Kingdom; and hence, from the walls of their cities, where they stood to do battle on the side of right, they gave forth a shout which struck terror to their enemies—"For God and for William, and no surrender."

Thus the cause of William took deep root, and spread widely. The orange color was exhibited everywhere. Every hat and carriage had orange ribbons. The women as well as the men vied with each other in giving welcome to William. For once, the Protestants, forgetting their divisions and jealousies, formed one grand, compact body, and faced their common danger, and gave welcome to William. Their union was seen at Derry, at the Boyne, at Enniskillen, at Anghrim, at Limerick, and at other places. By their strong arms and their faithful hearts the Prince of Orange finally triumphed. By their steadfast heroism the power of James was forever broken. When his Popish forces and his auxiliaries from France faced the bold front of resolute Orangemen, it was not long doubtful which side must prevail. And, by the splendid and decisive victories which the God of Battles gave to the arms of the Orange leader, the glorious revolution was virtually completed; for the Popish despot then fled to France, and William and his people then perfected the work of settling the Crown and Constitution of England *to be forever Protestant!*

I COME now to the *second head* or division of my subject—THE PRINCIPLES OF ORANGEISM. It will be plainly seen from the tracing which I have just given of the *origen* of the Institution what are some of the leading principles on which it is based. When the first Orange Confederates banded together to dethrone King James and to welcome William, their objects were to deliver their country from tyranny and wrong, and to *bring back* to England the religion, the laws, and the liberties which James had betrayed, after having sworn to defend them. When those Orange confederates despatched their pledge and invitation to William, the objects they avowed were still the same—"to *defend the Protestant religion, and to maintain the ancient laws and liberties of the realm of England.*" "When William displayed his banner, as he landed his troops on the soil of England, the objects avowed were still the same—"The Protestant religion and the liberties of England *I will maintain.*" When a free Parliament met, and William was made King, the Acts which were passed made clear the objects of the completed revolution—"The Protestant religion and the liberties of England." When attempts were made by Popish villains to assassinate William, and the Orange Institution, with greater zeal, united for defence, the objects were still precisely the same—"The Protestant religion and the liberties of England." And when at length, by the Bill of Rights and Act of Succession, the Constitution of England was declared for ever to be free from the intrusion of a Popish king, and to be free from the tyranny of arbitrary rule, the objects in view were still the same—"The Protestant religion and the liberties of England." Let this, then, be accepted as a true description of the "Jachin and Boaz"—the two chief pillars in the temple of Orangeism; for neither William himself, nor any of those who took his color and fought for his cause, had any object contrary to those two—"The Protestant religion and the liberties of England."

But we have these two fundamentals properly broken up into several particulars. Let us take, then, the full account of the principles of Orangeism, as given in the printed works of the institution:—

"Section I.—Objects of the Orange Institution.—The Institution is composed of Protestants, resolved to the utmost of their power to support and defend the rightful Sovereign, the Protestant Religion, the Laws of the Country, the Legislative Union, and the Succession to the Throne in the House of Brunswick—being Protestant; and united, further, for the defence of their own Persons and Properties, and the Maintenance of the Public Peace. It is exclusively an Association of those who are attached to the Religion of the Reformation, and will not admit into its Brotherhood persons whom an intolerant spirit leads to persecute, injure, or upbraid any man on account of his religious opinions. They associate also in honor of King WILLIAM III., Prince of Orange, whose name they bear, as supporters of his glorious memory.

"Section II.—General Qualifications.—The Master and Members of every Lodge into which a Candidate has been elected, must satisfy themselves with all due solemnity, previous to his admission, that he possesses the following qualifications:—An Orangeman should have a sincere love and veneration for the Heavenly Father; a humble and steadfast faith in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, believing in Him as the only Mediator between God and man. He should cultivate truth and justice, brotherly kindness and charity, devotion and piety, concord and unity, and obedience to the laws. His deportment should be gentle and compassionate, kind and courteous; he should cultivate the society of the virtuous, and avoid the company of the evil; he should honor and diligently read the Holy Scriptures, and make them the rule of his faith and practice; he should love, uphold and defend the Protestant religion, and sincerely desire and endeavor to propagate its doctrines and precepts; he should strenuously oppose the fatal errors and doctrines of the Church of Rome, and scrupulously avoid countenancing (by his presence or otherwise) any act or ceremony of Popish worship. He should, by all lawful means, resist the ascendancy of that Church, its encroachments and the extension of its power; ever abstaining from all uncharitable words, actions, or sentiments towards his Roman Catholic brethren. He should remember to keep holy the Sabbath-day, and attend the public worship of God, and diligently train up

his offspring and all under his control in the fear of God and in the Protestant faith. He should never take the name of God in vain, but abstain from all cursing, swearing and profane language, and use every opportunity of discouraging those, and all other sinful practices in others, His conduct should be guided by wisdom and prudence, and marked by honesty, temperance, and sobriety. The glory of God and the welfare of man, the honor of his Sovereign, and the good of his country, should be the motives of his actions."

Now, let us gather out of this particular account the principles which make up the entire fabric of Orangeism. Out of the two fundamentals, which express very clearly the "*objects*" of the institution, viz.:—"To defend and support the rightful Sovereign, *being Protestant*, the Protestant Religion, and the laws of the country; and to defend persons, properties, and the public peace," there are these *four* others which express the qualifications of a genuine Orangeman. "*First*, he must be a *religious* man. Secondly, he must be a *moral* man. *Third* he must be a *loyal* man; and fourth, he must be a *neighborly* man." Having, then, two glorious pillars *standing in front*, not pillars of brass, but pillars of gold, *and within these four walls*, which are truly walls of precious stones, the Orange Institution has taken its place. We challenge for it that these are its principles. We deny that it has any other principles whatever. Its goodness and glory are to be tried by these principles. Side by side with all the Institutions which appeal to the confidence and respect of intelligent men, the Orange Institution lifts up its appeal. Equal to any of them—nay, superior to all of them—it claims as its friend every man whose religion is the religion of the Bible—every man whose conduct is upright and virtuous—every patriot whose loyalty and love of country are based on truth—and every neighbor whose generous heart and open hand will do good unto all men, "especially to those who are of the household of Faith."

The *first* of these principles has respect to "*religion*." The Orange Institution knows no other religion but the *Protestant Religion*. Nor is there any other *true* religion but the *Protestant Religion*. The experience of the world proclaims this fact. The history of England makes clear this fact. It is the religion of the Bible; it is the religion of reason; it is the religion of liberty; and, as the enemy of ignorance, tyranny, and vice, wherever it goes it gives enfranchisement to the slave, light to the ignorant, conscious independence to the spiritually debased, and scatters priceless blessings to all the rest of the people. There is no question here of sects and parties. The "*Protestant Religion*" is not to be confounded with conflicting denominations. The Orange Institution knows no denomination. It holds the "*common Protestantism*" in which Episcopacy, and Presbytery, Wesleyan and Baptist are perfectly agreed. Its wide and apostolic arms embrace all who belong to the church of Jesus Christ. The church which it disowns is the church which has been an apostate and a persecutor from the beginning. It repudiates Anti-Christ. It has nothing to do with Infallible Popes. It discards all Angels and Saints and Virgins as mediators with God. Its creed is the Ancient and Apostolic creed which believes *in Christ as the "only way"*—in his dying on the cross as *the only atonement*,—in his advocacy in Heaven as the only intercession, and which gives *every man* a personal right to deal with his Saviour without the intervention or permission of Priests. And hence the scriptural words of the rule which I have read:—"An Orangeman should have a sincere love and veneration for his Heavenly Father; a humble and steadfast faith in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, *believing in him as the only mediator between God and man*." He should honor and diligently read the Holy Scriptures, and make *them* the rule of his faith and practice. He should love, uphold, and defend the Protestant Religion, and sincerely desire and endeavor to propagate its doctrines and precepts. He should strenuously oppose the fatal errors and doctrines of the Church of Rome, and scrupulously avoid giving an encouragement to Popish worship. He should remember the holy day of the Lord, attend the public worship of God, and train up his children in God's fear and service. And the glory of God, as the high end of his being, should be the motive and object of all his actions."

The *second* of the principles which have now been mentioned refers to *morality*. The Orange Institution, as accepting and professing the true religion of Christ, is the friend and advocate of all *sound morals*. It holds that *true* religion and *sound* morals are inseparably conjoined. Its *religion* and its *morals* are those of the New Testament. Its strongest protests are against those morals of *Priests and Jesuits* which justify and palliate the most abominable crimes, *and which sap the foundation of all truth and virtue*. It has no scheme for making sin and wickedness easy. It has no confessional where crimes are revealed and felonies are compounded. It has no license from Heaven to make oaths and perjuries a mere matter of convenience. It has no license from the Devil to make "*stealing*" for the church no "*stealing*" *at all*—to make "*lying*" for the church no "*lying*" *at all*—and to purchase exception from the pains of perdition by magnificent bequests, and masses for the soul, after a life of infamy. It has never taught that a man may be a Christian and yet a murderer, an adulterer, and a perjurer. Its pure morality is abundantly explicit in the rules which I have read—"An Orangeman should cultivate truth and justice, brotherly kindness and charity. His deportment should be gentle and compassionate, kind and courteous. He should cultivate the society of the virtuous, and avoid that of the evil. He should never take God's name in vain. And his life should be guided by wisdom and prudence, and marked by honesty, temperance, and sobriety."

The *third* of the principles of the Orange Institution refers to *loyalty*. The Orange Institution is

pre-eminently a loyal and patriotic body. Religion and loyalty, expressed in the words "Fear God and honor the King," are never dissociated by any true Orangeman. Yet his loyalty is not blind. It is not the loyalty of a *slave*; but that of a *freeman*. It is not the loyalty of superstition; but that of enlightened and thoughtful intelligence. It is not the loyalty which bends to the Tyrant King, who has arbitrary power, nor to an Infallible Pope, who assumes to speak with the authority of God; *but the loyalty of men who have assented to laws, who own the supremacy and majesty of law, and whose rights to have free and liberal Government have been won as the price of their forefathers' blood.* Let this be noticed as the intelligent loyalty of the Orange Institution. There is, indeed, a species of loyalty which will yield to power, *whatever it is.* There was once the Jacobin loyalty, which would prostrate its neck to the heel of oppression. There is now the Popish loyalty which submits to everything which the Priest may say, *because* the Priest keeps the conscience of his people in his pocket; but the loyalty of free and intelligent men—the loyalty of reason—the loyalty of Scripture—the loyalty which makes England the country which it is, is that which recognises that both the King and the people are subject to law—that the law is the free expression of the will of the people—that the King reigns for the good of the people—and that, when the King becomes a *Traitor to his country and its laws*, oppressing his people and trampling with ignominy their liberties under his feet, *then* he has forfeited all claim to allegiance and the throne, *and the people do well to hurl him to the ground!* Hence, the Orange Institution, in this loyalty of Britons, binds itself to defend the "*rightful Sovereign, the laws of the kingdom, and the succession to the Throne of Rulers who are Protestant* It pledges itself to "concord, and unity, and obedience to the laws." It engages to "resist, by all lawful means, the encroachments or ascendancy" of any foreign power. And the honor of the Sovereign, and the good of the country are imperatively required of all who would be its members.

Now, the *fourth* principle of the Orange Institution refers to *neighborliness*. I am not afraid nor ashamed to claim for the Orange Institution this charitable principle, *that it is neighborly to Romanists.* It feels towards Romanists in a very different manner from that in which those Romanists feel towards it. *It does for* Romanists what is abundantly well known Romanists *never have and never will* do for it. For example, the Orange Institution refuses to receive as members of its brotherhood "persons of an intolerant and persecuting spirit, and who would injure and upbraid *any man whatever* for his religious opinions." Again, the Orange Institution charges its members "*to abstain from all uncharitable words, actions, or sentiments towards their Roman Catholic brethren.*" And still again, never do Orangemen meet in their lodges but prayer is offered, in the most charitable benevolence, that all the members of the Church of Rome may be delivered from the errors by which they are bound, and be blessed with a purer and truer religion. How different is all this from what obtains on the other side! The reason, of course, is very obvious. Romanism *cannot* but be intolerant and persecuting. It cannot but intrigue and plot for the subversion of Protestants. It breeds riot, violence, and cruelty, and makes the heart as hard and unfeeling as iron. And, instead of prayer on behalf of heretics, it breathes out threatening and slaughter against them, and fulminates the most horrible and horrifying curses!

Much has been said about *Penal laws*, and about *the strenuous opposition of Orangemen to Popery*. But it should never be forgotten that the "Penal laws" were the result of the teaching and doings of Popery; and that Orangeism distinguishes between *the men and the system*. What had Popery been teaching in the world when Orangeism took its rise? What had the results been giving to the nations? What had been the encroachments and tyranny of the Priests, when the Reformation brought their tyranny to an end? It is well known that the *Penal laws* were devised as a protection against the *treason and the immorality of a system which sets all truth at defiance to gain its end.* Not one of those laws would ever have been passed, if it had been possible to trust a pack of Priests, which not even *oaths, however solemn, could bind.* And those laws have been relaxed, or altogether abolished, just as circumstances have so changed *that all grounds for fear* have given place to confidence. Not that opinion has changed as to the *nature and aim* of the Romish religion. It *cannot* but be hostile to a Protestant people. It *cannot* but seek the destruction of the Protestant cause. It cannot but make its people unsocial and bigoted and uncharitable. Its claims and its aspirations are in open antagonism to all that distinguishes a free people. And its atrocious principles, "that faith should not be kept with heretics"—that heretics should be "*burned as worse than thieves*"—that there is "no salvation out of the Romish Church," cannot but give rise, wherever there is power, to the bloody massacres which have given a hideous character to Popery in all the world! Hence the sufferings and disabilities of Protestants in Romish countries up until only the other day. Hence the barbarous and persecuting principles of the Pope's famous encyclical letter. And hence, *it has been avowed by candid Romanists* in England, only recently, that if power were again in the hands of their Church, *they would burn or persecute the Protestant heretics:* at least, they *would not* tolerate their religion for one moment.

Not such monstrous uncharitableness as this will be found among the principles of Orangeism. Were there anything like this, what would become of the thousands of Romanists, who are fed, and clothed, and protected by Protestants? Were there strict retaliation, what would be the position of Romanists amongst ourselves? Were there anything like this, would Orangemen, *while detesting the system of Rome as a plague*, and using all lawful

means to do it away, be the friends, the neighbors, the employers, and the helpers of those very men, who are taught by their religion to denounce them as heretics, and to hate them *as the implacable enemies of both God and man?*

We claim, then, distinctly, as essentially a part of the Orange Institution, that it has *the kindest feelings* of humanity and religion towards the Catholic people. We *hate* the system; but we *love* the men. We are the *enemies* of the system; but the *friends* of the men. We resist the encroachments and ascendancy of their Apostate Church; but we are willing to live on the terms of good neighborhood with all the people. By all "*lawful means*" we *will* resist the claims and assumptions and errors of that church. While feeding the Romish poor, we *will thus* resist; while clothing the Romish naked, we *will thus* resist; while giving equal rights and liberties to our Romish fellow-citizens, we *will thus* resist; and yet not in one hair of their head will Orangeism harm them;—not one Irish landlord will it tumble down—not one *penal law* will it revive against them—not one civil right will it take away from them—not one moment of disquiet will it inflict upon them. Nay, in charity and kindness it will defend *even them* from the tyranny which their priests love to exercise over them, PROVIDED they will be contented to submit to the laws, *and not provoke by attempts* to put their unsocial and priestly principles into practice amongst us.

LET us proceed now to the *third division or head* of our lecture.

I propose to deal in this division with *objectors* and *slanderers*. The *objections* of some deserve kind consideration; the *slanders* of others we shall try to dispose of with all fairness.

It has been objected, then, to the Orange Institution that the principles and rules which I have just submitted *are not all the rules and principles which govern the Society*. How am I to reply to this? How am I to certify to respectable objectors that the book which we offer, as containing the principles and rules of the Orange Institution, is not a *fraud*, but a true statement of the whole matter? I can do nothing more *than give my word*; and I now, therefore, affirm that the book referred to contains a true and particular account of the objects and principles of the Orange Institution. I challenge for it on the ground of the purity and scripturalness of its principles, from all honorable and intelligent men, and from all good Protestants, respect and confidence; and, *after this affirmation and challenge*, I denounce *as a slander* any insinuation, by word or action, *which implies that something is kept back from the uninitiated*.

This is the objection which I put *first*, because I have found, in my inter-course with the public, that many desirable and respectable people have a hidden suspicion that there is *something more than what is avowed* in our printed pamphlet. They say—"Oh, yes, your printed book is all very well; but there is something more. There is something too bad for public view; and *there cannot but be something exceedingly bad*, since the 'Orange' name *has been so much spoken against*." Let me assure all these, on the word of a Christian gentleman and minister, that this *is all*; and, when this is examined, I am sure that the feeling will be strong, and the conviction will be acknowledged, that *something more—something exceedingly bad*—is undoubtedly *needed* to warrant the reproaches and scorn, the misrepresentations and calumnies, which have been so freely cast against the Orange Institution.

But again. It has been objected against the Orange Institution that it is a *secret society*. Protestantism hates secrecy. It loves the light. Its glorious function is "*to give light*." And, because of this open and candid spirit, characteristic of Protestantism, *secret societies* and *working in the dark* are peculiarly repugnant to its genius and history. Hence, many Protestants shrink from uniting with the Orange Institution, *because they have a dread of secret societies*; and those "secret societies" are associated in their minds with the black atrocities of the "Gunpowder plot," and the "unparalleled butcheries" of St. Bartholomew's Eve. But, my answer is, that the charge is *utterly and absolutely untrue*. In no sense *whatever* is the Orange Institution a "*secret society*." It is *totally different* from a "secret society." It has nothing in common with a "secret society." So far from this,—its objects are avowed; it has books in which all its doings are entered; and those books are open to the regular inspection of the public authorities *as often as those authorities may desire to oversee them*. What "secret society" in all the world can say anything like this? And if this be true of the "Orange Institution," as I affirm it is, what honorable man, what man of intelligence will accept against it the great calumny, and the wicked reproach, that it is a "*secret society*?" Of course, the Orange Institution, like every institution, has its "private business;" *but it has no private business but what entered in its books*. There is an oath of *fidelity to the Cause*, and of *loyalty to the Crown*. And, in accordance with this, it has its *private signs* as *pass worts* for the recognition of its friends. But if, on account of these things, the Orange Institution is to have the reproachful stigma of a "*secret society*," there is not a benefit society—there is not a merchant's office—there is not a bank—there is not a department in the public service, but what is liable to the same reproach, for in every one there is *some* private business, and some *special way of securing* that that private business *shall be kept for those who are particularly interested in it*.

But again. It has been objected that the Orange Institution is an "*illegal society*." Old Mr. Plunkett used to say so. Daniel O'Connell also said so. The Pope says so. Archbishop Polding says so. And the notorious Father

John, the Father Confessor of convicted Fenians, is sure to say so. But what of that? Everything is illegal in the estimation of such interpreters which tends to check the encroachments of "*the Church*." Everything is illegal which is contrary to Koine, and which stands like a wall of iron and adamant against the nefarious schemes which Rome has laid to overthrow our Protestant liberties. But it is enough for *all reasonable and candid men* to know that by the highest authorities in law and justice, in government and business, the Orange Institution has been publicly declared to be a "legal society." It is true that on one occasion, by the false reports of interested men—by the clamour and threatening of the Pope's brass band, the House of Commons broke up the Institution, *as contrary to law*; but not long after, when the Institution again revived, and when juster views began to prevail, the verdict given was directly the reverse. On many occasions the legality of "Orangeism" has been publicly acknowledged. Orangemen have been thanked by the British Government for their great services in Ireland: and the most eminent barristers in England, and in these colonies, have been asked their "opinions" *on the principles of Orangeism*, and by one and all of them testimony has been borne, in the most ample terms, to the high character and legality of the Orange Institution. The charge of "illegality," is, therefore, a slander. It was raised by men who had a purpose to serve—which was *not very legal*. It is repeated by men who are not very caring for British law. It is a scarecrow to those who are thoughtless or ignorant. But, will reasonable men ask better proof than the proof *which we give them*, that a more legal association of loyal men is not to be found in all the world.

Again. It has been further objected that the Orange Institution is *unnecessary*. Ha! Yes. "Unnecessary." But who is to judge of what *is*, or what is *not* necessary? This is the rub. If we go to the Romanists, they are sure to tell us that *all Orange societies* are decidedly unnecessary. If we go to the "lovers of ease and peace," they are sure to reiterate that all such societies are "perfectly unnecessary." If we go to those who are so full of charity that they live "in a land of milk and honey," and breathe out only an atmosphere of Irish shamrocks and mosses, they will instantly tell us that all such societies are decidedly unnecessary. And then, if we consult the man who is anxious about the customers of his trade—or the politician who is hunting for votes and place, the thing is as certain as that the sun is in the heavens, that the echo will be—"decidedly unnecessary!" But, there are many others, far more respectable than any of these, who have hastily adopted this same objection. For example, there are many who say that no danger is to be apprehended from Romanism *now*. The days, they say, of its aggressions and tyranny are past. It can never gain, say they, the ascendancy *now*. And, therefore, while Orange societies were useful in the past, they are now, in the strength of the Protestant throne, "altogether unnecessary." But, is not such reasoning as this *in the very teeth of astounding facts* which are patent to all men? On this plan of "*lying down and loving to slumber*" England has been acting for a century past. But what has she gained by it? While she has been *taking her rest*, the enemy has been working. While she has been fancying herself secure, the enemy has been sapping the foundation of her bulwarks. While she has been boasting of her strength like Samson, luxuriating in the lap of Delilah, that wicked woman has been cropping his hair and making something *very like* a "Roman tonsure!" In a word, so bold and aggressive have Romanists been, within the last forty years, that the Pope has added England, as a "recovered star," to his papal firmament;—he basset up his church in the very heart of the kingdom, in defiance of law; he has parcelled out the country according to his will, and given titles of honor in defiance of the fumings of British statesmen; he has set up his convents, and schools, and nunneries, in open violation of the clearest statutes; and by help of his subjects, *as voters and legislators*, he has virtually established his Popery in Ireland; he has covered all England and Scotland with churches and priests; by chaplains and teachers he has got his foot in every *workhouse and gaol and asylum*; and his claims have now risen to this high degree, *that the way shall again be open for a Romanist to hold the highest offices in England;—nay, for a Papist King to sit again on the throne!* Such are the doings, such the prosperity, and such the aspirations of the bishops and priests of Rome's church in England. Their doings and prosperity are precisely similar *in all these colonies*. And, as we see the numerous defections in the English Church; as we see the cowardly truckling of English statesmen; as we hear of England's Premier promising "*guarantees for the safety and independence of the Pope*"; as we see the mighty strides which Romanism has taken among the nobility and poor of the land; as we study the demands of Cardinal Cullen and his political tools, *which are the Pope's brass band*, is it wisdom or folly to be wide awake? Is it true or false that combination is necessary? Is it our nation's duty to accept or discard that mighty instrument which has never failed to support and defend England's laws and throne—"the Orange Institution?" All loyal Orangemen will agree to this, that when *Rome ceases plotting* their work will be done. But, meantime, as the work of plotting goes on, all Orangemen believe in the wisdom of being ready. "*Prevention is better than cure*." Yes, and the policy of being ready is the death-blow to plotters. England would be better and safer than she is, this colony would be more peaceful and united than it is, had there been less tampering, less trafficking, less dishonesty, and less self-seeking among our public men; but Popery has been coaxed, and fattened, and flattered, until *now* it can *demand*, with its usual insolence, and mock at the simpletons who have been busily caressing it!

Judge, then, all reasonable men, as to what is *necessary*! The want of combination is the weakness and ruin of the Protestant cause. The marvellous union of the Romanists *is the secret of their power*. They are ever combining. By their church, by their guilds, by their confraternities and purgatory associations, by their St. Patrick societies, by their "Irish Patriot and Christian Doctrine Unions," *they are kept by their shepherds as a separate people*. In a moment they can act, *when action is needed*; with power they can make their voice to be heard, when they want to be heard. And what, then, is wisdom, on the part of Protestants? Is it to be careless and indifferent until the country has been brought to the brink of revolution? Is it to wait until encroachment has advanced so far that violence will be needed to drive it back? Nay, is it not wisdom rather to foresee *the objects which the enemy is seeking*; and, by the *lawful*, and open, and British means of uniting for the defence and maintenance of our rights and liberties, to disconcert and scare the wily enemy *without resorting to violence*?

Lastly here. It has been objected to Orangeism that its *existence* has been *the cause of illwill and contention*, and its *history* has been marked by *violence and bloodshed*. The very same charge has been made by infidels against Christianity itself. It is precisely the charge of Voltaire, and Hume, and Rousseau, and Gibbon, against the religion of Jesus. When these infidels would deny the mission of Christ—when they would refute the doctrines which Jesus taught—when they would ridicule the Scripture as an inspired revelation, they point to the wars and confusions and strifes which have come into the world in connection with the Christian religion. And, harping upon the atrocity and numbers of those wars, they have spoken eloquently *against the truth and divinity of that heaven-sent religion*! But, what is the reply? *Christianity claims to be tried by its principles*. It demands that it be judged by the teachings of the New Testament. And, judged by this test, the decision is inevitable that this charge against it is *deliberately false*! The same justice we claim on behalf of Orangeism. *Try the system by the principles which it avows*. Judge of it by its laws, and spirit, and ordinances. *Make it amenable only for what is its own*. Spare it not in searching its teachings. But never be so false to honor and justice as to make it accountable for what it really repudiates! Doubtless, there are bad Christians all over the world; but is religion to be accountable for those unprincipled men? In every church in Sydney hypocrites are to be found. Is the Bible responsible for the existence of those hypocrites? And, because there are some bad and worthless Orangemen—men who are unworthy of the name which they bear—men who are a disgrace to the cause which they own—men who are really not Orangemen at all—are these worthless men to be held up as the patterns and exponents of the Orange cause?

We utterly deny, therefore, and repudiate the charge. "*Illwill and contention*," no doubt, have arisen; but these would have arisen *in any case from the very nature of the Popery and Fenianism to which Orangeism is opposed*. "*Violence and bloodshed*," no doubt, have taken place; but these would have occurred *in any case*, from the very claims and policy which the priests have maintained in ruling their people. But, further, this may also be affirmed with all good conscience, that Orangeism has *no* ill will to Romanists. It *cannot*, and it *will not*, do them any wrong. It will be the first to help them in the time of need. But, *under cover of charity*, it will not be seduced into countenancing their religion. While tolerating and protecting them, it will keep a watchful eye on their designing priests. And, should those designing priests rouse their poor victims to the folly of violence, and the chance of arms, *then, undoubtedly*, in justifiable defence, Orangeism will rise in the greatness of its might, *and turn to flight the forces of the aliens*!

It is a cruel slander, therefore, that Orangeism is *uncharitable*, or that it delights in *violence*. Neither its origin nor its history will support such a charge. It is never the aggressor; *but it is mighty in defence*. If there have ever been excesses, *those excesses have been provoked*. Amply, too, it will atone for any excesses. But the foe which opposes it *never gives quarter*. It is a foe which would burn, and massacre, and annihilate all heretics. It is a foe which prefers treason and sedition to open warfare. And then, like every bully and coward, when it finds that it has fallen into the grip of a lion, its bellowings are heard to the ends of the earth, as if it were innocently suffering!

BUT I have now to dispose of some more villainous slanderers before I have done. Those already alluded to I have dealt with as *respectable*; but those who are now to be referred to for a little are of another class, and are so vulgar and contemptible that they hardly deserve the application of the lash.

We have all heard, then, the slander, repeated again and again, that Orangemen take *an oath* to wade "*knee-deep in Popish blood*." Again and again has this been alleged by the "White boy," "Yellow boy," and "Green boy" crew. And, *what is not a little provoking*, this infamous slander has been partially believed by many who assume to be charitable and liberal! I cannot say more than that *it is utterly untrue*; but, what is the secret of so foul an accusation? Who have invented it? And what is the cause? Shall I be charged with uncharitableness if I venture the explanation, *that as the thief who is chased repeats the cry of the police-man pursuing him, so as to mislead the attention of the public looking on*, Papists and Fenians, who delight in blood, have raised this slander *that they themselves may escape*!

Another slander is, that Orangemen keep up *their color and their days for the purpose of provoking and*

insulting others. Hence, some who are never done talking of charity, tell us to forget the 5th of November, and the 12th of July. They say that the past should all be *forgotten and forgiven*. They say that all party colors and names should be given up. And, *they boldly assert that*, because Papists resort to violence and blood to put down the observance of the days referred to, *the Orangemen are guilty of provoking and inciting to that hatred and violence!* But, what gross injustice is in this mode of reasoning? Are Orangemen not to have liberty to think? Are they to forget the 5th of November, and the 12th of July, *because the Papists choose to abhor those days?* Are the Papists to have St. Patrick's days, and Saints' days innumerable, without let or hindrance, and all others are to be forbidden? Because Papists *choose to be violent*, are all others meekly to succumb? Instead of yielding to such insolent demands—instead of basing the liberty of Orangemen on the whim of Papists—is not the proper way to show those creatures, who delight in blood, that their *riots and violence will obtain no sympathy*, and that the strong arm of the law *will protect the rights and liberties of all men?* I claim for Orangemen the right to judge as to whether or not they *shall make famous any days*. So long as they do so *in accordance with the law*, they have a right to their liberty. And if Papists take offence, and resort to violence, their offence is so unreasonable, and their violence so cowardly, that, *instead of slandering Orangemen for their refusal to submit to the whims of Papists*, all good men should unite in upholding them, *as the true friends of liberty*. We mean no unkindness—we mean no insult—we mean no uncharit, ableness—when we look into history, and thank God for his mercy in preserving our country from the devices of the enemy. *We only mean to stir up ourselves to watch the same enemy who is still lurking at our gate to do us damage.* And, if the agents of that enemy *will be offended at this—if they will resort to violence to deny us this liberty—and, if unprincipled Protestants will join with them, in sympathy, with their unreasonable demands, is not this only a proof that watchful-ness is needed, and that the lessons of history ought never to be forgotten?*

We have not forgotten the infamous slander of the *Sydney Morning Herald*. The Editor of that paper, whose Papal services *have not yet been rewarded by a red hat from the Pope*, pronounced a slander, which will never be forgotten until it be *buried with him in the grave*, viz.—that "Orangemen think more of the 'battle of the Boyne than of the sufferings of Calvary!'" This miserable Editor acts the part of the tailor, *whose standard measure for everybody* was himself. The mind that conceived such gross impiety is the only mind which could be guilty of the deed. The comparison is the thought of gross impiety. No Orangeman could have ever thought of such a thing. The "sufferings of Calvary" are too holy and sacred, in the estimation of every Orangeman, to be brought into neighborhood with the "battle of the Boyne." Yet, are we to be driven from our views by the impiety of an Editor, who dares to impute to us such frightful crime? Are we to think little of the "battle of the Boyne" because the Editor of the *Herald* impiously associates it with the unparalleled agonies of the dying Christ? No, we shall scorn the slander, *and yet make use of it*. In the "sufferings of Calvary" we *will* see the great deliverance which has been given to the world—a deliverance which Popery would obscure and diminish; and, in the "battle of the Boyne" we *will* see the great deliverance which was wrought out for our country—a deliverance which *Popery would now make in vain* by the drivelling and impiety of hireling scribes, who would sell their birthright, and the birthright of their people, for a mess of pottage!

What shall I now say of the slanders of the *Empire* and *Evening News*, which have accused us of everything but what is Christian and honorable? What shall I say of the slanders of the "rag" which values a workman's midnight labor at 8d. an hour? What shall I say of the slanders of the *Freeman*, which tells its ignorant and priest-ridden readers, in its weekly issue, that Orangeism is the worst of all wicked tilings? *This I will say*, that when they put their slanders into a tangible shape, I will try to refute them; but, meantime, I appeal to all reasonable and candid men, to set over against the unproved charges of venal newspapers and hirelings of priests, the principles which form the foundation of Orangeism, *and then judge as to the side where the truth is to be found.*

Last of all, I come to the last of all the slanders which have recently been hurled against our glorious Orangeism. It is the slander of Mr. William Forster, M. P. The other day he told the House—he told the world—that "Orangeism was just as bad, or as good as Fenianism!" Poor man! Great allowance must be made for the views of our friend. He has not forgotten the defeat of St. Leonard's. He has not forgotten the exposure of Ryde. It is natural, therefore, that he should show his anger in saying "*hard things*." The wonder, however, is, not that he said that "Orangeism is just as bad as Fenianism," but that he did not say that it is a great deal worse! For, without doubt, *Orangeism is infinitely worse than Fenianism*, to all such Protestants as Mr. Forster. It never has given him a "Sunday Morning Breakfast." It has never honored him, in the presence of an Archbishop, with a cup and saucer, in praise of the "Immaculate conception of the Virgin. It has never believed in his being a Protestant, *since he has repudiated the very name*. And it has thwarted and checked him on many occasions, when his measures and influence have been judged to be injurious to the liberty of the people. It is certain, therefore, that to all who will act and speak like Mr. Forster, "Orangeism" is infinitely worse than "Fenianism." And *worse*, I trust, it will always remain. The slander, however, we scorn, that the most loyal of all the Institutions of Britain should be compared to the one whose sedition and treason are the horror of the

world; but we are not offended. We shall not do violence because of the insult, although it might almost warrant a little "tarring and feathering." We will only say that the difference between *Orangeism and Fenianism*. will be best illustrated to Mr. Forster *in this*, that whereas the Fenians would revenge themselves, *if they could*, by hitting Mr. Forster from behind a fence, the Orangemen will revenge themselves in the more manly way of sending Mr. Forster a copy of their rules!

I WILL now conclude this lengthened lecture by offering to the friends and supporters of Orangeism a few friendly counsels.

Let me say, then, that the best system which was ever constructed may be abused and ruined by bad administration and unworthy support. By this very process Christianity degenerated, through many ages, until Popery was developed *with all its spiritual tyranny and vile abominations*. I find it easy and pleasant to defend Orangeism; but, I confess, I cannot so easily find a defence for the conduct and doings of all Orangemen. I find it easy and pleasant to defend the religion which is to be found in the new Testament; but I should shrink from the task of defending the religion which is found in all our so-called churches, and in all professing Christians. What, then is to be done? for good principles *ought* to be made manifest in corresponding conduct. What is to be done? for the world is justified in judging of a system by the character of its friends. I say the world is *justified—at least to this extent: that the conduct of its friends will always be an element to the judgment formed respecting any system*. Bad Christians are truly a disgrace to religion. They do not *prove* that religion is false; nor do they prove that the principles which they profess are bad; but, nevertheless, they damage religion, and *give rise to prejudices in the minds of the people which are not wholly to be blamed*. And so with bad Orangemen. They do not prove that Orangeism is false; nor do they prove that the principles of the system are bad; but, *they give a handle to the slanderer and the enemy* to heap up reproach, and they give warrant and color to some atrocious calumnies. For my part I will say that as unfaithful Christians will never prove that Christianity is false, unfaithful Orangemen will never shake the incorruptible principles on which the system of "Orangeism" is built; and yet, *it must be added*, that the excellence of the principles will never be an excuse for the unfaithful Christian, or the unfaithful Orangeman.

Let me, then, counsel all true-hearted and genuine Orangemen, wisely to take heed. Let me remind them that their system is essentially a *religious one*. Let me remind them that the religion which they accept, as *the basis of their system*, is the Protestant religion;" and the Protestant religion may be summed up in this, "*To fear God and keep his commandments*" King William III. gave us liberty to *have*, and liberty to *enjoy*, this reasonable religion. Our Reformation is not worth anything if it have not made us *earnest* in this ennobling religion. Our Revolution has not accomplished its work if it have *not decided* us on the side of this true religion. And our Orangeism is really nothing at all if it be not a pledge—*stronger than any which is given by others*—that *whatever* others may choose to do, "*we will serve the Lord*."

My advice to every Orangeman is this, "Be zealous for the honor and purity of your cause. Lower not its standard. Forget not its object Sacrifice not its history. And remember *that the eyes of a thousand slanderers are ever watching for a halt and a tripping*." The only way to answer slanderers is to live them down. Glory in your principles, brethren; but illustrate your principles in your daily conduct. You are *not* Orangemen unless you be "good men." If you dishonor God, the institution disowns you. If you break the law of the land, or fail to uphold it, you are *not* Orangemen. If you company with those who are evil doers, you are unfaithful to your pledge. If you act or speak unjustly towards Papists, you are forgetting the cause in which you are engaged. If you are Sunday strollers—church forsakers—wife neglecters—leaving your children without proper care—having bibles in your houses, but never opening them—unjust in your business—intemperate in your habits—or immoral in your conduct—you are *not* Orangemen. All *such* the Orange Institution repudiates and disowns. It will rather have none, than have such supporters as these. It will rather stand alone than have such friends as these. If, therefore, all who profess the Orange cause will consider the holiness of their solemn obligations; if they will *study* their rules, and *live* up to their rules; if they will faithfully use what the Prince of Orange gave them liberty to use; if they will rise to the freedom and glory of their privileges; if they will "fear God and honor the King;" if they will "love the brotherhood, and be kind to all men"—not only will the slanderers be shamed in their villainy, but the thousand who doubt, and stand aloof from our cause, will have the very demonstration which they are waiting to receive, that "Orangeism is the embodiment of all that is "loyal" in our relation as citizens, and of all that is "holy" in regard to religion!

graphic border

Gibbs, Shallard, and Co., Steam Letterpress and Lithographic Printer?, 108 Pitt Street.

Jubilee Shadows and Jubilee Hopes.

A Sermon:

Preached in the Nelson Cathedral

By His Lordship the Bishop of Nelson

On, the 26th June, 1887.

Price—Threepence.

R. Lucas & Son, Printers, &c., 'Mail Office, Nelson.

Jubilee Shadows and Jubilee Hopes.

The following is a portion of a sermon preached to a large congregation at the Cathedral on Sunday night, June 26th, by the Bishop of Nelson, who took as his text i. Kings, xx, 22, "And the prophet came to the King of Israel, and said unto him: Go, strengthen thyself and mark, and see what thou doest, for at the return of the year the King of Syria will come up against thee."

After a few introductory remarks, in which he spoke of the danger of the nation after a time of rejoicing over the peaceful victories of the last half century falling back into a sense of security and self-complacency, from which some rude catastrophe might be required to awaken it, the Bishop went on to say:—

Shadows—Ireland.

Let us look down the fifty years and see what shadows there are which are significant and distinctive and having a meaning and a message for us. There is a question which was full of trouble then, and it is fuller of trouble now—the Irish question, the condition of that unhappy island being frightful in the extreme. It is seen now every day more and more to be a religious question, that the particular tenets of one portion of Christendom on spiritual versus temporal supremacy are at the bottom of the whole difficulty, and men are coming round to believe it too. Daniel O'Connell was the chief mover when the Queen came to the throne. Repeal of the Union was the war cry then; it developed into rebellion, and it was grappled with and set down, just as the present agitation will have to be grappled with and set down. But who are really responsible for this? As long as the Priests of Ireland and the Bishops and Archbishops and Cardinals at their head receive laws and directions from, and are dictated to by, an external Power and one foreign to the Realm, there can be no loyalty to our constitution; there can be no peace, no confidence. Recent events show this to be the case. It is the intervention of the third party, whether at Rome or New York, that troubles Ireland. Those Irishmen who know neither Rome nor New York get on well enough in prosperity and peace. There are not better colonists I ere or elsewhere than men from the North of Ireland, in physique or morals, but they are loyal to the backbone and it is not amongst them that the trouble exists. The absorption of money and time and energy by this ever recurring Irish question is a very sad feature, a dark shadow of the last 50 years. The disendowment and disestablishment of the Irish Church could not mend matters—it was not necessary; the parties who paid for its support did not wish it subverted, but it was only because it was the outward and visible sign of Protestant ascendancy that it was demanded to be destroyed. The attack upon it, however, has so far, on the whole, turned out for its good. But it has brought no peace, while, as a sop to Cerberus, the movement has signally failed. Need the sacrifice of the Church of Ireland have been made and enforced? Succeeding ages will wonder and be perplexed as to the meaning of its overturning, but they will note that no great pacification of Ireland followed. As a matter of fact, what we see now is a body of Roman priests who know all about the conspiracy movements of disloyal subjects, but who shelter themselves behind their oaths and declarations from declaring the designs of seditious and conspiring men who stop at nothing. Perhaps it may be asked, what have we to do with the question? I answer, the principle at the bottom of it affects us. The supremacy of the Crown must be insisted upon; two Kings will make dissension. The members of the Roman Catholic Church have a right to be protected in their religion and its exercise, but not to the extent of allowing teaching to be given which is really subversive of order, namely, the setting up of the spiritual as a Court of Appeal above the temporal, other than so far as the Supreme Being is concerned. God, we believe, has no Vicar on earth. If we believed that, we should consider the claims of those who profess to occupy the position, but as it is, we have no need to do so. If a firm stand were taken in this matter with regard to external interferences, much of the trouble would disappear, but as long as the great organisation of the Romish Church over Ireland can be and is controlled from Rome, so long will there be friction and dissatisfaction. You have only to see the identification of the priests with movements in Ireland of the most barbarous character, and to notice their connection with the higher orders of the hierarchy and the reference of them to the head quarters, to see that this is a movement which is aimed at the Protestantism of the Empire—notwithstanding that a few Protestants themselves are beguiled into it and made the tools of those who will cast them aside as soon as it is convenient, that is, as soon as the Parliament of Home Rule meets, or else the alternative of civil war takes place. Let it not be said that such reference is unrequired or unnecessary; individuals are loyal, no doubt, and it suits large numbers of persons to take up one attitude in one country and colony and another elsewhere, but I cannot in honesty pass in review the events of the last 50 years, without seeing in the Maynooth grants and in the disestablishment and

disendowment of the historical Irish Church, and in the fearful and barbarous murderous actions of the last few years, and of the present day, of the Separatist party in Ireland, without remarking upon it as one of the "shadows." One of two things is certain—either that the Roman Church has no influence at all in Ireland, or else that, if it has, it has not been influenced in the direction of putting down these conspiracies, but, as we now see, is in numberless cases responsible for aiding and abetting them. If the Supreme Pontiff of the Roman Church were to use the influence he professes to have in virtue of the position he assumes, and which is professedly re-cognised by his followers, what might not now be accomplished in the pacification of that unhappy country? But he makes no sign. There is every anxiety to secure dominion and the power of interference, but no sign of a firm hand being stretched out to protect the residents—to say nothing of the non-residents—in the due enjoyment of their rights, or to put down the barbarous raids of Moonlighters, or more refined but scarcely less cruel schemes of Boycotters, and similar invaders of the rights of property. If such a proclamation were to issue and fail, at all events something would have been done, but as matters stand at present, we have the spectacle of a large body of men taking a line of disruption and disloyalty and not a voice from head quarters to discourage them. Well, England will manage that question, but when we find persons in eminent positions in the colonies expressing their sympathy with Ireland in revolt, no amount of local loyalty will blind our eyes to facts or prevent our looking into the matters and "marking and seeing what we are doing." I claim perfect toleration both at home and here for any denomination which acknowledges allegiance to The State as the supreme power in temporal things, but it is impossible to tolerate any power, society or church, which so mixes up spiritual and temporal that under the guise of the spiritual it wishes to have the lead and supreme authority in matters temporal. This is a dark shadow, the blame of which must rest on the right heads. It mars much of the glory of the present reign—it is an open sore, a grievous blot, a weakness in the body politic. It is a source of reproach to us externally, and it may prove a very serious leak in the fabric of the ship of the State. Precious lives, untold money, valuable time, immense intellectual power, are being squandered in a struggle which can have but one issue if the Realm and Empire of England is to continue. Either Romanism will rise to a paramount position again in the world, or it will have to accept the position of one amongst many, and, whatever its pretensions, to be content with keeping them to itself, for the subjects of the realm of England cannot serve two masters in the same sphere, or in any part where those spheres are made to coincide. If Romanism requires the absolute supremacy of the Sovereign Pontiff it must be confined to the spiritual sphere, and we are not going to be beguiled into a foreign allegiance, or its manifest evils, under any theory of combination of the spiritual and temporal spheres. This is the old battle fought before at the Reformation, and if we stand firm it will not have to be fought again; if we yield, our glory as a realm will go, or we must fight the battle over again.

Evils of Great Cities.

The next shadow that meets the eye is the dark cloud resting over the development of our great cities—the gathering together of such vast masses of people in numbers beyond the control either of Government or Church influence, or their ability to secure their temporal or spiritual interests. Great cities mean great centres of vice, sin, unhappiness, and sorrow, and these have increased, and are apparently increasing. Disappointment is being bred every hour of every day, and the evils of close lodging, insufficient pay, food, and clothing, are baffling even the organised efforts of societies and churches to grapple with such difficulties. Something is done, but this social evil cannot be stamped out; it can only be reduced and starved out by limiting the demand for it. The revelations of the last five years are such as to make us tremble for the stability of society, and even for the existence of the future. Shall these evils appear in our midst? Shall the cities of this colony too become centres of evil and festering plague spots of sin? There is but one remedy a higher tone of personal morality, and a deeper spirit of self control. It is self indulgence which lays the mind open to wrong thoughts; self indulgence which forbears to check them as they rise; self indulgence which allows them to gather strength as they go till they develope into an impetuous, irresistible torrent of passion. There is a purity of nature of a physical character, and a purity of grace of a spiritual character. I believe some can follow the purity of nature for its own sake; they see and feel its harmony with the rest of natural laws, and feel themselves bound by such laws. Others again find these natural laws not strong enough for them, and need higher, fuller, and stronger reasons and powers, and they find them in the grace which comes from and is connected with Christ. Whatever others may do, you who call yourselves, and are, Christians, have no uncertain course before you. Self control for the sake of, and in the name of, your Master is a sufficient law, argument, reason, and force for you. This is the will of God—your sanctification. This shadow is a dark and wide spreading one. However this is not one that cannot be remedied, but one which will at once melt into brightness at the approach of the light of truth, holiness, and following the mind and will of Christ.

Growth of Luxury.

An immense growth of personal and domestic luxury is contemporaneous with these fifty years, and especially the last two decades thereof. Riches being heaped up and extravagantly lavished on luxuries of food, and of dwelling, and of vestment, beyond all limit, while no tithe is given to God, or the poor, or the work of the church, but all goes in self indulgent and excessive expenditure on decoration and articles of luxury. We cannot say there are not some indications of the same thing here. I do not advocate an asceticism which knows no pleasure to be lawfully derived from the beauties of art and colour, far from it; but where there is ability to secure this there should also be borne in mind the wants of others, both of soul and body, and at least a tithe of income should be assigned for the benefit of the souls and bodies of the needy amongst our fellow creatures. This is by no means done. The supporters of our so called charities are proverbially not the richest amongst us, but those who can least afford it, and feel what they give more than others. The many spend their money on themselves, and are so involved in spending it that they never have anything to spare for appeals made to them for others.

Selfishness.

But one of the wide spread shadows, and akin to this just mentioned, is a spirit of intemperance and excess, a seeking for self gratification and amusement at any cost, pervading so many, if not all, classes of the community, and this too in connection with an exclusive and caste spirit, which raises up barriers between class and class, and keeps men confined in their sympathies and exclusive in spirit, only finding pleasure in the company of those who can run with them to the same excess of riot. We see side by side, but mutually ignoring each other, the mansion and the hovel, not the mansion either of the titled or the noble, but the mansion of wealth hastily gotten, and not always honestly acquired. It has grown to such an excess and height that against it there is already a protest and a reaction; we will only hope that we may not see a repetition of this out in the colonies. All common gatherings, great or small, such as we have just had and are going to have, where all are one and at one, are helpful in doing away with the artificial barriers which self indulgence and mere wealth create between masses and classes of men.

Exclusion of Religious Teaching from Schools.

A very sad and dark blot, too large to be dwelt on now, is that of the tendency to expel religion from our educational course. New Zealand and France have a sad pre-eminence in this matter, and I am not sure that New Zealand is not the worst, for it does not even require morals and manners to be part of the education, and the French code does. But this I firmly believe, will be amended ere Jong, and before five years are over I expect to see religious instruction imparted in our schools without abating one bit of the usefulness of the present Act.

Intemperance.

Some assert there is more of what is generally known as intemperance; it is hard to say whether it is so or not, or whether it is only seen to be more because it is more revealed and shown up; but, going further, there is no doubt that there has been a great growth of indifference to religion amongst the working classes of the people, and a spirit of hostility amongst artisans and mechanics to religion and the ministers of religion. There is no doubt an inattention and indifference to religion on the part of many of our men, who hold aloof from Christian ordinances. I am not altogether sure there is more of this than there was; at the same time there are so many who have ceased to take any active part in worship and attendance on the means of grace, but whether it be worse or better, it is sufficiently unsatisfactory to report upon and we cannot hide it from ourselves. Men who used to be occupied in religious work, and seemed to delight in the ordinances of the Church, have, we will not say ceased to believe, but ceased to exhibit their faith by external profession, and in some cases are destroying the faith which once they preached.

Nature of the Shadows.

The shadows of the past are of the old sort; they are the result of yielding to the temptations of the world and of the flesh; they arise from exclusive and excessive attachment to the occupations and enjoyments of the present without regard to the future, and to the wants and wishes of the individual man and of the lower self of each man, regardless of the claims of others. Immorality, untruthfulness, and unfaithfulness to responsibility are the main blots which mar the moral prospect and make us tremble when we review the age in which we live

and out of which we have sprung. These are dangerous vices, secret for the most part and therefore more dangerous, dangerous because they lie at the root of all action, dangerous because they sap the vitals of the body and soul of the nation; dangerous too, because they lie close in their very nature to duties and virtues and are not so much faults of actual and pronounced sin, but faults, grievous faults, of excess, and of over passing all bounds and all restraints. Liberty turned into license and joy turned into excess. I take no gloomy view either of the state of our homes or our colonial society, nor do I defend it; but there is enough to make us grieved, enough to make us, amidst the joys of success and progress, think seriously, and refuse to blind our eyes to the truth. We have been spared much of what other nations have gone through. No famine, nor pestilence, nor war has weighed us down, we have had peace and plenty; we, therefore, owe a greater measure of conformity to the laws of our being, the laws of our nature, or in a word, the laws of God, and, as in private duty bound as a Christian nation, we may say to the laws of Christ.

Jubilee Hopes.

Let us now turn to the consideration of some of the elements of Hope for the future which a review of the past seems to contain.

Increase of Knowledge.

First of all, we see light coming in from all sides; information and knowledge are pouring in upon every subject. What is required is not information, so much as thought, and consideration, time to weigh new facts and fresh information. Those whose duty it is to invite reports from various sources know what a conflict there is in the mind when the statistics and information which have been asked for arrive, extensive in magnitude, minute in details sometimes confirmatory, sometimes contradictory and opposing, and difficult to reconcile, yet only requiring time to digest, arrange, and to form into valuable help and assistance. We seem to be in such a state as this: You cannot name a department which is of any human interest that has not received attention. There are Societies whose sole existence depends on the investigation of all that concerns the past or present or future of man, man's nature, man's language, man's place or motive in political, social, or religious society. We have this comfort at all events—we have plenty of information to go upon. If "authority" have ceased to have weight, information and knowledge have increased a hundred fold, and supply somewhat the place of authority. Out of this information and knowledge the laws of the future will be extracted—not fashioned—for law after all is only the experience of recognized customary action. Although from its magnitude it is somewhat embarrassing yet is to my mind a cheering and hopeful thought, this accession to our possessions of so much fresh and unappropriated and unclassified knowledge. Let me take an example. There has been opened up to us the whole history and literature and language of a vast group of Eastern Empires in Assyria, which will bear upon a very important biblical and linguistic subject, the religions of the old world, and the genesis of the religion of the Jewish people, or the religion of the Bible and the religion of Christianity, based upon it, or developed out of it, or at least fundamentally and historically associated with it. The flood of light thrown upon this one department of knowledge is alone a cause of hope. It is so because it prevents apprehension. If what we discovered was limited, or had only the effect of overthrowing previous teachings, that would be small comfort, though we could only rejoice at the overthrow of what was incorrect and untrue, however long believed, however freely cherished. We desire to believe not what is safe, but what is true, as the Prince Consort put it when asked his opinion respecting certain supposed heterodox books, which appeared some years ago and made a great stir. Did time permit, I could show this to be the case with regard to all departments of human knowledge. I cannot say why such a series of revelations should have been retained for the time that now is, but only record my testimony to the fact, and that it has no terror for me as it would have if I were of any other way of thinking, but I perceive in it the elements of the utmost hope. We may have to wait and labor and be patient before we can convert such knowledge into wisdom, and before we can combine the phenomena into groups from which we may deduce laws, but the material is not denied us. So far from that being the case we never had so much laid down for us to work with, only we must be patient and not generalize too soon, or come to conclusions too rapidly, or indulge hasty and crude dogmatism. Theories must remain theories; hypotheses must be recognised as such. Novelties must not be refused to be treated as such, and to be subject to somewhat of shyness in being looked at, but the volumes of material furnished to us on all sides fill us with the most lively satisfaction, and encourage all to renewed exertions, as students, observers, and judges, as almost on the threshold of a new world.

Desire for Union.

While there are many disintegrating influences, there is a wider spread desire for union. A reaction has set

in with regard to the assertion of individual liberty; that assertion has not sufficed; it will go on, but we see that it will not answer practically. The celebration of the Jubilee has been instructive in this respect. Every one has had his recommendation to make. Every one who could put his pen to paper and sign his letter or not as he pleased has had his suggestion to make. It has been so in England and other parts of the world just as much as in Nelson. It is a feature of the age, and this arises from the levelling influences of the Press and the correspondence admitted to it. I am not complaining of it, I merely point it out as a feature, but it has the effect of showing the need of combination and union if any thing is to be accomplished. The individual may succeed in asserting himself, but either the personal leader or the combining idea is needed to lead to action, and we have some hope that this combining idea is to be found in the work of the Christian Church. Whether the day has come for that to assert itself may be thought questionable by some, but I think we may say there is a more hopeful outlook. There are many 'irreconcilable,' no doubt, on all sides in each of the various parties and sects in the Church and out of it, many who desire only to work on the old lines, and who wish the people to come to them, and by union mean absorption. It is not in them any hope appears to lie, but in a wider circle in which things which tended to separation, looked at from a different and wider point of view, are seen to unite. The dropping of temporary names and phrases which could not be permanent, is seen to be carried on, and in place of this is rising a uniting of those who have one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who 'is above all, and through all, and in you all.' Let us try and foster this hope here: there is no obstacle to it Let us keep out the spirit of caste and class, and unite, not for the sake of the word union, but the thing and that which it brings. Let us level by all means, but by levelling up not down. If there are superiors and leaders and prominences let them be those of greater holiness, purity, liberality, virtue, goodness, and greatness, not of mere title and prestige. If there should be valleys in the scenery of the future let them be valleys of beauty or retired coolness and grateful shade; not the recesses of ignorance or chilly darkness, or of the Shadow of Death, but the Valley of Hope and the Vale of Rest.

The Race of Heroes not Extinct.

When we look at the Victorian era, so far as it is already recorded on the pages of history, we see a very hopeful sign in its possessing and presenting to the world men and women of truly an heroic type of character and action, whose influence was really for great good in their day and generation, and more than that, it is an influence which abides and, what is better still, there is no sign of this noble race of saints, heroes, and martyrs coming to an end. Men and women are ready to give up home and all its comforts and associations in order to benefit their fellow creatures. Of course, there always have been some such, but I feel sure on this point that their numbers have greatly increased, and that their quality has by no means diminished. Their names must rise to the lips of many of you, but I am thinking of the many, who, though their names are unknown and their lives unwritten, have in heaven, and in the smaller circles in which they have moved and worked, as great a ground for reputation as any of those of whom we have heard so much. Each name has still a following, not of blind imitators, but of intelligent disciples and learners, and society has been, and is being, purified by their examples. When I was at home last in 1883 I spent four weeks at my old College, of Trinity, Cambridge, and as the custom is, in any room that might be vacant, I was placed in one decorated, as many a College room is, with trophies of athletic and similar victories. There was the oar, the identical oar of the University stroke belonging to him whose name was over the door but who was absent in vacation, and the walls were hung with photos of friends and loved ones, and the cups of victory won by the inmate of this room. Last week a paper came to me in which I read the following record from the interior of China:—"At Hing Lung Mr Stanley Smith baptised 54 men and two women." That was the name over the door of those rooms, the name on that oar, and on those cups! This is an example, and a fresh and recent one too. The Gospel of Christ will not fail while men can be found thus to forsake all and follow Christ for the advancement of His Kingdom.

Organisations for Self Control.

There is hope in the many new organizations for self control. Indeed that is our only hope. All our evils may be summed up in self indulgence: all our security in self control, and this is the key of the position as regards home influence. It is not so much the control and discipline of the younger members as of the older members of the family and household. It is this that will make homes happy and attractive. We cannot multiply institutions, and homes and refuges, and young men's rooms, and young women's homes, and reading rooms, and clubs and guilds. These are rather for those who are away from home. The home must be made happy if the youth is to be happy and attached to it, but this means self denial. If the heads find their chief pleasure at the club, or the card party, or the tea table, all the time indifferent to the social comfort of the rising members of the family, no wonder they try to find pleasure elsewhere, and late hours and loose company and questionable occupations are resorted to almost in despair by those who ought properly, and would in a healthier state of

things, have been satisfied by simple pleasures, purer occupations, and more guileless amusement. Hence for the rising generation those associations which present to them the sterner and more bracing atmosphere of self control—appealing to the counter features of natural asceticism and restraint in the human heart, are a cause of congratulation. Human nature has, we believe, an instinct of government; it does not like lawlessness even though it practises it; it does not like noise and confusion, though paradoxically, it aids and abets it, but it is thankful when the legitimately strong hand of parental discipline takes its position, and if that is wanting then it not seldom welcomes as a temporary and necessary dictator, the influence of members banded together to supply by co-operation what should have been supplied from other sources. These White Cross Armies, Social Purity movements, University-cultured men resident amongst the masses, and Temperance movements we hail as needed and as successful, but what are all these to the Church, if she would only realise her duty, her position, and her power? Members one of another—one is your master, ail ye are brethren—let us hang together, not try to do what cannot be done, but let us focus our light and our heat, look to our own membership, bring others to Christ, be watchful and strengthen the things which are ready to die. Let each help the other, no carping, no standing alone or aloof while others are fighting. The battle before us is not the officers', but the soldiers' battle. Let each man mend one—that is, first of nil, himself—each knows where his weakest point lies, take it at once, take it this very night to the throne of Jesus; ask for pardon, ask for power and believe God's love, and this will be indeed to you a jubilee, a year of release. Your privileges shall then return to you: the life you had bartered for a mess of pottage, for vanity and for sin will then come back to you, and you shall enter on that which the Lord intended for you. No Jacob shall beguile it from you again, it shall be yours and come back to you. Wonderful recovery! Divine restoration! Not impossible, but truly glorious. This, this, is the jubilee of God: therefore go strengthen thyself, and mark and see what thou doest."

Butterfly graphic

R. LUCAS AND SON, PRINTERS, ETC., BRIDGE-STREET, NELSON.