



A PROTESTANT'S

*Appeal*

TO

THE DOUAY BIBLE,

ETC., ETC.



A PROTESTANT'S  
APPEAL  
TO  
THE DOUAY BIBLE,  
AND  
Other Roman Catholic Standards,  
IN SUPPORT OF  
THE DOCTRINES OF THE REFORMATION.

BY THE  
REV. JOHN JENKINS.

---

*"Speaking the truth in love."—PAUL.*

---

THIRD EDITION.

MONTREAL:  
WESLEYAN BOOK DEPOT, GREAT ST. JAMES STREET.  
1853.

MONTREAL :

R. & A. MILLER, ST. FRANCIS XAVIER STREET.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
DEDICATION.....	7
PREFACE.....	9
THE ONE SOURCE OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH.....	13
THE ONE HEAD OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.....	49
THE ONE OBJECT OF RELIGIOUS ADORATION.....	83
THE ONE SACRIFICE FOR SIN.....	129
THE ONE MEDIATOR BETWEEN GOD AND MEN.....	177
THE ONE METHOD OF JUSTIFICATION.....	219
THE ONE AGENT OF REGENERATION.....	263
THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS.....	301
PURGATORY.....	345
PROTESTANTISM.....	387



TO  
JOHN HANNAH, D. D.,  
TEACHER OF SACRED THEOLOGY,  
DISTINGUISHED  
NO LESS  
BY HIS CHRISTIAN VIRTUES,  
THAN  
BY HIS BIBLICAL LEARNING ;  
**THESE LECTURES,**  
DELIVERED  
IN ILLUSTRATION AND DEFENCE  
OF THE DOCTRINES OF  
**PROTESTANTISM,**  
ARE  
GRATEFULLY AND AFFECTIONATELY  
INSCRIBED  
BY  
*One of his first Pupils.*



## PREFACE.

---

PROTESTANTS need instruction as to the Scriptural ground upon which rest the doctrines of the Reformation.

Protestants are too ready to receive the unwarranted assertion made by the defenders of Romanism, that antiquity is altogether on the side of the Papacy.

Protestants are not sufficiently aware that it is impossible to sustain the peculiar dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church, by an appeal even to her own versions of the Bible.

Protestants, moreover, entertain a too lenient view of the principles and practices of Roman Catholicism.

Impressed with these facts, the author, in the course of the last Winter determined to present to the members of his Congregation, in a series

of Lectures, a connected view of those doctrines of Protestantism which directly bear upon the errors of the Papal Church. He hoped also, that by making known his intention, some Roman Catholics might be induced to hear what a Protestant can say in defence of the principles of his Faith.

The author was not disappointed in this hope. Hundreds of Roman Catholics heard these Lectures, and some few were convinced that Protestantism is **THE OLD RELIGION**. Many Protestants also were confirmed in that Faith for which their forefathers had laid down their lives.

It is at the request of large numbers of the Protestant portion of his audience, which swelled, as the course proceeded, to four thousand persons, that the author has been induced to give these Lectures to the public.

In preparing for the press, he has strictly adhered to the forms of expression which were employed in the pulpit. The reader, therefore,

will not look for that precision of style which would mark a simply didactic treatise.

The author wishes to record his indebtedness to a valuable work on a portion of this controversy, by the Right Reverend Bishop Hopkins, for the assistance, both in argument and in authorities, rendered him in discussing the subject of the second lecture; also to the works of the Reverend Dr. Cumming of London, and of the Reverend Dr. Elliott of Cincinnati, for some of those illustrations of the character of Roman Catholicism, which are found in others of the Lectures.

Montreal, 15th August, 1853.



## LECTURE I.

### THE ONE SOURCE OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH.

It has been already announced to you that my object in delivering the series of Lectures upon which we now enter, is to expound the principles and doctrines of the Protestant faith. I rather desire to inform the Protestant mind than to contend, much less cavil with my Roman Catholic friends. It will, I need not say, be impossible, in addressing myself to such a subject as that whose discussion is now proposed, not to refer to the Church whose errors gave rise to those Lutheran remonstrances which resulted in the system denominated "Protestantism:" but, in doing this it will be my continual purpose to avoid the utterance of a single word that will even offend the taste, much less wound the feelings of any person who may hear me. It is possible, so at least I believe, to deal with error without descending to personal abuse; it is possible to expose the inconsistencies of a system, without infringing towards its adherents, the law of love.

I ask for these Lectures the candid consideration of every Roman Catholic who may favour me with his presence and attention. Whatever I shall say of the doctrines and worship of the Church of Rome will be derived from acknowledged standards or authorities of

that Church. What I shall say of Protestantism, will be, so far as I know it, in faithful accordance with its universally acknowledged principles. And I will farther say, that if any Roman Catholic who may hear me, seek additional information on any subject which shall be discussed, and will take the trouble of writing to me a note, I will do my best, in the course of the series, to bring out the information which he needs. In order to this, however, it will be necessary for the writer to subscribe his name and address, as it has been a rule with me for many years to commit to the flames, without reading, every anonymous communication that I receive.

And now it only remains to invoke upon this undertaking the Divine blessing. Let us remember that no exhibition of the truth of God can be uninfluential. Edification and sanctification are the fruits of a docile and prayerful attention to the word of God. To exhibit the truth, is to communicate light to the darkened conscience of the guilty: To exhibit the truth, is to plant a guide-post in the way of the sinner who wanders over the wilderness of error, seeking rest and finding none: To exhibit the truth, is to erect a light-house within view of the tempest-tossed mariner, who seeks in vain a harbour of repose for his troubled conscience.

The subject announced for exposition this evening is

“THE ONE SOURCE OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH.”

The words which I have selected as the foundation of my remarks upon this vital question, are found in the

xvii. chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, at the 17th verse. They occur in that sublime prayer which our adorable Saviour last offered for his disciples: "THY WORD IS TRUTH."

This is the first principle of Protestantism. The word of God is the fountain of religious truth,—the one only source from which is derived all that we know of God which is not revealed to us by his works; and all that we know of man's relation to God, of man's position in the sight of God, of God's disposition towards man as a sinner, of man's duty to God, and of man's future destiny. We do not, be it remembered, assert that the word of God is the source of ALL truth, for there are mathematical truths, which are derived from sources independent of the Bible; and there are physical truths which have been ascertained by the investigations of science; and there are divine truths, such as the eternal power and Godhead of the Creator, which are revealed to us by the vast and glorious works of creation. What we assert as a first principle of Protestantism is this,—that of all revealed truth, the Bible is the sole fountain.—"Thy word is truth."

We wish to remind you of a doctrine which is too reasonable to be disputed, and to which we shall frequently refer in the course of this discussion, viz., that truth is never inconsistent with itself; that truth never contradicts truth; that physical truth and mathematical truth, and the truth of natural theology, and the truth of revealed theology are all in perfect harmony with each other. Independent they are, but contradictory they never can be. This evening we

have to do with the source of all revealed truth. Let me then announce a doctrine kindred to that now adduced, a doctrine which is no less philosophical, viz., that revealed truth can never contradict itself. If (e. g.) I draw from the acknowledged fountain of revealed truth any doctrine whatsoever, I am bound to reject as false every dogma which does not accord with that doctrine. Truth is as immutable as Divinity, truth is as consistent as God. No change in society, no measure of antiquity, no discovery of science, no variation of climate or of language affects *truth*. What was truth in Jerusalem when Christ was crucified, was truth in Rome when Paul was crucified; what was truth in Rome 1800 years ago, is truth in America, in Montreal, in 1853. It will be acknowledged by all parties, that, so far, this is an advantage to us in our present inquiry.

Another thing favourable to our present investigation is this, that between the Church of Rome and Protestantism there is no dispute as to the plenary inspiration of those Scriptures or writings which we call the Bible, including the Old and New Testaments. The Old Testament in Hebrew, as handed down to us by the Jews, and the New Testament in Greek, which every Protestant student of the original uses, and from which our present English version is taken, are acknowledged by the Church of Rome to be the inspired word of the living God. We speak now of the Scriptures in the original tongues, and we would remind every Catholic and Protestant present, that all the versions of the Scriptures which are of any account in either of the two communities, acknowledge one and the same ori-

ginal. There is certainly a dispute as to the veracity of the translations from that original; but no Protestant need question the fidelity of the translators of King James's Bible, when he remembers the care which was taken to secure a perfect rendering of God's own word, or while he has the testimony of such scholars as Lowth, Horsley, and Selden, in support of the integrity of the English text. Indeed we desire no farther proof of the accuracy of the Protestant Bible than that which is afforded by the fact, that there is so general a correspondence between it and the Latin vulgate, a version which the Council of Trent declared to be authoritative and divine. In the course of these lectures we shall advance no text, (without a distinct announcement to the contrary,) in support of the principles of Protestantism, that is not found in the Roman Catholic versions of the Scriptures;—in the Vulgate, in Martini's Italian translation, or in the Douay version.

PROTESTANTISM ENTERS ITS PROTEST AGAINST ANY ADDITION WHATSOEVER TO THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES, AS BINDING UPON THE FAITH AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH, OR UPON THE CONSCIENCE OF ITS MEMBERS.

FIRST,—Protestantism rejects the Apocryphal books or writings; not as historical and moral writings having the same claim to our respect as the works of Xenophon, or Plato, or any other ancient historian or moralist; but it rejects them as inspired writings.

Observe 1.—The Canon of both Jews and Protestants, as it respects the Old Testament, is precisely *one*.

In support of this position, I shall merely transcribe a few sentences from the celebrated Catholic historian, Dupin, who in his history of the Canon, vol. i. page 7, quotes Jerome on this subject:—"All the books of the Old Testament among the Jews are twenty-two, of which five belong to Moses, eight to the prophets, and nine to the other holy penmen; and we are to take notice, that whatever is not contained in the number of those books which we have translated from the Hebrew, is Apocryphal. From hence, it follows, that the Book of Wisdom, commonly ascribed to Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, said to be composed by Jesus, the son of Sirach, Judith, Tobit and Pastor, do not belong to the Canon, no more than the two books of the Maccabees." Did Jesus Christ, or his apostles, ever charge the Jews with the omission of any Canonical book? No. And yet if the writings which we call Apocryphal were inspired, as the Church of Rome asserts, they would surely have laid themselves open to that charge. Did Christ, or his apostles, ever quote from, or refer to these disputed writings?

Observe 2.—The Apocryphal books were not admitted into the Canon of scripture during the first four centuries of the Christian Church. The first catalogues of the Canonical books made by the ecclesiastical Greek and Latin authors, comprehended no more than the Jewish Canon in the Books of the Old Testament. In support of this statement we again furnish the testimony of our Catholic historian Dupin, whose statements no

candid Roman Catholic will be disposed to question. "The first and most ancient catalogue of the Canonical books that we have, drawn up by a Christian author, is that of Melito, Bishop of Sardis. This catalogue is mentioned by Eusebius in the 26th chapter of the 4th book of his history. In it he reckons only twenty-two books of the Old Testament. Origen, in a passage extracted from his commentary on the 1st Psalm, reckons also twenty-two. The Council of Laodicea, which is the first Synod wherein the number of Canonical books was determined, assigns only twenty-two books of the Old Testament, including the book of Esther, and joining Baruch, the Lamentations and the letters, with the prophecy of Jeremiah. This catalogue is followed by St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his fourth catechetical lecture, and by St. Athanasius in his Festival epistle." The same historian says again that "the first catalogue wherein the books of the Apocrypha were admitted as canonical and as having the same authority as the Bible, is that of the third Council of Carthage, (Africa,) held in the year 397;" he further intimates that they were "received on condition that the Church beyond the sea (Europe) should be consulted for its confirmation." Taking then, the authority of a Roman Catholic historian, it appears that during the first four centuries the Jewish canon alone was received in Christendom. The decision of the Council of Laodicea, omitting the Apocrypha, was received by the universal church. But the Council of Carthage in Africa decided only for themselves, and besides they wished to consult churches in other countries on this subject. At a

*second* African council, held in 418, the Apocrypha was taken into the Canonical catalogue, but they were so far from determining absolutely on this subject that they thought proper to confer with the churches in Italy. It remained for the Council of Trent in 1545, authoritatively and definitely to *add* the uninspired Apocrypha to the Word of God, and to pronounce its anathema upon all who do not hold it as sacred and canonical. Yet we are often asked, and this too in the language of defiance, to show that the Christian church previously to Luther ever held a different Canon!

SECONDLY,—Protestantism rejects an unwritten word; it rejects all oral tradition as a rule of faith: It denies the necessity of an unwritten word to supplement the deficiencies of the written word: It denies the existence of an unwritten word, and it has in vain demanded the proof of its existence in the Catholic Church. Where lie these oral traditions? where is the evidence of their inspiration? Do they teach any thing different from the preaching and writings of the Great Teacher and His Apostles? Then I reject them, and I say “ye make the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.” But Protestantism goes farther, it denies the possibility, for any practical, authoritative purpose, of an unwritten word. Take (e. g.) the history of the Old World: Primitive religious truth had to pass through few hands, and yet how soon did the world forget the institution of the Sabbath, and the doctrine of God’s Unity. What has oral tradition done for the descendants of Noah? I need only refer to those nations which in the present day are destitute of the Gospel. But a

Roman Catholic friend might be disposed to ask whether we are not commanded to "hold the traditions which have been taught, whether by word or epistle?" Yes, I grant that the Thessalonians were thus taught, and I have no hesitation in declaring my willingness to accept these traditions or deliverances of the Apostle's mouth, if the Church of Rome can produce them, and furnish demonstrative evidence that they are truly what they profess to be. I cannot proceed to the next step in the discussion, without inviting your attention to the opinion of two of the Fathers on the comparative value of the written and unwritten word. Theophilus Alexandrinus, who died in 412, says plainly, "It is part of a devilish spirit to think any thing to be Divine that is not in the authority of the Holy Scriptures." Jerome, who died eight years after Theophilus, writes thus in his controversy with Helvidius: "As we deny not those things which are written, so we refuse those things which are not written. That God was born of a virgin, we believe, because we read it; that Mary was married after, we believe not, because we do not read it."

THIRDLY,—Protestantism rejects the authority of the Fathers as a rule of faith. They were but men, fallible men; they aspired not to inspiration; they were in the habit rather, as we have already seen, of appealing to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as their rule of faith. Protestants esteem the Fathers, many of them at least, as men of piety and learning, and reject not their testimony when it agrees with the teaching of the Scriptures; but it is as necessary to establish the Scriptural authority of the doctrines of the Fathers by

an appeal to the Word of God, as it is to establish the scripturalness of the teaching of our own divines, by an appeal to the same standard. We spoke just now of immutability as an essential attribute of truth: does the teaching of the Fathers, or their exposition of the Bible possess this attribute? Is there no contradiction amongst them? Is there even a general consistency of opinion? By no means. Not only is one Father opposed to another Father, but not unfrequently to himself. The creed of Pope Pius IV. contains the following vow or oath, which every Minister of the Church of Rome takes upon himself: "Nor will I ever take or interpret the Scriptures otherwise than by the unanimous consent of the Fathers." But who ever found the Fathers unanimous in their interpretation of the Word of God? It would surprise if not amuse you, were I to quote their differences of opinion even on that simple passage of Scripture, "the Lord's Prayer." But I have only time to refer to their various interpretations of a passage which is considered of some importance by our Roman Catholic brethren: and lest it should be surmised that my own representations of the views of the Fathers might be swayed by previously formed opinions, I shall give you an epitome of these views furnished by one of the most learned writers, and eminent authorities in the entire Roman Catholic community, Cardinal Bellarmine. The passage occurs in the 3rd chapter of 1st Corinthians, and is thus rendered in the Douay version: "According to the grace of God that is given to me as a wise architect, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every

man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay but that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be manifest; for the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire, and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward; if any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

The Cardinal first enumerates the difficulties of the passage, and then furnishes an epitome of the differences of the Fathers:—

"The difficulties of this passage are *five* in number. 1. What is to be understood by the builders? 2. What is to be understood by gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble? 3. What is to be understood by the day of the Lord. 4. What is to be understood by the fire, of which it is said, that in the day of the Lord it shall prove every one's work? 5. What is to be understood by the fire, of which it is said, he shall be saved, yet so as by fire? *When these things are explained, the passage will be clear.*

"The first difficulty, therefore, is, who are the architects who build upon the foundation? The blessed Augustine, in his book on faith and works, c. 16, and in his 'Enchiridion,' c. 68, and elsewhere, thinks that all Christians are here called by the apostle architects, and that all build upon the foundation of the faith either good or bad works. Chrysostom, Theodoret,

Theophylact, and Œcumenius, appear to me to teach the same upon this passage. Many others teach that only the doctors and preachers of the gospel are here called architects by the apostle. Jerome insinuates this in his second book against Jovinianus. The blessed Anselm and the blessed Thomas hold the same opinion on this passage, although they do not reject the former opinion. Many more modern think the same, as Dionysius the Carthusian, Lyra, Cajetan, and others.

“The other difficulty is rather more serious, for there are *six* opinions. *Some*, by the name of foundation, understand a true but an ill-digested faith; by the name of gold, silver, and precious stones, good works; by the names of wood, hay, and stubble, mortal sins. Thus Chrysostom upon this place, who is followed by Theophylact. The *second* opinion is, that Christ, or the preaching of the faith, is to be understood by the name of foundation; that by the names of gold, silver, precious stones, are to be understood Catholic expositions, as the commentary of Ambrose and even Jerome seem to teach. The *third* opinion, by the name foundation, understands living faith; and by the name of gold, silver, and precious stones, understands works of supererogation, &c. Thus the blessed Augustine, in his book on faith and works, lib. 6. The *fourth* opinion is that of those who explain by gold, silver, &c., to be meant good works; by hay, stubble, &c., venial sins. Thus the blessed Gregory, in the fourth book of his dialogues, c. 39, and others. The *fifth* is the opinion of those who understand by gold, silver, &c., good hearers; and by stubble, &c., bad hearers. Thus

Theodoret and Eecumenius. The *sixth* opinion, which we prefer to all, is, that by the name of foundation is to be understood Christ as preached by the first preachers; by the name of gold, silver, &c., is to be understood the useful doctrine of the other preachers, who teach those who now received the faith; but by the name of wood, hay, &c., is to be understood the doctrine, not indeed heretical, or bad, but singular, of those preachers who preach catholically to the Catholic people, without the fruit and usefulness which God requires.

“The *third* difficulty regards the day of the Lord. *Some* understand by the name of day, the present life or the time of tribulation. Thus Augustine, in his book of faith and works, c. 16, and Gregory, in the fourth book of his dialogue, c. 39. . . . But all the *ancients* seem to have understood by that day, the day of the last judgment, as Theodoret, Theophylact, Anselm, and others.

“The *fourth* difficulty is, what is the fire, which in the day of the Lord shall prove every one’s work? *Some* understand the tribulations of this life, as Augustine and Gregory, in the places noted; but these we have already rejected. *Some* understand eternal fire; but that cannot be, for fire shall not try the building of gold and silver. . . . *Some* understand it to be the pains of purgatory; but that cannot be truly said. First, because the fire of purgatory does not prove the works of those who build gold and silver; but the fire of which we are speaking, shall prove every man’s work what it is. Secondly, the apostle clearly makes a dis-

inction between the works and the workmen, and says, concerning that fire, that it shall burn the works, but not the workers ; for he says, ‘ if any one’s work shall remain, and if any work shall burn ;’ but the fire of purgatory, which is a real fire, cannot burn works, which are transitory actions, and have already passed. Lastly, it would follow that all men, even the most holy, would pass through the fire of purgatory, and be saved by fire, for all are to pass through the fire of which we are speaking. But that all are to pass through the fire of purgatory, and be saved by fire is clearly false ; for the apostle here openly says, that only those who build wood and hay are to be saved as if by fire : the Church, also, has always been persuaded, that holy martyrs, and infants dying after baptism, are presently received into heaven without any passage through fire, as the Council of Florence teaches in its last session. It remains, therefore, that we should say, that the apostle here speaks of the fire of the severe and just judgment of God, which is not a purging or punishing fire, but one that probes and examines. Thus Ambrose explains it on Psalm 118, and also Sedulius.

“ The *fifth* and last difficulty is, what is to be understood by the fire, when he says, ‘ But he shall be saved yet so as by fire ?’ *Some* understand the tribulations of this life ; but this cannot be properly said, because then even he who built gold and silver would be saved by fire. Wherefore, Augustine and Gregory, who are the authors of this opinion, when they were not satisfied with it, proposed another, of which we shall speak by-and-bye. *Some* understand it to be *eternal* fire, as

Chrysostom and Theophylact. But this we have already refuted. *Others* understand the fire of the conflagration of the world. It is, therefore, the common opinion of theologians, that by the name of this fire is to be understood some purgatorial and temporal fire, to which, after death, those are adjudged, who are found in their trial to have built wood, hay, and stubble."

I ask you, then, in view of this illustration, to consider the absurdity of that pledge which is so solemnly given by every Roman Catholic minister, not to interpret the Holy Scriptures, otherwise than "by the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

But I cannot refrain from directing your attention to the opinions of the Fathers upon another text of Scripture. And, when I read it, you will not think it presumption in me, to say that, of all the passages of the New Testament, we have a right to expect, on this one especially, that the consent of the Fathers should be unanimous. I refer to Mat. xvi, 18:—"I say to thee: that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church."

Remember, I am not now discussing the meaning of our Lord's language, I merely announce the views of the Fathers. Some of them say that the rock is Peter's faith; as Cyril of Alexandria, (dial. 4, on Holy Trin.) "He called nothing but the firm and immovable *faith* of the disciple the rock upon which the Church was founded, without the possibility of falling:" and thus Chrysostom (serm. de pent.)—"He did not say upon Peter, for he did not found his Church upon a man, but upon *faith*. What, therefore, is meant by

‘upon this rock?’ Upon the *confession* contained in his words.” Also (Chrys. serm. 54, on Matt.) “and I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; that is to say, upon the *faith* of the confession.” Augustine sometimes interprets the rock to mean Peter, and sometimes to mean Christ; and referring to his contradictions in his book of retractions, he leaves the reader to choose for himself whichever of the interpretations he prefers. His words are to the following: (Retrac. lib. 1.) “I have said, in a certain passage respecting the Apostle Peter, that the Church is founded upon him as upon a rock. . . . But I know that I have frequently afterwards so expressed myself that the phrase ‘upon this rock’ should be understood to be the rock which Peter confessed. For it was not said to him, thou art Petra, but thou art Petrus; for the rock was Christ. Let the reader *select* which of these two opinions he deems the most probable.”

I might, almost without end, multiply examples of the differences which exist amongst the Fathers upon passages of Scripture and doctrines of faith; passages and doctrines that are allowed, by even Roman Catholics, to be of vital consequence in the system of Christianity. Am I surprised at this want of unanimity? By no means. It is to be expected that fallible men of different degrees of learning, educated in different schools, born and trained in various countries and climates, surrounded by dissimilar influences, should variously interpret texts of Scripture. I do not wonder at these differences, but I do wonder that a church so

prudential as that of Rome, should have enjoined this absurd exigetical law, and that any reasonable man should consent to be governed by it.

Now, I think you will agree with me that we have reached thus far in our investigation:—that the introduction of the Apocrypha into the Biblical Scriptures was not sanctioned by either Christ or His Apostles, or even by the early church; that, indeed, it was not until nearly the commencement of the fifth century that it was received by any portion of the church, and then by only the African portion; and that, therefore, the voice of antiquity is against its reception into the inspired canon. I have also shown that oral traditions are not only not authoritative, but are entirely fabulous; and have asserted, without fear of successful contradiction, that no saying or miracle of Christ or His Apostles not found in the New Testament has ever been disclosed by the Catholic Church on indubitable testimony. And lastly, that the Fathers disagree amongst themselves as to some of the most important passages of Holy Writ, and therefore give an uncertain sound, rather than a sure word of testimony. We are driven back from these shifting sources of doctrinal instruction to the pure truth of God. They furnish no sure foundation upon which we can build our hopes, and in the midst of that which is so changeful and uncertain, we feel that we are only safe when we plant ourselves upon this rock—the Holy Bible. “I profess plainly,” said the immortal Chillingworth, “that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot but on this rock only. I see plainly that there are popes against popes, councils against councils,

some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves ; a consent of the Fathers of one age against a consent of the Fathers of another age, the church of one age against the church of another age. . . . In a word, there is no sufficient certainty, but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon. This therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe ; this will I profess, and according to this will I live. Propose me any thing out of this book, and require whether I believe it or no ; and seem it ever so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this ; ‘ God hath said so, therefore it is true.’ In other things I will take no man’s liberty of judgment from him, neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse man nor the worse Christian, I will love no man the less, for differing in opinion from me. And what measure I mete to others, I expect from them again. I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore that men ought not to require any more of any man than this, to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, to endeavor to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it.”

PROTESTANTISM ASSERTS THE ABSOLUTE SUFFICIENCY  
OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES FOR THE GUIDANCE OF  
THE CHURCH IN ALL MATTERS OF DOCTRINE AND  
PRACTICE.

On this subject, the standards of the churches of England and Scotland, with which all other Protestant churches agree, are sufficiently explicit.

The Sixth Article of the Church of England reads thus:—

“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.”

Not less clear and peremptory are the ninth and tenth sections of the first chapter of the Westminster confession :

“The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture, (which is not manifold, but one,) it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

“The Supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture.”

But why need I refer to ecclesiastical standards, since the Word of God abundantly declares its own sufficiency. I appeal to a few of the many texts which may be adduced in support of this assertion. The first occurs in the 8th chap. of Isaiah, ver. 20. “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this Word it is because there is no light in them.”

(Vulgate) "There will not be to them the morning light." Here the people of Israel were commanded to test even a prophet's message. "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them. . . . If they hear not Moses and the prophets neither will they believe if one rise again from the dead." . . . "But though we or an angel from Heaven preach a Gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." . . . . "The Holy Scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation,"—"to instruct thee to salvation." And if this could be said of the Old Testament, much more may it be said of the New. What want I more than to be instructed to salvation? What work of supererogation is that which requires that I receive as truth necessary to salvation, more than that which is able to make me wise unto salvation? For myself I want no more than this—only give me the incorruptible seed of the Word, which is able to save my soul, and I want naught beside. No! I will not wander away from this sure word of prophecy, I will not put in its place any word of man, no tradition shall have with me the same authority as the written word of the Living God, and when I am in doubt of its meaning I will go to no uninspired authority, but following the apostolic maxim, I will compare Scripture with Scripture; no private interpretation shall satisfy me, no interpretation of Bishop, or Cardinal, or Priest; the Scripture is its own, its best interpreter, and will make all things plain. Our Roman Catholic friends sometimes say that the Protestant rule of faith is the Bible explained by every man's private judgment. This is not a fair representation;

—our rule of faith is the Bible alone, without note or comment, or any thing indeed, extrinsic from itself. This is the only standard of appeal which the Protestant can recognize. As long as he keeps within the circumference of the Bible he is on impregnable ground ; but the instant he goes beyond the Bible, and allows that the opinion of Henry, or Scott, or Wesley, or the comments of the Anglican, or Scottish, or any other church, are part and parcel of the rule of faith, he has left the munition of rocks—he is unsafe, and is in momentary danger of being carried away with every wind of doctrine.

PROTESTANTISM ASSERTS IT TO BE THE PRIVILEGE OF EVERY MAN TO APPROACH THIS SOURCE OF TRUTH, THE BIBLE, AND TO DRAW FREELY FROM ITS STREAMS.

There is presumptive evidence that the Divine Author of the Holy Scriptures intended the Bible for all men. Moses promulged the law of God and the will of God to the Israelites generally : Joshua did the same : Ezra, after the return from Babylon, followed in this respect his great exemplar Joshua : The prophets spoke to the people generally in the vulgar tongue, and wrote in the vulgar tongue : Christ spoke to the multitudes, addressing to them, (as, for instance, in his sermon on the Mount,) some of the sublimest mysteries, and some of the hardest sayings of the Christian religion : Peter addressed the multitudes in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and Paul preached almost daily to large assemblies of Jews and Greeks. They as well

as the other writers of the apostolic epistles wrote to the brethren of the Churches—to “all the holy brethren.” Seeing then, that the Bible is made up of these several parts, who can resist the conclusion that it was designed without let or hindrance for the whole people? Yes, my brethren, the Bible, like Christ, was given for the World.

But we have direct evidence from the Bible itself that the Holy Scriptures were designed by God to be read and investigated by all. “Search the Scriptures for you think in them to have life everlasting, and the same are they that give testimony of me.” Now, whether you regard this as a command, or as an assertion, you are in either case bound to acknowledge that it was both the duty and the privilege of the Jews to “search the Scriptures.” The Bereans were applauded by the inspired historian in the following language: “Now these were more noble than those in Thessalonica, who received the word with all eagerness, daily searching the Scriptures whether these things were so.” We have quoted from the Douay version, and the words remain a standing reproof to every Roman Catholic Minister who refuses to his fellow-man the opportunity and privilege of emulating the nobleness of the Berean Christians.

“They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them.” “From thy infancy,” said Paul to Timothy, “thou hast known the Holy Scriptures,” a statement which clearly shows what was the domestic practice of the Jews as to scriptural instruction. The last passage which we furnish in support of the Protestant principle

that man's inalienable right is to read the Bible, is from one of the Apostle Peter's letters, in which, speaking of Paul and his writings, he says, "As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things, in which are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and the unstable wrest as they do also the other Scriptures to their own destruction." I direct your special attention to this passage, because it proves that St. Paul's epistles were read by the unlearned members of the Christian Church; and because also, though these unlearned Christians wrested the Scriptures of Paul to their own destruction, the Apostle Peter does not command other unlearned Christians to desist from reading them lest they also should similarly wrest them.

But we have the testimony of the ancient Fathers also in favour of the general reading of the Holy Scriptures.

"Search the Scriptures," says Clement of Alexandria, in his celebrated epistle to the Corinthians. "Who is there," observes Chrysostom, "to whom all is not manifest which is written in the Gospel? Who that shall hear, 'Blessed are the meek, blessed are the merciful, blessed are the pure in heart,' and the rest, would require a teacher to learn any of these things which are here spoken? As also the signs, miracles, histories, are they not known and manifest to every man? This pretence and excuse is but the cloak of our slothfulness. Thou understandest not those things which are written: how shouldst thou understand them who wilt not so much as slightly look into them?"

Take the book into thy hand; read all thy history; and what thou knowest, remember; and what is obscure, go often over it." This Father yet more plainly corroborates the antiquity of the Protestant doctrine and practice, for he says, "The Philosophers speak obscurely, but the Apostles and Prophets make all things delivered by them clear and manifest; and, as the common teachers of the world, have so expounded all things, that every man may, of himself, by bare reading, learn those things which are spoken." The same author, in his Homily on Lazarus, says, "I do always exhort, and will never cease to exhort you, that you will not here only attend to those things which are spoken; but, when you are at home, you continually busy yourselves in reading the Holy Scriptures, which practice also, I have not ceased to urge upon them who come privately to me. For, let no man say, 'Alas, I am taken up with lawful causes, I am employed in public affairs, I follow my trade, I maintain a wife and children, and have a great charge to look to; it is not for me to read the Scripture, but for them which have cast off the world, which have taken up the solitary tops of mountains for their dwellings, which live this contemplative kind of life continually.' What sayest thou, O man? Is it not for thee to turn over the Scriptures, because thou art distracted with many cares? Nay, then it is for thee more than for them; for they do not so much need the help of the Scriptures as thou who art tossed in the midst of the waves of worldly business." He says again, "Wherefore hath the spirit of God so dispensed this word that publicans,

fishers, tent-makers, goat-herds, and shepherds, plain unlettered men may be saved by these books : lest any of the simple sort should pretend this excuse, that all things which are said should be easy to discern ; and that the workman, the servant, the poor widow, and the most unlearned of all other, by hearing of the word read might get some gain and profit." The same Father says elsewhere, "I beseech you that you come speedily hither, and hearken diligently to the reading of the Holy Scripture ; and not only when you come hither, but also at home take the Bible into your hands, and by your diligent care reap the profit contained in it." Once more, in his Homilies on the Colossians, he exclaims, "Hear I beseech you, ye secular men, provide you Bibles which are the medicines for the soul : at least get the New Testament."

I ask, is this accordant with the present teaching of the Church of Rome ? Is it the common practice of the Ministers of that Church, thus to exhort the laity ? Who ever heard a Roman Catholic Priest or Bishop beseech his flock to provide themselves Bibles, especially the unlettered and the poor of his flock ? Yet, this celebrated Father, as we have seen, did this ; and others of the Fathers are not less explicit, not less "Protestant" in the enunciation of their views on the general reading of the Scriptures. Jerome says, "It is for the whole people that the Apostles wrote. The laity ought to abound in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures." Isidorus affirms, "That the heavenly oracles have been written for the whole human race ; even husbandmen," he continues, "are in a condition to learn there what

it is fitting for them to know. 'The learned and the ignorant, children and women may equally instruct themselves there.' I might multiply quotations, but I forbear. I have furnished these for the purpose of demonstrating to both Protestants and Catholics that the boasted reverence of the Church of Rome for the Fathers is not so supreme as it is sometimes assumed to be, and that antiquity is against her in her present practice of restraining the laity from a free examination of the word of God.

Abundant testimony, therefore, is at hand in favour of the reading of the Sacred Scriptures by the people. Prominent members of the Roman Catholic Church frequently assert that the Bible is not withheld from them, or from the laity generally. We acknowledge that there may be found in the decrees of the Council of Trent one or two clauses favouring such a permission, but then these permissory clauses are so fenced around by restrictions, that they become tantamount to a direct refusal. And here, let me observe, that the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church are not at one on this subject of Bible reading. A conclave of Bishops meeting at Bononia gave the following counsel or advice to Pope Julius III. : "By all means, as little of the Gospel as might be, especially in the vulgar tongue, should be read to the people; and *that* little which is in the Mass ought to be sufficient; neither should it be permitted to any mortal to read more, for so long as men were contented with that little, all went well with them."

Pope Pius VII. published in 1816, a Bull against

Bible Societies, in which he represents the circulation of the Scriptures by Bible Societies "as a crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined; a pestilence which must be remedied and abolished; a defilement of the faith, eminently dangerous to souls; impious machinations of innovators; wickedness of a nefarious scheme; snares prepared for men's everlasting ruin; a new species of tares, which an adversary has abundantly sown." In the same Bull the Pontiff says, "It is evident from experience that the Holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit."\*

But I must not longer detain you with extracts corroborative of a fact which, despite the occasional denials of her members, is stamped upon almost every page of the history of the Roman Catholic Church. That the ecclesiastics of that community generally, are opposed to the circulation of the Bible, is too patent to the world to demand accumulated proof. The Word of God is not read by the great body of Roman Catholics; it is not even circulated amongst them; it is not permitted to a Roman Catholic to buy or sell a copy of even the Douay Bible, without an order in writing. Should a Roman Catholic bookseller infringe this law, he would subject himself to heavy ecclesiastical penalties. Yet we are told the Bible is not withheld from the members of the Church!

Lastly, I ask you not, "Are you a Roman Catholic?" "Are you a Protestant?" I ask you not, "Are you an

\* See note at the end of this Lecture.

Episcopalian ? a Presbyterian ? a Methodist ?” But I ask you, “Are you a MAN ?” Then has your Divine Creator vested in you the right, which it were unjust to withhold, of reading, for yourself, the Holy Bible. Do you feel that you are in darkness ? This Divine Word will be a light unto your feet, and a lamp unto your path. Would you become acquainted with the character of the Great God with whom you have to do ? With his attributes, with his will, with his law ? All the information which you require may be found and obtained in this Blessed Volume of truth. Are you a sinner ? In this Bible and in it alone, is disclosed the method of pardoning mercy through the atonement of Jesus. Are you in sorrow and affliction ? The Bible reveals to you the only fountain of consolation. Are you an immortal spirit rapidly journeying to the eternal world ? In this Bible, this book of books, you have opened up to you the path that leads to immortality and eternal life. By whatever motives men may attempt to draw you off from the study of this Bible, heed them not, for it is God’s great gift to every man, and therefore to you. It is your light in the darkness of the wilderness ; it is your chart in the voyage of life ; it is your anchor in the storm of distress ; it is your armour in your conflicts with your enemies ; it is your bridge of safety over the river of death. Love your Bible—bind it to your heart—cleave to its truths—follow its instructions—obey its laws—trust its promises. “SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES,”—for they are they which testify of Christ : “Let THE WORD OF CHRIST dwell in you richly in all wisdom” : “The word

of the Lord endureth for ever, and this is the word  
WHICH BY THE GOSPEL IS PREACHED UNTO YOU."

"Here may the wretched sons of want  
Exhaustless riches find ;  
Riches, above what earth can grant,  
And lasting as the mind.

"Here the fair tree of knowledge grows,  
And yields a free repast ;  
Sublimèr sweets than nature knows,  
Invite the longing taste.

"Here the Redeemer's welcome voice  
Spreads heavenly peace around ;  
And life and everlasting joys  
Attend the blissful sound.'



## NOTE TO LECTURE I.

### ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH RESPECTING THE READING OF THE SCRIPTURES BY THE LAITY.

1. The fourth rule of the congregation of the Index contains the following provision: "It is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the Bishops or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the Priest or Confessor, permit the reading of the Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend will be augmented and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it, without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary."

2. Propositions of Father Quesnell expressly condemned in the Bull Unigenitus. Translated from Dens Theology. (Vol. viii. pp. 315, 316.)

"The reading of the Sacred Scripture is for all.

"The obscurity of the sacred word of God is no reason for laymen to dispense themselves from reading it.

"The Lord's day ought to be sanctified by Christians for reading works of piety, and, above all, of the Sacred Scripture. It is damnable to wish to withdraw a Christian from this reading. (Acts xv. 21.)

"It is an illusion to persuade oneself that a knowledge of the mysteries of religion is not to be communicated to women by the reading of the sacred book. Not from the simplicity of women, but from the proud science of men, has the abuse of the Scriptures arisen, and heresies have been produced. (John iv. 26.)

"To take away the New Testament from the hands of Christians, or to shut it up from them, by taking from them the

means of understanding it, is to close the mouth of Christ to them. (Matt. v. 2.)

“To interdict from Christians the reading of the sacred Scriptures, particularly of the Gospel, is to interdict the use of the light from the sons of light, and to cause that they should suffer some species of excommunication. (Luke xi. 33.)

“To take away from the simple people this solace of joining their voice to the voice of the whole church, is a custom contrary to the apostolical practice and the intention of God. (1 Cor. xiv. 16.)

The following are amongst the closing denunciations of this well-known Bull :—

“We declare, condemn, and reprobate respectively, by this our Constitution, perpetually in force for ever, all and singular, the propositions before inserted, as false, captious, ill-sounding, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and its practice, neither against the Church alone, but also against the secular power, contumacious, seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspected of heresy, and savouring of heresy itself, also favouring heretics and heresies, and even schism, erroneous, approaching to heresy, often condemned, and again even heretical, and manifestly renewing various heresies, and chiefly those which are contained in the famous propositions of Jansenius, and indeed being received in that sense in which they were condemned. Commanding all the faithful in Christ, of either sex, not to presume to think, teach, or preach concerning the said propositions, otherwise than contained in this the same our Constitution, so that whosoever shall teach, defend, publish, or treat even in disputation publicly or privately, unless it may be to impugn them, or any of them, conjointly or separately, shall be subject *ipso facto*, and without any other declaration, to ecclesiastical censures, and the other punishments decreed by law against the perpetrators of similar things.

“We command also the venerable brothers, the Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops, and other ordinaries of places, also the Inquisitors of heretical pravity, that they may by all means

coerce and compel gainsayers, and rebels, whatsoever, by censures, and the aforesaid punishments, and the other remedies of law and fact; the aid even of the secular arm being called in for this purpose, if necessary."

3. Translation of the Bull against Bible Societies, issued June 29th, 1816, by Pope Pius VII, to the Archbishop of Gnesen, Primate of Poland.

" Pius P. VII.

" VENERABLE BROTHER,—*Health and apostolic benediction.*

In our last letter to you we promised, very soon, to return an answer to yours, in which you have appealed to this holy see, in the name of the other Bishops of Poland, respecting what are called Bible Societies, and have earnestly inquired of us what you ought to do in this affair. We long since, indeed, wished to comply with your request; but an incredible variety of weighty concerns has so pressed upon us on every side, that, till this day, we could not yield to your solicitations.

" We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined; and having, because of the great importance of the subject, conferred in Council with our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, we have, with the utmost care and attention, deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish this pestilence as far as possible. In the mean time we heartily congratulate you, venerable brother, and we commend you again and again in the Lord, as it is fit we should, upon the singular zeal you have displayed under circumstances so dangerous to Christianity, in having denounced to the apostolic see this defilement of the faith so eminently dangerous to souls. And although we perceive that it is not at all necessary to excite him to activity who is making haste, since, of your own accord, you have already shown an ardent desire to detect and overthrow the impious machinations of these innovators; yet, in conformity with our office, we again and again exhort you that whatever you can achieve by power, provide for by counsel,

or effect by authority, you will daily execute with the utmost earnestness, placing yourself as a wall for the house of Israel.

“ With this view, we issue the present brief; namely, that we may convey to you a signal testimony of our approbation of your excellent conduct, and also may endeavour therein still more and more to excite your pastoral solicitude and diligence; for the general good imperiously requires you to combine all your means and energies to frustrate the plans which are prepared by its enemies for the destruction of our most holy religion; whence it becomes an episcopal duty that you, first of all, expose the wickedness of this nefarious scheme, as you have already done so admirably, to the view of the faithful, and openly publish the same, according to the rules prescribed by the Church, with all the erudition and wisdom which you possess; namely, ‘ that the Bible printed by heretics is to be numbered among other prohibited books, conformably to the rules of the Index; (sect. 2, 3;) for it is evident from experience that the holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit.’ (Rule iv.) And this is the more to be dreaded in times so depraved, when our holy religion is assailed from every quarter with great cunning and effort, and the most grievous wounds are inflicted on the Church. It is therefore necessary to adhere to the salutary Decree of the Congregation of the Index, (June 13th, 1757,) that no version of the Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted, except such as are approved by the apostolic see, or published with annotations extracted from the writings of holy Fathers of the Church.

“ We confidently hope that, in these turbulent circumstances, the Poles will give the clearest proofs of their attachment to the religion of their ancestors; and, by your care, as well as that of the other Prelates of this kingdom, whom, on account of the stand they have wonderfully made for the depository of the faith, we congratulate in the Lord; trusting that they all may very abundantly justify the opinion we have entertained of them.

“It is, moreover, necessary that you should transmit to us as soon as possible the Bible which Jacob Wulek published in the Polish language, with a commentary, as well as a copy of the edition of it lately put forth without those annotations taken from the writings of the holy Fathers of our Church, or other learned Catholics, with your opinion upon it; that thus, from collating them together, it may be ascertained, after mature investigation, that certain errors lie insidiously concealed therein, and that we may pronounce our judgment on this affair, for the preservation of the true faith.

“Continue, therefore, venerable brother, to pursue this truly pious course, upon which you have entered; namely, diligently to fight the battles of the Lord for the sound doctrine, and warn the people intrusted to your care, that they fall not into the snares which are prepared for their everlasting ruin. The Church demands this from you, as well as from the other Bishops, whom our rescript equally concerns; and we most anxiously expect it, that the deep sorrow we feel on account of this new species of tares, which an adversary has so abundantly sown, may by this cheering hope be somewhat alleviated; and we always very heartily invoke the choicest blessings upon yourself and your fellow-Bishops for the good of the Lord's flock, which we impart to you and them by our apostolic benediction.

“Given at Rome, at St. Mary the Greater, June 29th, 1816, the seventeenth year of our pontificate.

“PIUS, P. VII.”

4. Extract from the Bull of Pope Leo XII., to the Irish Clergy, dated May 3, 1824.

“It is no secret to you, venerable brethren, that a certain Society, vulgarly called THE BIBLE SOCIETY, is audaciously dispreparing itself through the whole world. After despising the traditions of the holy Fathers, and in opposition to the well-known Decree of the Council of Trent, this Society has collected all its forces, and directs every means to one object,—the *translation*, or rather the *perversion*, of the Bible into the

vernacular languages of all nations. From this fact there is strong ground of fear, lest, as in some instances already known, so likewise in the rest, through a perverse interpretation, there be framed out of the Gospel of Christ a gospel of man, or, what is worse, a gospel of the devil."

## LECTURE II.

### THE ONE HEAD OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I CANNOT proceed to the subject of this evening's discourse, without expressing the gratitude which I felt last Sabbath, at the interest which was taken in the subject of the opening Lecture of this series,—“The one source of religious truth.”—And for the sake of those who were not present on that occasion, as well also with a view of refreshing the memories of those who were, I will repeat, in few words, the conclusions to which we came; which, I am bold to say, must have been undeniable in the view of every candid Catholic or Protestant who was present.

Our time was chiefly occupied in defending *three Protestant principles*:

FIRST, we entered our protest against any addition whatever to the Holy Scriptures as binding upon the faith and practice of the Church.

We showed (1) that Protestants reject *the Apocrypha*, on the authority of the Universal Church of Christ for the first four centuries of its existence, and on the distinct authority of the earliest fathers; in support of which statement we adduced the testimony of the celebrated Catholic historian Dupin.

We showed (2) that Protestants reject *all oral traditions* as a rule of faith, because there is no satisfac

tory evidence that such traditions exist; and we farther quoted the opinion of Theophilus Alexander and Jerome, that no truth or doctrine can be established but by the authority of the *written* word of God.

We showed (3) that Protestantism rejects *the authority of the fathers* as a rule of faith; we pointed out their inconsistencies with themselves and their disagreements with each other; and we gave you an illustration from the works of Cardinal Bellarmine, of the manifold difference of their views on texts of importance in the Protestant controversy; thus demonstrating the positive inconsistency of the oath taken by every minister of the Roman Catholic Church,—“I will never take nor interpret the Scriptures, but by the unanimous consent of the Fathers.”

The SECOND principle of Protestantism which we defended, was the absolute sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for the guidance of the Church in all matters of doctrine and practice. This was supported principally by an appeal to the Scriptures themselves as rendered in Roman Catholic versions of the Bible.

The THIRD principle of Protestantism, for which we contended, was thus enunciated: “It is the privilege of every man to approach the fountain of truth, the Bible, and to draw freely from its streams.” This principle was maintained on three grounds; on the presumptive evidence derived from the facts that the Scriptures were written in the vulgar tongue, and that they were delivered either by mouth or epistle to the people generally; on the direct evidence which the Scriptures furnish by both precept and example, that it

behoveth every Christian to search the Scriptures; and on the authority of the ancient Fathers, who, as we demonstrated from their own writings, enjoined upon the members of the Church in their day the general reading of the Word of God.

From these several considerations, arguments and testimonies, we reached the conclusion that "THE BIBLE IS THE ONE ONLY SOURCE OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH."

I most cordially repeat, this evening, the twofold profession which I volunteered a week ago, namely, that it will be my continual purpose to avoid the utterance of a single word that shall even offend the taste, and much less grieve the mind of any of my hearers; and that unless there be a distinct announcement to the contrary, every passage of Scripture quoted in support of the principles of Protestantism will be taken verbatim from one of the Roman Catholic versions of the Sacred Scriptures.

And now I invite you to a serious and prayerful contemplation of the subject to be brought before you this evening,—

"THE ONE HEAD OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH."

This is a subject which will afford an opportunity of educating some of the leading peculiarities of the Protestant system, those I mean which especially distinguish it from Roman Catholicism. I have chosen as my text, a passage which occurs in the epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians, and which you will find in the first chapter,

at the 18th and 19th verses. It is thus rendered in the Douay Bible :—

“AND HE IS THE HEAD OF THE BODY, THE CHURCH, WHO IS THE BEGINNING, THE FIRST-BORN FROM THE DEAD; THAT IN ALL THINGS, HE MAY HOLD THE PRIMACY: BECAUSE, IN HIM, IT HATH WELL-PLEASSED THE FATHER, THAT ALL FULNESS SHOULD DWELL.”

Our investigation this evening will comprehend two general enquiries :—

First, What is the Church, the Catholic Church ?

Second, Who is the Head of this Church ?

WHAT IS THE CHURCH? And it may be well to announce at once, that the principle upon which I shall pursue this inquiry is that which is laid down by St. Augustine in his controversy with the Donatists: “Let them,” says he, “show me their Church; not in the councils of their Bishops, not in the writings of disputers, not in the miracles and prodigies of which they boast; but let them show it me in the ordinances of the law, in the predictions of the prophets, in the songs of the Psalms, in the preaching of the Evangelists, and in the canonical authorities of the sacred books. This is our foundation, to which we inviolably attach ourselves, reposing only upon this Scripture which is come from the Prophets and Apostles.”

As my special object in these Lectures is to expound the principles of Protestantism, it will be necessary here to state what Protestants mean by “the Church,” as well as by the epithet “Catholic,” which they not unfrequently prefix to it. We mostly adopt that member

of the Apostle's creed, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." But then what meaning do we attach to the expression? As an answer to this demand I shall transcribe the definition of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, who met about the year 1645, and agreed upon that celebrated "Confession of Faith," which was afterwards ratified by both ecclesiastical and parliamentary authority, as "part of the covenanted uniformity in religion betwixt the Churches of Christ in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland:"—

"The Catholic or Universal Church," say they, "which is invisible, consists in the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ, the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

"The visible Church," say they again, "which is also Catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined (i. e.) to one nation as before under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

The article of the Church of England on this subject is as follows:—

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

The literal meaning of the Greek word *ἐκκλησία*

which is rendered "Church" in both Protestant and Catholic versions of the Scriptures, is *assembly*, and was indifferently employed, even by the inspired writers, to assemblies in general. I need only refer in illustration, to verses 32 and 39 of the nineteenth Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles:—

"Now some cried one thing, some another. For the assembly (*ἡ ἐκκλησία*) was confused, and the greater part knew not for what cause they were come together."

"And if you enquire after any other matter, it may be decided in a lawful assembly (*ἐκκλησία*.)"

The word is derived from the verb *εκκαλέω* to call out. The English word, Church, is most probably derived from a contraction of two Greek words, *κυρίου* and *δίκης*, signifying the house of the Lord.

Having given the Protestant definition of the word "Church," I shall now transcribe from the writings of Cardinal Bellarmine that definition which is most generally adopted by our Roman Catholic brethren. "The church is an assembly of men, united in the profession of one and the same Christian faith; and in the communion of the same sacraments, under the government of their lawful Pastors, but especially of the Roman Pontiff." This is the Cardinal's exposition of what the Church is. The Douay Catechism, (page 20,) declares in somewhat similar terms, that "the Church is the congregation of all the faithful under Jesus Christ, their invisible head, and His vicar upon earth, the Pope"; the same catechism goes on to say that the church consists of "a Pope or supreme head,

Bishops, Pastors, and Laity;" and, on the next page, we have the following sentence, to which I invite your special attention: "He who is not in due connexion and subordination to the Pope and general Councils, must needs be dead, and cannot be accounted a member of the Church, since from the Pope and general Councils, under Christ, we have our spiritual life and motion as Christians." In the Canon law of the Roman Catholic Church, we find the following: "The Roman Church, by the appointment of our Lord, is the mother and mistress of all the faithful."

And now you will be prepared for this *general statement or declaration*.

That the Reformed Churches of Christendom protest against the assumption, by any particular church, and therefore by the Church of Rome, of the right to apply to itself alone, the title of Catholic or Universal.

FIRST,—They deny this right on the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Let any Roman Catholic produce, even from his own admired versions of the New Testament, a single passage which in the smallest degree favours the doctrine that the Church of Rome was ordained by Christ and His Apostles, to be the one only true Church on earth, the mother and mistress of all Churches, and I will at once lay aside this Protestant robe, and present myself to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Montreal as a candidate for admission into his communion. But is it so? I open the Douay Bible on the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and I read in the first verse, that at the time of Stephen's martyrdom, "there was raised a great persecution

against the Church which was *at Jerusalem.*" Now Peter founded this Church on the day of Pentecost ; it was therefore the first Christian Church ever established ; in the midst of it was held the first Christian Council that ever assembled ; and at this Council, though Peter was present, and addressed its members, you do not find either in the Acts of the Apostles, or in any authenticated copy of the Fathers, even the shadow of an intimation that he assumed authority over the other Apostles. So far from this, we learn from the nineteenth verse of the fifteenth chapter, that *James* pronounced the decretory sentence—"For which cause I judge that they who from among the Gentiles are converted to God, are not to be disquieted ;"—which, as says Chrysostom, whose authority my Roman Catholic friends at least will not question, means, "I with authority say this," for as he immediately explains "he, (i. e. James) had the authority of the Church at Jerusalem committed to him." I pass on to the forty-first verse of this same chapter, and I read of Paul's going through Syria and Cilicia "confirming *the Churches.*" In the fifth verse of the following chapter, I find the same expression, "And *the Churches* were confirmed in the faith." Such language would not be tolerated by the Church of Rome in the present day ; she rejects the notion of several churches ; but you have seen from her own version of the New Testament that the *Apostles* spoke of various churches. I go on to consult the epistle to the Romans. There was but one Apostolic letter written to the Church at Rome, and this not by Peter but by Paul ; our Roman Catholic

friends seem to hold it in high veneration on account, as they say, "of the sublimity of the matter contained in it." Now I think you will all agree with me, that we have a right, *a priori*, to expect in this epistle some reference to the position of eminence which the Church of Rome now declares itself to have held from the days of Peter and Paul. If Rome was, as is maintained, the mistress of Churches, if Peter, as is also maintained, was the founder of the Church there, and was withal the Prince of the Apostles, might we not fairly look out for some expression of deference to the apostolic chief, and might we not anticipate that Paul would say a word or two of Rome's exalted destiny? I search the Vulgate and the Douay version in vain for any such expression; there is not a syllable which, by even the most refined torture, could be brought to support this strange opinion. I rather meet with expressions that overthrow the doctrine of the Universal dominion of the Church of Rome, for in the sixteenth chapter, the Apostle speaks "of the church that is in Cenchre." He speaks also of "the Churches of the Gentiles," and of "the Church which is in the house of Prisca and Aquila," and as he draws towards the closing sentences of his epistle, he says, "All the Churches of Christ salute you." There were, then, other Churches besides that at Rome, and they sent their ordinary salutations to the Church at Rome; ordinary I say, for a precisely similar salutation was addressed by the same Apostle to the Corinthian Church,— "The Churches of Asia salute you." The Apostle does not call the Roman Church "our Holy Mother," but addresses it in the same terms

in which he addressed every other Church to which he wrote.

The Roman Catholic Church, in common with ourselves, believes that Paul was martyred at Rome, and that immediately before his martyrdom he wrote his second letter to Timothy, Bishop of Ephesus. I will turn then, to this epistle, for surely I ought to find something about the supreme exaltation of the Church at Rome, something about Peter its asserted founder, and something about the necessity of Timothy and all other Bishops submitting themselves to the authority of the Holy See. Now, I wish every Roman Catholic present, to read out of his own Bible this epistle, for he will, I am sure, be completely baffled when I tell him that in this, Paul's dying testimony for the truth of Jesus, addressed to the Ephesian Bishop, there exists not a single reference either to the pre-eminence of Rome, or to the chiefship of Peter; he issues no command requiring subordination to the decrees of the Church there; he speaks of several persons by name, but he says not one word of Peter or of his work.

SECONDLY,—The right of the Church of Rome to assume for herself only, the title of Catholic or Universal, is denied by Protestants on the authority of the Ancient Fathers.

I feel sure that if you will only give me your attention on this important point in the Protestant controversy, I shall convince you that, appealing only to the best authenticated Catholic standards, this assumption was not by any means coeval with the establishment of the Church at Rome.

(1.) The first proof that I shall adduce will be taken from the Roman Catholic version of the epistle of Clement Bishop of Rome, to the Corinthians, written about A. D. 90. In this epistle he expostulates with them on their having deposed their ministers, and having permitted contentions amongst themselves. It will be observed that Clement here affects no superiority over the Corinthian Church, but addresses it as having equality with the Church at Rome. The commencement of the epistle runs thus : "The Church of God which worships at Rome, to the Church of God which worships at Corinth, called and sanctified by the will of God, &c.," a very different style of address from that which is now employed by the Bishop of Rome, when he writes an ecclesiastical epistle.

" 'The Apostles,' preached to us from Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ from God. Christ, therefore, was sent by God, and the Apostles by Christ; each mission was performed in its own order, by the will of God. Therefore, having received their command from him, and being certainly assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and confirmed in faith by the word of God, with the plenitude of the Holy Ghost, they went forth announcing the approach of the kingdom of God. Preaching, therefore, through regions and cities, they appointed the first fruits of those whom they approved in the spirit as Bishops and Deacons, over 'those who believed.'

"Our Apostles also, knew through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be contention about the name of Bishop. Therefore, on this account, being filled with

perfect foreknowledge, they constituted those of whom we have spoken before, and delivered a rule thenceforward for the future succession, that when they departed, other approved men should take their office and ministry. Those, therefore, who were constituted by them, or after their time, by other approved men, with the consent of the whole Church, and who fulfilled their ministry to the sheepfold of Christ, humbly, quietly, and liberally, and through a long period, obtained a distinguished report from all men, those we think it unjust to depose from their office. For it will not be accounted a light sin, if those who offer gifts without strife and with holiness, should be removed from their episcopate."

(2.) The second patristic testimony which I shall adduce is from the writings of Irenæus; and here I shall have to tax your patience for a little, because it is to the authority of this Father that our Roman Catholic friends so frequently refer in proof of the supremacy and catholicity of the Church of Rome. Listen then, to the following sentence from his work against Heresies: "We have not known the system of our salvation, except by those through whom the Gospel came to us; which then, truly, they preached, but afterwards, by the will of God, they delivered to us in the Scriptures, to be the pillar and ground of our faith." Here at least, there is no reference to the Church having been built upon Peter, but upon the Gospel Faith—this is the pillar, this the ground of saving truth.

But in the third chapter of this same book against

Heresies, there occurs the following passage, to which I invite your candid attention, because it is the strongest evidence from antiquity which the Roman Catholic Church can adduce in favour of her claims. Irenæus, then, contending against the Gnostics of his day, says, "The tradition of the Apostles being manifested through the whole world, it remains to be seen throughout the whole Church by all who wish to behold the truth. And we are able to enumerate those who were instituted Bishops by the Apostles in the Churches, and their successors to our own time, who taught and knew nothing like what these men rave about:—But since it would be tedious," he continues, "in such a volume to reckon the successions of all the Churches, we confound all those who in any manner infer what is unseemly, by the successions of the Bishops of that greatest, very ancient, and universally known Church, founded and constituted at Rome, by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, which shows the tradition which it has from the Apostles, and the faith announced to men, and descending even to us. For to this Church, on account of the more powerful principality, it must needs be that the whole Church should resort, that is, those who are faithful, from all places round about; in which Church, the tradition which is from the Apostles, has always been preserved by those round about it." This I grant is a strong passage; but let us fairly examine it, and see whether, as Roman Catholics say, it proves Irenæus to be a witness that the Bishop of Rome then possessed supreme authority over the Christian World, and that the

Church of Rome was acknowledged of right to be the mother and mistress of all Churches. Observe then,

*First*,—That this Father speaks of all the Apostles indifferently, and expressly declares that the tradition of the Apostles was given to us in the Scriptures to be the pillar and ground of our faith.

*Secondly*,—That he speaks of “the successions of all the Churches,” and expressly tells us that to avoid tediousness merely, he selected one, and that one, in his estimation, the most illustrious in the world.

*Thirdly*,—That he ascribes the establishment of the Roman Church to the joint labours of Peter and Paul, uttering not a syllable respecting the primacy of Peter.

*Fourthly*,—That with respect to “the more powerful principality” of which he speaks, Irenæus does not use one word which connects this principality with the Church, or with its Bishops. He simply says, “to this Church on account of the more powerful principality,” not on account of its or her, but the more powerful principality:—“*Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentioris principalem necessesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam.*” I think the candid hearer will agree with me that the fair interpretation to be put upon these words is this: “That on account of the more powerful principality of Rome, where was held the seat of the imperial government, where was the Capitol from which the decrees of the Roman Senate went forth throughout the globe; in which were concentrated all the wealth, the learning, the ambition, the pleasures, and the interests of millions, and which was at once the head and the heart of that most mighty of empires, it must

needs have been that the Church founded there, and flourishing there, was regarded with peculiar interest by the minor Churches around it—that it was the richest, the most numerous, the most influential, and the most important Church in the general esteem of Christians, by reason of its peculiar location.” Nothing could be more natural than that it should be so regarded. We meet daily with similar cases amongst every denomination of Christians. We see, even amongst ourselves, that it does not require a prelatical form of government to impart to a Church influence and power. Let a church, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, or Methodist, be established in any metropolis; let it rise to the position of a wealthy, a numerous, a benevolent church; let it be served by ministers of talent and experience, and by officers of repute in the state as well as in the church;—I ask you what would be the influence of such a church upon the surrounding country churches? Precisely that which Irenæus ascribes to the Church at Rome in the passage now under consideration. It is a satisfaction to know that this view of the language of Irenæus is taken by a celebrated Roman Catholic author, the learned Touttée, the translator of Cyril.

But we have the testimony of Irenæus himself that this, and no other must have been his view. In the second century there was a controversy between Victor, the Bishop of Rome and the Churches of Asia, about the time of keeping Easter: and the eastern churches, refusing to change their custom for the sake of conforming to the practice of Rome, Victor undertook to

excommunicate them. For this high-handed stretch of power he was generally censured, and amongst the rest, Irenaeus wrote him a letter of expostulation, of which the following is a part :—

“But those elders, who, before Soter, governed the Church over which you now preside, (i. e., the Church of Rome,) namely Anicetus, and Pius, and Hyginus, with Telesphorus and Sixtus, neither observed this custom themselves, nor allowed those who were with them to observe it. Nevertheless, although they did not observe it, yet they preserved peace with those who came to them from these Churches in which it was observed.————And when the most blessed Polycarp came to Rome, in the time of Anicetus, and there was a little controversy between them about other things, they embraced each other presently with the kiss of peace, not greatly contending about this question. For neither could Anicetus ever persuade Polycarp to cease this thing, because he had lived familiarly with John, the disciple of our Lord, and with the other apostles, and observed their custom continually. Nor, on the other hand, could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, since Anicetus said that he retained the custom of those elders who were before him. When matters were thus situated, they communed together; and Anicetus yielded to Polycarp, as a token of respect, the office of consecrating the offering in the Church; and at length they departed from each other in peace, as well those who observed this custom, as those who observed it not, keeping the peace of the whole Church.”

Now I put it to my Roman Catholic hearers whether this letter, or its sentiments rather, is not utterly at variance with the interpretation which their Church seeks to put on the before mentioned passage. If Irenæus had intended to teach that it was necessary for the whole Church to agree with the Church of Rome, how could he justify Polycarp in differing from that church? How could Anicetus be held out as a worthy example for Victor, in giving the kiss of peace to the Bishop of Smyrna, at the very time that he was obstinately refusing to conform to the supremacy of Rome? If, according to your doctrine, Rome was even then the acknowledged mother and mistress of all churches, if the Bishop of Rome, as your canon tells us, held by divine institution the place of God and of Christ upon the earth, tell me, how Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, and the companion of the apostles, could be so ignorant of these mighty prerogatives as to hold a controversy with the then Pope? Tell me how it was that Victor, Christ's vicar upon earth, as you call him, gave the kiss of peace to one who resisted his authority? And tell me, lastly, how it was that the Bishop of Smyrna, was permitted to take precedence of the Bishop of Rome in the consecration of the Holy Sacrament.

Having thus produced the testimony of both Scripture and the Fathers against the assumption of the Church of Rome, in applying to herself alone the title of Universal, and in asserting her right to govern, ecclesiastically, entire Christendom,—I produce

THIRDLY,—The testimony of acknowledged history in

support of the Protestant view. Eusebius, in his invaluable history, has preserved several epistles of the Emperor Constantine, through whose zeal and devotion the Church obtained so signal a victory over Heathenism. Two of these epistles throw considerable light on this subject:—

“ Copy of the Emperor’s epistle, in which he orders a Council of Bishops to be held at Rome, for the unity and peace of the Church.

‘ Constantine Augustus, to Miltiades, Bishop of Rome, and to Marcus. As many communications of this kind have been sent to me from Anulinus, the most illustrious proconsul of Africa, in which it is contained that Cæcilianus, the bishop of Carthage, is accused, in many respects, by his colleagues in Africa; and as this appears to be grievous, that in those provinces which divine Providence has freely entrusted to my fidelity, and in which there is a vast population, the multitude are found inclining to deteriorate, and in a manner divided into two parties, and among others, that the bishops are at variance; I have resolved that the same Cæcilianus, together with ten bishops, who appear to accuse him, and ten others, whom he himself may consider necessary for his cause, shall sail to Rome; that before you, as also Reticus, Maternus, and Marinus, your colleagues, whom I have commanded to hasten to Rome for this purpose, he may be heard, as you may understand most consistent with the most sacred law.’ ”

“ Copy of the epistle in which he commanded another council to be held, for the purpose of removing all the dissension of the bishops.

‘Constantine Augustus, to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse. As certain persons, some time ago, perversely and wickedly began to dissent from the holy religion of celestial virtue, and to abandon the doctrine of the Catholic Church, desirous, therefore, of preventing such disputes among them, I had given orders, that this subject, which appeared to be agitated among them, should be rectified, by delegating certain bishops from Gaul, and summoning others of the opposite parties from Africa, who are pertinaciously and incessantly contending with one another, the bishop of Rome being also present, that by a careful examination in their presence, that which seems to be in contest might be thus decided. But since, as it happens, some forgetful of their own salvation, and the reverence due to our most holy religion, even now do not cease to protract their own enmity, being unwilling to conform to the decision already promulgated,——it has appeared necessary to me to provide that this matter, which ought to have ceased after the decision was issued, by their own voluntary agreement, now at length, should be fully terminated by the intervention of many.

“Since, therefore, we have commanded many bishops to meet together from different and remote places, in the city of Arles, towards the Calends of August, we have also thought proper to write to thee, that taking a public vehicle from the most illustrious Latronianus, corrector of Sicily, and taking with thee two others of the second rank which thou mayest select, also three servants to afford you services on the way, you may meet them within the same day at the aforesaid place :

that by thy firmness and the prudence and unanimity of the rest that assemble, this dispute, which has continued incessantly until the present time, in the midst of most disgraceful contentions, may be discussed, by hearing all that shall be alleged by those who are now at variance, whom we have also commanded to be present; and thus the controversy be reduced, at length, to that observance of faith and fraternal concord, which ought to prevail.' ”

I appeal to you, could these epistles have been consistently written, if the doctrine which is now contended for by the Church of Rome, had been then understood and prevalent? How, if the Church and Bishop of Rome were then pre-eminent, could Constantine have committed the charge of a Council of Bishops, meeting in Italy, to the Bishop of Syracuse? How could Constantine have transferred to this council the decision of a question which another council, at which the Pope was present, failed to settle? Tell me, how it is, if the Roman Catholic doctrine is true, that Constantine writes to the Bishop of Rome conjointly with Marcus, and merely as an equal and a colleague with Reticus, Maternus, and Marinus? Tell me why it was that the Bishop of Rome did not convoke these councils? for, according to the Roman Catholic doctrine this was his prerogative. And tell me, lastly, if the Roman Church, by the appointment of our Lord, is the mother and mistress of all the faithful, how it is that the celebrated Eusebius, one of the most learned men of his day, from whom we have just quoted, writing a book on the History of the Church for the first three hundred

and twenty years of the Christian era, honoured by a place in the Canon law of the Catholic Church, placed on her list of saints, and called by her the father of ecclesiastical history,—tell me, I repeat, how it is that that celebrated man knew nothing of this vast prerogative which the Church assumes, that he records nothing which at all resembles it, but on the contrary records so much which is utterly opposed to it ?

FOURTHLY,—The assumption for her sole dignity of the designation Catholic, is inconsistent with the doctrine of the Church of Rome herself. You all know how commonly the advocates of Roman Catholicism insist upon unity as essential to Catholicity; so much so, that the want of visible unity in Protestantism is the argument which they ply against us with greatest frequency and power. Now we affirm, without fear of contradiction, because we shall prove it from Roman Catholic writers of authority, that the Church of Rome is absolutely destitute of this mark of Catholicity; out of her own mouth, therefore, and not ours, are we prepared to disprove her asserted right.

The Church of Rome is not united on the doctrine of infallibility. Some place it in the Church virtual, or the Roman Pontiff. This may be designated the Italian opinion, and it has been believed and propagated by Popes, Cardinals, Councils, and Doctors of the Church; amongst whom I might mention Popes Pius, Leo, Boniface, Cardinals and Doctors Bellarmine, Pole, Baroni, Turrecremata, and the Councils of Florence, Lateran, and Trent. The majority of those who adopt this view, refer the infallibility to questions of faith,

and admit the Pope's liability to error in fact. But the *Jesuit* portion of the Church, which is rapidly extending its doctrine and influence, acknowledge the Pope to be unerring in both these respects. "The Pope," say they, (I quote on the authority of Caron in his *Remonstrantio*,) "is not less infallible, in questions of fact or right, than was Jesus Christ." But the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, as maintained by the Italian School, and supported by the Popes, Cardinals and Councils already mentioned, has also been rejected by similar authority. "It is certain," says Pope Adrian, "that the Pontiff may err in those things which relate to faith." "It is not to be doubted, that both I and my successors may err," says Paul. "The French and other moderns," says *Dens*, "impugn the infallibility of the Pope." The Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil, have also rejected these superhuman pretensions, and place infallibility in a general council. An assembly of this kind, in their estimation, is superior to the Pope, who, in case of disobedience, is subject to deposition by the same authority. There is a third opinion on this subject, sustained by eminent names, which reposes infallibility not in any general council, but in a general council convoked, presided over, and confirmed, by the Bishop of Rome. There is even a fourth opinion which spreads the infallible power over the universal church. To this opinion, however, there are not many adherents.

Now, brethren and hearers, I ask you whether, if Unity is an infallible test of Catholicity, the Church of Rome can lay claim to be entitled the Catholic Church of Christ? Here is a doctrine of great moment in their

ecclesiastical scheme, respecting which there is a complete disunion of opinion : and I put it to my Roman Catholic friends this evening, whether it is kind or just to taunt their Protestant neighbours with want of unity, while there is so great a division in their own communion on this, to them at least, vital question.

Again, there are diversities between the doctrines of the Church of Rome as now held, and those which were held in earlier periods of her history; that are completely subversive of her claim to unity. I have only time for one or two instances :—

The Council of Trent declares that the Pope of Rome is Christ's vicar, and hath the supreme power over the whole church; and that without subjection to him, as such, there is no salvation. Is there any unanimity between this doctrine and that propounded by Gregory the Great in his first Epistle, in which he says "For one Bishop to set himself over the rest, and to have them in subjection to him, is the pride of Lucifer and the forerunner of Antichrist?" I might multiply quotations illustrative of such diversity, but the time fails.

What then is the Catholic Church? I reply,—It is the whole body of Christ's redeemed ones in earth and in heaven. With Cardinal Bellarmine, I acknowledge that the Catholic Church of Christ is divided into two portions,—the Church triumphant, which is before the throne of God and the Lamb, and the Church militant, which is now on earth fighting its way through the wilderness, towards the heavenly Canaan. And so we often sing those simple but sublime stanzas :—

“The Church triumphant in thy love  
 Their mighty joys we know,  
 They sing the Lamb in hymns above,  
 And we in hymns below.

“Thee in thy glorious realm they praise,  
 And bow before thy throne ;  
 We in the kingdoms of thy grace,  
 The kingdoms are but one.”

What is the Catholic Church on earth ? It is the whole body of Christ's believing disciples throughout the world :—It embraces all the branches of the living vine united in our divine stock :—all the living stones of that spiritual temple which is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone :—all the members of that spiritual body, of which Christ is the head and the divine Spirit, the soul :—all those who, by faith in Christ, are washed and sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God :—all those scattered throughout the world who are new creatures in Christ Jesus, and who live a life of faith in the Son of God who hath loved them, and given himself for them. Call them what you will, bring them from where you will ; find them in any one of the manifold ecclesiastical divisions of which Christendom is composed ; bring them out of the Roman Catholic Church, or out of the Protestant Episcopal Communion, or out of the Presbyterian Churches ; I care not : let them but be found trusting only in the merits of a crucified Saviour, let them but be found bringing forth the fruits of faith and love, let them but be found with an indwell-

ing Jesus, as the hope of glory in their hearts,—on the authority of the word of God, I call them members of “the body of the Church.” I believe with Chrysostom, that “where pure faith is, there the church is; but where pure faith is not, there the church is not.”

There is a church on earth, not always visible to men, but like the seven thousand in the days of Elijah, known only to God. There is a church on earth in which Jehovah delights, and upon which he sheds an illustrious glory. Come with me this evening round about her, and mark her foundations: see your Divine Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the chief corner stone;—look at Peter and Paul, and James and John, making up with him the glorious foundation;—see Stephen and his brother martyrs, see Timothy and Titus, Polycarp and Clement, with their brother elders in the church, imparting strength and height and beauty to the walls;—contemplate the myriads of unknown spiritual stones that have been inserted by the Divine Architect, to give compactness and symmetry to the whole. Walk about her, and see how century after century has contributed its stratum of spiritual masonry, see how each is bound to each, and all to Christ by that love which is the bond of perfectness. And still the structure rises! one believer and another and yet others are built upon it day after day; its towers point towards heaven; already can we anticipate what it will be; its beautiful proportions, its simple grandeur, its pure and graceful ornaments stand out to view; and oh! when, leaving the spot from which we look upon its exterior, we enter the vestibule and pass within,—

what scenes of beauty and purity, of majesty and glory, burst upon our astonished gaze! The altar is there, the cross in which we glory; the sacrifice is there, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world; the Priest is there, the Great High Priest, Jesus, the Son of God; the incense is there, the prayers of the saints; the holy water is there in the laver of regeneration; the spirits of the departed saints are there, ministering with angels for the heirs of salvation; the Holy Spirit is there, like a dove, hovering over the whole scene, and sending forth his gentle and sanctifying influences upon the assembled worshippers. "Holiness unto the Lord" is written over the altar; and on one side we read the inscription—"Glory to God in the highest," and on the other side—"Peace on earth, good-will towards men."

And now we are to inquire "WHO IS THE HEAD OF THIS CATHOLIC CHURCH?"

The way to the solution of this question has been so completely paved by our previous investigations, that a few plain steps will lead us immediately to it. "Who is the Head of the Catholic Church? The text answers the question, and I read it again:—"And He is the Head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he may hold THE PRIMACY."

Protestants assert that CHRIST is the One Head of the Catholic Church; Roman Catholics, as we have already seen, assert that there are two Heads; 1st, Christ in Heaven; 2d, His Vicar, the Pope, on earth.

I wish to read to you an extract from a well known

Roman Catholic work, "*Ferraris Bibliotheca Prompta*," which is an authorised standard of Roman Catholic divinity. The extract may be found in the Frankfort edition, printed in 1783, under the word "PAPA."

"The Pope is of such dignity and highness, that he is not simply man, but, as it were, God, and the Vicar of God. Hence the Pope is of such supreme and sovereign dignity that, properly speaking, he is not merely constituted in dignity, but is rather placed on the very summit of dignities. Hence also the Pope is 'Father of Fathers;' and he alone can use this name, because he only can be called 'Father of Fathers,' since he possesses the primacy over all, is truly greater than all, and the greatest of all. He is called 'most holy,' because he is presumed to be such. On account of the excellency of his supreme dignity, he is called 'Bishop of Bishops, Ordinary of Ordinaries, universal Bishop of the Church, Bishop or Diocesan of the whole world, divine Monarch, supreme Emperor and King of Kings.' Hence the Pope is crowned with a triple crown, as King of heaven, of earth, and of hell. Nay, the Pope's excellence and power is not only about heavenly, terrestrial and infernal things, but he is also above angels, and is their superior; so that if it were possible that angels could err from the faith, or entertain sentiments contrary thereto, they could be judged and excommunicated by the Pope. He is of such great dignity and power, that he occupies one and the same tribunal with Christ; so that whatsoever the Pope does, seems to proceed from the mouth of God, as is proved from many Doctors. The Pope is, as it were, God on earth,

the only Prince of the faithful of Christ, the greatest King of all Kings, possessing the plenitude of power, to whom the government of the earthly and heavenly kingdom is intrusted. Hence the common doctrine teacheth, that the Pope hath the power of the two swords; namely, the spiritual and temporal, which jurisdiction and power Christ himself committed to Peter and his successors: 'To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' &c.: (Matt. xvi.): where Doctors note that he did not say 'key,' but 'keys,' and by this comprehending the temporal and spiritual power: which opinion is abundantly confirmed by the authority of the holy Fathers, the decision of the canon and civil law, and by the apostolic constitutions."

Protestants deny that there is any authority in the Word of God for these assumptions. The passage upon which rests the whole claim of the Pope and Church of Rome to so pre-eminent a dignity is found in the sixteenth chapter of the Gospel by St. Matthew, at the eighteenth and following verses:—"I say to thee that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

Upon this passage I desire to make two or three brief observations.

(1.) It is conceded on all hands that the literal meaning of the text is, "Thou art *a stone*, and upon this *rock*," &c. The two words are different—one is

πέτρος which means a small stone or pebble—the other is πέτρα which signifies a rock. The vulgate so far as the Latin language enables it to do so, maintains this distinction. “*Tu es Petrus, et super hanc Petram.*” If our Lord had said thou art a rock, and upon this *rock*, or, thou art a stone, and upon this *stone*, we might be ready to allow that the literal interpretation of the words would favour the meaning that Jesus Christ intended to affirm that he would build his church upon Peter.

(2.) Observe, that this is withal a figurative expression, and one, therefore, upon which alone a vital doctrine ought not to be made to rest.

(3.) Observe, again, that the Lord Jesus renewed this commission of Peter to all the apostles after his resurrection.—(St. John, ch. xx. 22.)

(4.) Observe lastly, that neither our Lord nor Peter’s apostolic brethren, by their conduct at least, put such a construction upon the words, as is sought to be applied to them. When the mother of Zebedee’s children made a request on behalf of her two sons, you remember how that the other apostles were filled with indignation against the two brethren. And what said their Divine Master?—“You know that the princes of the Gentiles lord it over them, and they that are the greater exercise power upon them. IT SHALL NOT BE SO AMONG YOU.” This was spoken after the declaration concerning Peter, and I ask, was it possible for the Great Teacher so to express himself if it had been his intention to make Peter the chief and prince of the apostles? We have already seen that in the first apostolic council that was held,

Peter exercised even less power and authority than James. Surely the apostles would have conceded all authority to Peter, had they understood that he was constituted by Christ their prince and leader, and if they had understood him to be placed in the stead of Christ, would have paid him that deference which they owed to Christ. And now I must beg you to look with me into the epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, and to read from the Douay Bible a few verses in the second chapter.

“9 And when they had known the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship: that we should go unto the gentiles, and they unto the circumcision:

“10 Only that we should be mindful of the poor: which same thing also I was careful to do.

“11 But when Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

“12 For before that some came from James, he did eat with the gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision.

“13 And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented, so that Barnabas also was led by them into that dissimulation.

“14 But when I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all: If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the gentiles to live as do the Jews?”

I ask you then, seriously to examine this passage. Do you find in it a syllable which could lead you to imagine that Peter was the prince and ruler of the apostles? If it were so, how comes it to pass that Paul entered upon his ministry and continued in it for three years, without securing the authority and permission of Peter for that act? (Gal. 18, &c.) What becomes of Peter's headship in view of the fact that Paul withstood him to the face? What becomes of Peter's infallibility in view of the declaration of the blessed and inspired Paul that he was to be blamed? How could Paul, the youngest in office of all the apostles, dare to charge this chief of chiefs, this ruler of rulers, this prince of princes, this foundation of the church, this first infallible Pope of Rome, as he is called by our Roman Catholic friends—how, I repeat, could he dare to charge him with dissimulation? Brethren, the whole theory which has been built upon this and one or two other texts, is completely exploded by the conduct of the apostles towards Peter.

But let us take another view of this passage. Much as it may surprise you, I am prepared to show that no minister of the Roman Catholic Church can give this interpretation of the passage without a direct violation of his oath. I showed you, last week, that every Catholic Priest has solemnly sworn "not to take or interpret the Holy Scripture, otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." Now, I hold my Roman Catholic brethren to this oath, and say, that forasmuch as the fathers are very far from unanimous on the meaning of Christ in these words, they

have no right to interpret it at all, and much less to build upon it an essential doctrine of their faith.

Tertullian was of opinion that our Lord conferred this authority upon Peter individually, for he says, speaking of the powers and claims of the church:—  
“I would know from whence you derive this right which you claim for the church? If, from our Lord’s saying, or observing to Peter, do you therefore presume this power of loosing and binding to have descended to thee, that is to the whole church which is related to Peter? If so, you are overturning and changing the manifest intention of our Lord who conferred this upon Peter individually. Upon *thee*, he says, I will build my church: To *thee* will I give the keys, not to the church.”

Origen, in his commentary on Matthew, vol. i., says:—  
“If you suppose that the church is built by God upon one single rock, Peter, what do you say of John, the son of thunder, and every one of the other apostles?”

St. Hilary, who also wrote a commentary on St. Matthew’s Gospel, speaks of this passage as follows:—  
“The confession of Peter obtained a worthy reward, for that he saw the Son of God in man. O happy foundation of the church, in the declaration of this new name! O happy door-keeper of heaven, to whose will the keys of the eternal porch are delivered!”

Ambrose says expressly: “Faith, therefore, is the foundation of the church, for it was not said of the flesh of Peter, *but of his faith*, that the gates of death should not prevail.”

Jerome is the last father, whose opinion I shall quote

respecting this passage:—"You say, says he, that the church is founded on Peter, although the same thing is elsewhere done upon all the apostles, and all received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, so that the strength of the church is consolidated upon all alike." Need I ask if it be possible to interpret this passage according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers?

But supposing we were to admit all that Roman Catholics say in relation to Peter, they would still have to show us from the testimony of Scripture and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, 1st, That he had authority to confer the same powers upon others; and, 2d, That he actually did confer them upon the Bishop of Rome. Have they done this? No! Can they do this? Echo answers "NO!"

Who then is the primate of the Catholic Church? JESUS CHRIST, and he shares not this dignity with any creature. He needeth no vicar upon earth, for "where-soever two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst." He needeth no coadjutor, for "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," and "to him all power is given in heaven and in earth." Yes, Jesus is our glorious HEAD—our wisdom, our guide, our life, our beauty, our ALL; "He is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he may hold the primacy." He alone is that spiritual king to whose authority we yield: We take upon us HIS yoke and reject every other: We sit at HIS feet, and refuse to listen to any words which are not according to his gospel. He is our primate, our chief shepherd, the

bishop of our souls. We cast ourselves before this our Divine Head, and were he present with us in body we would kiss his feet in token of our subjection. To be members of his body, to be branches in his vine, to be stones in his temple, to be members of the spiritual apostolic Catholic Church of Christ—this is the highest honour and the greatest happiness that we crave. From Him, as the giver of life, the church derives all her being; from Him, as the Sun of Righteousness, the church derives all her glory; from Him as the King of kings the church derives all her authority. We know no other ecclesiastical crown but that which adorns the brow of our blessed Emanuel; we recognize no other ecclesiastical throne but that upon which the Son of God is exalted a Prince and a Saviour; we submit to no ecclesiastical sceptre, but that which is swayed by Him whose right it is to reign, even Jesus Christ. And, believing, as the Douay Bible reads, that “he holds the PRIMACY IN ALL THINGS,” we rejoice to sing—

“ All hail the power of Jesus’ name,  
Let angels prostrate fall;  
Bring forth the royal diadem,  
AND CROWN HIM LORD OF ALL.”

## LECTURE III.

### THE ONE OBJECT OF RELIGIOUS ADORATION.

THAT the Bible is the One Source of Religious Truth, and that Jesus Christ is the sole Head of the Universal Church, are propositions whose truth has been proved, I venture to think satisfactorily, in the two preceding lectures.

The ground, then, on which we stand has been disclosed, the foundation has been made bare. The Holy Scripture is the standard of appeal in all matters of doctrine and practice; and in this Protestants only follow the example of the Fathers and the Church in the first four centuries of the Christian era:—The one only Head of the Catholic Church which comprises all the spiritual members of Christ's body, is He to whom all power is given in heaven and on earth,—our glorious Lord, our Divine King, our Almighty Redeemer; and here also, Protestants are supported not only by the Bible, but also by the most illustrious names in the early church, and, I may say also, in the Roman Catholic calendar of saints.

It is not necessary that I should farther recapitulate, but proceed at once to the subject of my present Lecture,

“THE ONE OBJECT OF RELIGIOUS ADORATION,”  
a subject which occupies a prominent place in the

controversy between ourselves and our Roman Catholic brethren. The Scripture, which I am about to read to you as a text, is found in the twenty-second chapter of the Apocalypse, at the eight and ninth verses. It reads in the Douay Bible thus:—

“AND AFTER I HAD HEARD AND SEEN, I FELL DOWN TO ADORE BEFORE THE FEET OF THE ANGEL, WHO SHEWED ME THESE THINGS.

“AND HE SAID TO ME: SEE THOU DO IT NOT: FOR I AM THY FELLOW-SERVANT, AND OF THY BRETHREN THE PROPHETS, AND OF THEM THAT KEEP THE WORDS OF THE PROPHECY OF THIS BOOK, ADORE GOD.”

In addressing myself to this delicate and confessedly difficult task, I distinctly avow my intention of advancing no statement in reference to the Roman Catholic view of the subject, except upon the testimony of authorized Catholic expositors or liturgies. It is scarcely needful to remind you that the discussion will embrace one of the strongest grounds upon which the Reformed Churches have protested, and still protest against the Church of Rome. If the charge which Protestants seek to bring home to her, in connexion with religious adoration, can be sustained, then will she stand convicted of a most fearful violation of the law of God. Protestants think that the principles and practices of Roman Catholicism are idolatrous in their nature and tendency. My desire is, that it may be found impossible to make good the charge: great would be my delight if the argument should fail, and if Protestants should, after all, be convicted of injustice to their “Catholic” friends. Let then Protestants and Catholics,

in investigating this subject, consider, at the very outset, those particulars in which they agree.

1. We all acknowledge the existence of one Supreme God, in whom we live, move, and have our being, who created all things by the word of his power, and who upholds all things by the same almighty word. I take up any of the numerous prayer books which are in use amongst the members of the Church of Rome, and I read in one of the acknowledged creeds of that Church, the Nicene: "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible." I open the prayer book of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and I read the same words in one of their Confessions of Faith. I look into the Westminster Shorter Catechism, and I find that form of faith usually designated the apostles creed, in which occur the words, "I believe in God the Father Almighty Maker of heaven and earth." "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord," saith the Catholic, and the Protestant, taking up the same orthodox note, responds, "The Lord our God is one Lord."

2. Protestants and Catholics equally acknowledge the mysterious, but, as they think, Scriptural doctrine of the Triune character of Jehovah. This doctrine I do not feel it necessary to defend this evening, because between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, it is not a disputed point. It may be well, however, and it will be only fair, to acknowledge that, in the Protestant community, there are some few, I use the expression comparatively, who adhere to the tenets of Arius, and still fewer who follow the more extreme opinions of

Socinus ; but it will be conceded, I think, that between Roman Catholics and the great mass of Protestants, there is a perfect agreement in respect of this sublime mystery of our common Christianity. I have more than once read, and with delight too, upon the altars of Roman Catholic Churches in Spain, Malta, Sicily, and elsewhere, "*Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, filium Dei, unigenitum,*" &c. ; and I have rejoiced to see it rendered into the vulgar tongue in the devotional books of the Catholic Church ;—"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all ages ; God of God ; Light of Light ; true God of true God ; begotten, not made consubstantial to the Father ; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man," &c. I go into a Protestant Episcopal Church, and in the course of the morning service, I hear, repeated by the minister and people, with a little verbal alteration, the same beautiful passages. I go into a Presbyterian Church during the ordination of a minister, and I find him subscribing to a confession of faith, in which the following passage is found : "In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity ; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding ; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father ; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son." On this second subject, therefore, there exists a general unanimity. The Roman Catholic Church chaunts

forth the praises of the Triune God, in the words, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost"; and the Reformed Churches rejoice to respond, "As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."

3. Protestants and Catholics acknowledge also the obligation of every man to worship, adore, serve, and love this exalted Three-One Jehovah.

Indeed, each of the two systems is based upon this elementary truth: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God." This is tacitly acknowledged in all those prayers and anthems of praise which are offered to the Divine Being by members of both communities. For instance, I find in a Roman Catholic book of devotion, entitled, "The Key of Heaven," and which received the imprimatur of the late Roman Catholic Archbishop, Dr. Murray, the following devotional exercises:—

"O God, to whom every heart is open, every will declares itself, and from whom no secret lies concealed, purify by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, the thoughts of our hearts; that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily serve thee: through," &c.

"Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace to men of good will. We praise thee, we bless thee, we adore thee, we glorify thee. We give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty."

Now I am free to acknowledge that more orthodox evangelical or fervent prayers and thanksgivings, could not be put into the mouth of any Christian, and I rejoice

to state that many such are to be found in the devotional books of our Roman Catholic Friends.

There is, then, no question of dispute here: We all acknowledge that God is a Spirit, and that they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth; that indeed we ought to love him with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and strength.

4. Protestants and Catholics are generally agreed as to the fearfully evil character of idolatry in the sight of God.

I open the Douay Bible, on the second commandment, and I read:

“Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth.

“Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve *them*: I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.”

To which I find appended the following note:

“All such images or likenesses, are forbidden by this commandment, as are made to be adored and served; according to that which immediately follows, *thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them*. That is, all such as are designed for *idols* or *image-gods*, or are worshipped with *divine honour*. But otherwise images, pictures, or representations, even in the house of God, and in the very sanctuary, so far from being forbidden, are expressly authorised by the word of God.”

I take up Dr. Butler's Catechism, recommended by

the four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, and find the following: "What is commanded by the first commandment? Answer, To adore one God, and to adore but him alone." I read again: "What else is forbidden by the first commandment? Answer, To give to any creature the honour due to God alone." In another catechism, I find this abhorrence of idolatry expressed yet more forcibly; and, though the copy of the work now in my hand does not appear to be sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority, I willingly quote from it, forasmuch as it is published in this city by a Roman Catholic bookseller, and, as I suppose, freely circulated and used by the members of that communion. I believe it indeed to be a reprint of an ecclesiastically authorised catechism, bearing the same title, and published and circulated in Ireland. On page thirty-seven I read: "Do you then worship the angels and saints as God, or give them the honor that belongs to God alone?" Answer, "No; God forbid. For this would be high treason against his divine majesty." In all this, I need scarcely say, Protestants are at one with their Roman Catholic brethren.

At this stage of the discussion, it will be desirable to determine, What is idolatry? Its existence we all acknowledge. We acknowledge also the tendency of the human mind, or we would rather say *heart*, in its fallen state, to seek after visible objects of worship. This, indeed, is proved by all history. First, the more glorious created objects—the sun, the moon, the stars, were deified, were worshipped as gods: then, heroes, men of renown in various pursuits, after their departure

into the spirit-world were deified, the localities of their birth, of their exploits, of their death, were venerated, rude likenesses of them were constructed in various substances, and multiplied, until they came to be revered and adored, not in one place merely, but in many places at the same time. Subsequently to this the doctrine of the metempsychosis led to the deification of the inferior animals, and thus to employ the language of St. Paul, the world "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of corruptible man, and of birds and of four-footed beasts and of creeping things." Thus originated the terrible, the God-dishonouring sin of idolatry, which has been the parent of so much cruelty and bloodshed, and moral degradation, and which, like a pestilence, has swept over the most august nations and the fairest spots of our earth, leaving upon them and upon their people, the impress of moral corruption and of spiritual death. I have witnessed idolatry in various forms and surrounded with different circumstances, but wherever I have seen it it has been attended with the same demoralizing influences—a thorough prostration of mental vigour, and an extinction of the moral perception, the influence of which extends over every grade of society and to every social relation.

In what, then, does idolatry consist?

FIRST.—It does not necessarily consist in a denial of the existence of the true God. Such a denial is no part of the system of Paganism. In Pagan nations, as also in those which are Christian, you may now and then meet a professed Atheist, but scarcely any man,

however ignorant, who worships an idol, doubts the being of an infinitely supreme and glorious Spirit. I grant that, in some of the ruder Heathen nations, the prevailing notions respecting the nature of God, are very crude and imperfect, but it is not to be forgotten, that in those countries in which Paganism has reached the magnitude and the refinement of a religious system ; the people hold doctrines concerning the divine nature not very dissimilar from those which are entertained by ourselves. For example, the eternity, the omnipotence, the omnipresence, the omniscience, the holiness, the wisdom, the benevolence of the Supreme Being are held in their integrity by the Brahminical sects of Hindostan ; but not less, on this account, are they idolaters, worshippers of images. Almost every form of man, of beast, of bird, of reptile, is worshipped as God by the intelligent, as well as by the ignorant Hindoo. In the course of my missionary labours amongst them, I do not remember meeting with more than two who denied or even doubted the being of a God.

SECONDLY.—Idolatry does not necessarily consist in withholding from the Divine Being supreme adoration. That such an adoration of the true God is compatible with the commission of the sin of idolatry, may be gathered from the history of the children of Israel. I turn, in the Douay Bible, to the Fourth Book of Kings, and I read in the seventeenth chapter, at the twenty-ninth and following verses :—

“ And every nation made gods of their own, and put them in the temples of the high places, which the

Samaritans had made, every nation in their cities where they dwelt.

“ And nevertheless they worshipped the Lord. And they made to themselves, of the lowest of the people, priests of the high places, and they placed them in the temples of the high places.

“ And when they worshipped the Lord, they served also their own gods according to the custom of the nations out of which they were brought to Samaria :”

THIRDLY.—Idolatry consists in the transfer of any religious adoration to other than God. “ I am the Lord thy God, a jealous God.” “ The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him only shalt thou serve,” is the language which our ever blessed Redeemer employed to resist the temptation of Satan, who had asked Him to “ fall down and worship him.” More particularly,—

(1.) You all acknowledge that to ascribe Divine names, titles, attributes, and works to any creature is idolatry. Now, the Reformed Churches protest against the Church of Rome, because she ascribes to the Virgin Mary such names, titles, attributes and works.

In “ the litany of our Blessed Lady of Loretto,” I find the title “ Refuge of sinners,” applied to the Mother of our Lord. But David, in the forty-sixth Psalm says : “ Our God is our refuge.” I find in the same litany the title “ Gate or door of heaven,” applied to the Virgin. Christ says “ I am the door. By *me* if any man enter in he shall be saved.” “ *I* am the way,” he again saith ;—expressions which intimate most clearly that he regarded the title as solely applicable to him-

self. Other titles are ascribed to the Virgin which certainly partake of a divine character, such as "Most holy Mary," "Queen of Angels," "Queen of Heaven," "Seat of Wisdom," "Mirror of Justice." These may be found over and over again in the devotional books of the Roman Catholic Church ; and I ask, do they not savour too much of divinity to be applied to any creature, more than which I am not aware that any Catholic ever contended the Virgin to be. It is possible, however, that you may not consider the ground of our protest to have been made, as yet at least, sufficiently clear. You may imagine that it is necessary to adduce stronger proof of the ascription of divine titles and works to the Virgin Mary. Let me then refer you to another Roman Catholic publication, and as I wish to make sure the ground on which I stand, I will mention the name of the author, his reputation in the Church of Rome, the name of the work, the place in which it was printed, the date of its publication, and the authority upon which it is circulated amongst the adherents of the Church. The author then of the work from which I quote is St. Bonaventure ; his position as a *saint*, should invest him with some authority ; he was moreover a Cardinal Bishop. There is a special service to his honour in the Liturgical books of the Roman Church, from which service the following sentence is extracted : " he, St. Bonaventure, wrote many things ; in which, combining the greatest learning with ardent piety, he affects the reader while he instructs him." In the same service there is the following prayer : " O Lord, who didst give blessed Bonaventure to thy people

for a minister of eternal salvation, grant, that he who was the instructor of our life here on earth, may become our intercessor in heaven." The work to which I allude is the Psalter of the Blessed Virgin, published in Rome as late as the year 1840, called the eleventh edition, and having the imprimatur and re-imprimatur of the ecclesiastical authorities in the Vatican. The plan of the work is to introduce the name of Mary into each of the Psalms, where now the name of God appears. The work contains other pieces of devotion, from which I give you the following specimen. It is printed in Italian, which I will first read,\* and then translate literally :

" We prefer our praises to thee, O Mother of God. We praise thee, O Mary, Virgin.

" All the earth shall reverence thee, the spouse of the Eternal Father.

" To thee, Angels and Archangels, To thee Thrones and Principalities humbly bow themselves.

" To thee all Choirs, to thee Cherubim and Seraphim, exulting worship around [thee.]

" To thee all angelic creatures sing praises with incessant voice.

" Holy, holy, holy Mary, Mother of God, both Mother and Virgin."

You agree that creation is a work of God, and that to ascribe it to a creature is idolatry ; what then will be thought of the following extract from the same book : "The heavens declare the glory of the Virgin, and the firmament showeth forth her handiwork?" I know

\* See note at the end of this Lecture.

that these extracts must be offensive to the mind of many a Roman Catholic in the congregation. I feel persuaded that they are regarded by you as not only idolatrous, but even blasphemous; I am aware too that some defenders of the Church of Rome have sought to remove the responsibility of this work from Bonaventure, the celebrated Dr. Doyle especially; but if he remove it from the Saint, he throws it upon the Church, which, from 1834 to 1840, permitted eleven editions to be published at Rome, the heart and centre of the Church, with the imprimatur of her authorities. In the face of this, Manning has asserted, without proof, that this Psalter is found in the index of Prohibited Books; which we deny; and, therefore, throw upon him, and upon any one else who makes the same assertion, the burden of proof. You must see the index yourselves before you believe that there is to be found in it, a book passing through two editions a-year for six successive years, bearing the imprimatur of the Vatican, and printed at Rome. But the evidence is irresistible that this is an authorised Roman Catholic work. Give me your attention, and I will convince you that this is the case. The first formal and entire collection of the works of Bonaventure was published in 1587, under the patronage of Sixtus the Fifth, Pope of Rome. The Psalter is included in this edition; and what is rather remarkable, there is prefixed to it a life of the Saint, by Peter Galesinius, who, on page 19, particularly specifies the Psalter as the production of Bonaventure. If these are not the present sentiments of the Church of Rome, she has changed since the days

of Sixtus V., and even since the date of the last edition of this work, the last that we have heard of, that of 1840. We have a right to hold the Church of Rome to these sentiments, or to oblige her to confess that her teaching is not uniform, and therefore that her boasted unity is fabulous.

(2.) To offer sacrifice, prayer, or praise to any creature is idolatry. This is admitted by several authorities of the Catholic Church. For instance, I find on page 40, of the grounds of Catholic doctrine, a work from which I have already quoted the following question and answer :

“ Q. Do Catholics pray to saints ?

“ A. If by praying to saints, you mean addressing ourselves to them, as to the authors or disposers of grace and glory, or in such a manner as to suppose they have any power to help us independently of God's good will and pleasure, we do not pray to them.”

From this it is clear, that the Church of Rome regards positive prayer, and dependance upon any creature as idolatrous and sinful. We accept this exposition, and state that the Reformed Churches protest against the Church of Rome, because its members are taught in their devotional works to present absolute prayer and praise to the Virgin, and to place absolute dependance upon her.

I find in the litany of our Blessed Lady of Loretto, the following prayer : “ We fly to thy patronage, O sacred Mother of God ; despise not our prayers in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O glorious and blessed ever Virgin.” Is not this addressing absolute prayer to a creature ?

My next proof is taken from the Encyclical letter of Pope Gregory the XVI., dated August 15, 1832: "We select for the date of our letter this most joyful day, on which we celebrate the solemn festival of the most blessed Virgin's triumphant assumption into heaven, that she who has been, through every great calamity, our patroness and protectress, may watch over us writing to you, and lead our mind, by her heavenly influence, to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock.

"But that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope. (St. Bernard. Serm. de Nativ. B. V. M., sect. vii.) May she exert her patronage to draw down an efficacious blessing on our desires, our plans, and proceedings, in the present straitened condition of the Lord's flock. We will also implore, in humble prayer, from Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and from his fellow-Apostle Paul, that you may all stand as a wall to prevent any other foundation than what hath been laid."

I adduce, as another proof some petitions which occur in a small devotional work, entitled, "Il Tesoro dell'Anima," The treasure of the soul. It was printed in Naples in 1842, and is in general use throughout the kingdom of the two Sicilies. On page 70, we have the following specimens of absolute prayer:

"O most afflicted soul of the Virgin give me consolation.

“O most adorable body of my dear Mother, comfort me.

“O most loving tears of the Queen of Paradise purify me.

“Receive for thy servant me, who love and trust thee. In the hour of my death aid me, to the end, that with all the elect I may glorify thee for ever and ever. Amen.”

I now hold in my hand a work by Saint Alphonso de Liguori, entitled *Le Pouvoir de Marie*, published “with the approbation and under the patronage of the Archbishops and Bishops of Paris, Tours, Nevers, Luçon, etc.” From this volume, which is well known and much read by the French Canadian portion of our community, I shall read two extracts illustrative of the teaching on this subject of eminent members of the Roman Catholic Church.

The first is an absolute prayer to the Virgin :

“O Mary, my refuge, how often have I not felt myself to be, through my sins, the slave of Hell ! You have broken my bonds, you have snatched me from the hands of my fierce enemies ; but I tremble from fear of again falling into their power, for I know that their rage has no repose, and that they expect me yet to become their prey. Holy Virgin ! be my buckler and my defence ; with your aid I am sure to conquer ; but grant that I may never forget to invoke you in my conflicts, and especially in this last, the most terrible of all, when the demon expects to betray me at the last hour. Put you your name upon my lips and in my heart, and may I expire while pronouncing this name

to the end, that I may find myself at your feet in heaven. Amen."

The second is an account of a vision, whose teaching is neither more nor less than an exaltation of the power and mercy of Mary beyond those of our Divine Lord:—

"We read in the Chronicles of the Franciscans, that Brother Leo, once had the following vision: 'He saw two ladders, one red, at the top of which was Jesus Christ, the other white, at the top of which the Virgin Mary had placed herself. Several attempted to ascend by the first ladder, they mounted a few steps then fell, they again attempted it with no greater success. No one arrived at the summit. At this crisis a voice cried to them to turn to the white ladder, and having done so, they happily ascended, for the benevolent Virgin held out her hand to aid them.'"

I know that my Roman Catholic friends will say, "Such expressions as those do not escape our lips." Some of them, I grant you, do not, others of them, however, are taken from devotional books which are in common use in this city. But, in respect of those petitions that occur in books, which, though you have never seen them, are sanctioned by the proper ecclesiastical authorities, you surely will not venture to protest against these, you surely will not reject the prescriptions of your own Catholic Church, you will not surely disavow the sentiments which I have now read from the Pope's encyclical letter, you are bound by your own vows, bound by every principle of your church, to pay the same deference to these sentiments as you are intending to pay to the Pastoral letter which has lately

reached this country from the sacred congregation, respecting subjects that relate to the government of your church. We hold you, my dear friends, and your church, to the doctrines which we have gathered from these works, freely circulated as they are in Catholic Countries, until their authors shall have been denounced, and the books themselves introduced into the *Index expurgatorum et prohibitorum*.

We have then proved, satisfactorily, as I think, that Divine titles and works, are ascribed to the Virgin Mary by authority of the Church of Rome, and that the members of that church present absolute worship to her, and place an absolute trust in her. Against this, the Reformed Churches raise their solemn protest.

FIRST,—On the authority of the Word of God.

And here I will read at once from the Douay Bible that passage upon which the Roman Catholic Church chiefly relies for the *honor* and *reverence*, as she calls it, for the *adoration*, as we call it, which she pays to the blessed mother of Jesus Christ. It is found in the first chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke, at the twenty-eighth verse.

The chief stress is laid upon the 48th verse; “Behold, from henceforth, all generations shall call me blessed.” Now I ask what does this prove? Is it intended to be urged that this is a sufficient warrant for those honours which are paid to the Virgin? The argument proves too much. “Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.” But let us turn to the Book of Judges. In the fifth chapter, I find

the canticle of Debora and Barac, and I read the following passage in the twenty-fourth verse: "Blessed among women, be Jahel, the wife of Haber." Am I then on the ground of this passage to regard Jael as worthy of religious reverence and homage? And yet, so far as the text is concerned, we have as much authority for the one as for the other. But let us see how Jesus, the Son of Mary, understood this passage. He, the founder of Christianity, knew what position his Mother should assume in the church which he established. He knew whether she was or was not the Queen of Angels, the Queen of Heaven, the Gate of Heaven, the Most Holy, the Seat of Wisdom, the Refuge of Sinners; and if the Roman Catholic doctrine be true, I have a right to expect that, by both words and actions, Jesus Christ would intimate, to his disciples at least, the exalted reverence which was due to her who bare him. Let us then search the Scriptures whether these things are so. I turn to the Douay Bible, and open it at the second chapter of St. John's Gospel. I read in the first few verses:

"And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee: and the mother of JESUS was there.

"2. And JESUS also was invited, and his disciples, to the marriage.

"3. And the wine failing, the mother of JESUS saith to him: They have no wine.

"4. And JESUS saith to her: Woman, what is it to me and to thee? my hour is not yet come."

I will give my hearers the benefit of the note which is subscribed:—

“ *What is to me, &c.* These words of our Saviour spoken to his mother have been understood by some commentators as harsh, they not considering the next following verse : *Whatsoever he shall say to you, do ye* which plainly shews that his mother knew of the miracles that he was to perform, and that it was at her request he wrought it; besides the manner of speaking the words as to the tone, and the countenance shewn at the same time, which could only be known to those who were present, or from what had followed: for words indicating anger in one tone of voice, would be understood quite the reverse in another.”

But look again : what a comment on the words “blessed art thou amongst women,” does our Lord Jesus Christ furnish in the eleventh chapter of the Gospel by Luke (ver. 27) ?

“ And it came to pass : as he spoke these things a certain woman from the crowd lifting up her voice said to him : Blessed is the womb that bore thee, and the paps that gave thee suck.”

Not less forcible is the comment which he pronounced on another occasion, and which is recorded in the eighth chapter (ver. 19, 20, 21).

“ And his mother and brethren came unto him ; and they could not come at him for the crowd.”

“ And it was told him : Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee.

“ Who answering said to them : My mother and my brethren, are they who hear the word of God, and do it.”

And now let me conduct you to a scene upon which

angels gazed with holy reverence, and upon which many in this Church have often gazed in imagination with sacred joy and grief. I take you to the heights of Calvary on the day of the Saviour's crucifixion ; see your Jesus hanging upon the cross ; see there the blood streaming from his temples, from his outstretched hands, from his nailed feet ; contemplate his fearful agony ;

See from his head, his hands, his feet,  
Sorrow and love flow mingled down ;  
Did ere such love and sorrow meet,  
Or thorns compose so rich a crown ?

See at the foot of the cross looking on with mournful anxiety, the mother of Jesus, and the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdelene, and with them the beloved John. Now mark the affection of the man Christ Jesus ! “When Jesus therefore had seen his mother, and the disciple standing whom he loved, he saith to his mother, woman, behold thy son. After that he saith to his disciple, behold thy mother.” What tenderness is here displayed ! what pity ! what kindness ! Who can but admire the filial care of the Son of Man, so strikingly exhibited at the very moment that he was bearing the sin of the whole world ! But is there any reference to the high dignity with which the Church of Rome seeks to invest her ? Does it not seem to you impossible that such an address should have been presented by the Lord Jesus Christ to Mary and John, were the Roman Catholic theory scriptural and evangelical ?

Again, in what light did the Apostles regard Mary after the ascension of our Lord ? Did the Apostle John

even, to whose care she was committed, and in whose house she dwelt, mention even her name, in any one of the three epistles which he wrote? No. Did Peter or Paul refer to her in any way during any of their sermons, or in any of their prayers or epistles? No. I put it to you, then, whether such an omission is at all compatible with that prominent place in the Christian ritual which she has received from the Church of Rome. We are commanded to pray, we are taught to pray, we have examples of apostolic praying, but always to God through Christ. This subject, however, of the invocation of saints will be discussed in the lecture on "The One Mediator between God and men."

SECOND,—We raise our solemn protest against the Church of Rome for the worship which she pays to the Virgin Mary, on the authority, not only of the Word of God, but also of the Ancient Church and Fathers.

It was about the middle of the fourth century that the opinion arose that in the days of Christ, and before his birth, there were in the temple of Jerusalem, virgins consecrated to God, among whom Mary grew up in vows of perpetual chastity. Her marriage with Joseph was declared to be formal, and he was regarded as an ascetic from his youth. This was Jerome's opinion. At this time a sect sprang up whose peculiar tenet was, that the Virgin Mary should be worshipped, and that religious honours should be paid her. The members of this sect were called Collyridians from Collyridæ, the cakes which they offered to the Virgin. Whether it were possible for these Collyridians to exceed the Saints Bonaventure and Liguori in the homage which they paid

to the Virgin Mary, I leave you to judge : it is at least evident that Epiphanius, and others of the Nicene Fathers condemned them as heretics ; for in his work against Heresies, Book iii., he says : “ Some persons are mad enough to honour the Virgin as a sort of goddess.” Might he not have said the same if he had lived in the days of Liguori ? “ Certain women, he continues, have transplanted this vanity from Thrace into Arabia, for they sacrifice a bread cake in honour of the Virgin, and in her name they blasphemously celebrate sacred mysteries. But the whole matter is a tissue of impiety, abhorrent from the teaching of the Holy Ghost, so that we may call it a diabolical business. In them is fulfilled this prophecy of Saint Paul—‘ Certain persons shall apostatize from the faith, attending to fables and doctrines concerning demon gods.’ ” After speaking of idolatry in Neapolis, the natives of which sacrificed to a girl whom he took to be Jephthah’s daughter ; and of idolatry in Egypt, whose inhabitants honoured Pharaoh’s daughter as a goddess, he further remarks : “ We Christians most indecorously honour the Saints. Rather ought we to honour Him who is their Sovereign Lord. Let, then, the error of seducers cease. The Virgin Mary is no goddess. To the peril therefore of his own soul, let no one make oblations in her name.” Surely the Father who penned these sentiments, would, were he now amongst us, lift up his voice against the incense and the prayers, and the gifts, and the homage which are daily presented by the Roman Catholic Church—not to Mary merely, but even to statues and images of Mary !

Protestants are charged by their Roman Catholic friends with dishonouring and despising the blessed Mother of our Lord Jesus, and with disregarding her memory. A note in the Douay Bible, appended to the forty-eighth verse of the first chapter of Luke, reads thus: "These words are a prediction of that honour which the Church in all ages should pay to the blessed Virgin. Let Protestants examine whether they are any way concerned in this prophecy." I reply, that Protestants *are* concerned in this prophecy. We do call her blessed among women. We cherish her memory in high estimation, as one of the most humble and obedient of all the Saints of the Most High God, and to Christians of every name we commend her example of meekness, and patience, and purity. Would that we all possessed the graces which were exhibited by the Virgin Mary! How privileged was the beloved disciple to have been permitted to receive her into his own home! Who would not with him have rejoiced to hear her speak, as she doubtless often did, of the Saviour's infancy, of His youth, of His manhood. We go thus far with our Roman Catholic neighbours, but we cannot, we dare not, on so slender authority as that which they adduce, pay her DIVINE honours. No, my hearers! we should imagine that we heard a voice from heaven interrupting every prayer, every bow, every curtesy, every prostration, interrupting the ascent of every cloud of incense, with the words of the text "See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant." We do not forget him who hath said: "I the Lord thy God am a jealous

God." Amongst ourselves we see that jealousy is excited by the surrender to others of a small part only of that love and service which we owe to *one* alone. What would avail the professions of attachment, the smiles, the attentions of a husband to a faithful wife, should she witness smiles and attentions conferred upon another? What would avail in the presence of a King all the titles with which we should address him, and all the homage with which we should present ourselves to him, and all the obsequiousness which should mark our conduct towards him, were we to select a favorite courtier, and in the presence of the King himself address to that courtier the same titles, and approach him with the same obsequious bearing? "The Lord thy God is a jealous God;"—think of this, and remember that he hath also declared, "my glory will I not give to another."

And now I appeal to you, have we not clearly convicted the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church of permitting the issue and the use of publications in which the glory of the Most High God is transferred to the Virgin? convicted them too in the very face of a passage from their own version of the Scriptures. "I the Lord, that is my name, I will not give my glory to another?" Have we not proved beyond the possibility of a question, that eminent Saints of the Roman Catholic Church whose days are kept, whose works are admired, and to whom invocation is prescribed, have given to a creature the titles, the service, the prayers, the praises, which belong only to the Creator? "The Lord thy God is a jealous God:"

See it manifested towards Israel when the golden calf was set up to represent the Lord, and worshipped with incense and offerings. See how the jealousy of the Most High was stirred, "Let me alone, that my wrath may be kindled against them, and that I may destroy them:" "The Lord thy God, is a jealous God:" See it manifested when Israel, in the days of Elijah, sought to mingle the worship of Baal with the worship of Jehovah! "The Lord thy God is a jealous God." See it manifested in the history of Herod, who, when he had made an oration to the people, permitted himself to be called a god; and who because he did not give the honour to God was forthwith struck by an angel of the Lord, and being eaten up of worms, gave up the ghost. And because the Lord our God is a jealous God we protest against the presentation of prayer or any other worship to a creature. Rather would we follow the command of Jesus, who taught us to pray not to his beloved Mother, but to "Our Father which art in heaven." Rather would we imitate those apostolic prayers in which the Father was addressed through the Son. The Trinity which we adore is not that of Jesus, Mary and Joseph, as some Roman Catholics have taught, but that of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The refuge of sinners to which we fly is not Mary, but Jesus Christ the Son of God, who alone "saves his people from their sins." The ladder by which we hope to ascend from earth to heaven, is Jesus; the door through which we hope to enter into the heavenly city, is Jesus; with us Jesus and not Mary is the fountain of wisdom; with us the Eternal Word and not Mary is the mirror of

justice ; with us God and not Mary is the Comforter of the afflicted ; and we will content ourselves with the exclamation of David, “ Unto THEE will I cry, O Lord, my rock—unto THEE O God do we give thanks, unto Thee do we give thanks, for that Thy name is near Thy wondrous works declare.” “ Truly my soul waiteth upon God, from Him cometh my salvation, He only is my Rock and my salvation, he is my defence.”

It will not avail for any Roman Catholic present to say, “ I do not subscribe to those sentiments which you have this evening read respecting the Virgin Mary.” I hold you to every sentiment that I can find in these or any other books which are sent forth by the authorities of your Church. You belong to a Catholic Church, your profession is that your doctrines, your ritual, your liturgies, your practice, are one ; this is the boast of your great writer, Dr. Milner ; if then, they are one, they cannot be diverse ; if you are a Catholic, how dare you refuse to employ any authorized liturgy which I can produce ? Will you resist the authority of your Saints, your Cardinals, your Bishops, your Pastors ? If so, you are not obedient sons of the Church, and there rests upon you her bitterest anathema.

Before I proceed to the next step in the discussion, I would explain that I have confined your attention to the adoration of the Virgin because she is the most eminent Saint of the Roman Catholic Church. From other devotional publications, ecclesiastically authorized, I could have adduced passages to show that divine titles and works are ascribed to other saints. This subject, however, will be more fully expounded in a subsequent

lecture. I therefore resume the discussion, reminding you that we have shown, that to ascribe divine titles, attributes, and works, to any creature is idolatry; and that the Roman Catholic Church has done and is doing this to the Virgin Mary. We have shown that to offer sacrifice, prayer or praise to any creature is idolatry, and that the Roman Catholic Church has done and is doing this also to the Virgin Mary. And now we take another position.

That to bow down religiously, *i. e.* for religious purposes before images, pictures, or other representations, is idolatry.

And here I wish to refer to those refined distinctions of adoration or worship which Roman Catholic Divines have promulged. The following extract from the work *Ferraris Bibliotheca Prompta*, will convey to you the Roman Catholic exposition of this graduated worship: (Elliott p. 756).

“ That it may be fully understood what worship or adoration is due to them, it is to be observed, that adoration is an act by which any one submits himself to another, in the recognition of his excellence. This is the common opinion. And this adoration or worship is civil or political, sacred or religious. Adoration merely civil or political, is that which may be offered to Kings and supreme Princes on account of the excellence of their station, or the excellency of human power which they possess beyond others; as is mentioned in Scripture, where some are said to have adored Kings. So David, falling on his face, adored three times. (1 Sam. xx 41.) ‘ All the assembly blessed the Lord God of

their fathers, and bowed themselves, and adored God, and then the King;' (1 Chron. xxix, 20 ;) where, as you see, the same word adoration refers to God and the King; although, to God the worship is *latria*, to the King it is only civil respect. Sacred or religious adoration is that which is offered to any one on account of sacred or supernatural excellence, as the adoration which is rendered to God, the blessed Virgin Mary, and all the saints. Of sacred or religious adoration there are three kinds; namely. *latria*, *hyperdulia*, and *dulia*. The adoration or worship of *latria*, is that which is due to God alone, and is given on account of His uncreated supremacy and infinite excellency. The adoration or worship of *hyperdulia* is that which is due and rendered to the blessed Virgin on account of the maternity of God, and other excellent gifts, and her special super-eminent sanctity beyond others. The adoration or worship of *dulia* is that which is due and given to the saints on account of the supernatural excellence of their sanctity and glory. These are common opinions."

I think we have a right to ask for the authority upon which these refinements have been introduced into the Christian ritual. We deny their Scriptural character, and require proof from our Catholic friends of the existence in the age of the Apostles of such distinctions and gradations. But we return to our position, viz. : that "to bow down religiously, *i. e.* for religious purposes, before images, pictures, or other representations, is idolatry."

In support of this position we adduce—

*First.* The teaching of the word of God in the second commandment. We have already read in the Douay Bible the following words:—

“Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve *them*: I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.” (Exodus xx.)

And here I must enter my solemn protest against those mutilations of this sacred decalogue which have been allowed, by some authorities at least, in the Roman Catholic Church. Several authorized Roman Catholic Catechisms omit the second commandment altogether, others I admit present it entire; but one instance of mutilation which came under my own notice while residing in the Mediteranean, is worthy of more particular mention. On the lectern in the Cathedral of St. John’s at Valetta there are two brazen tables, representing the two tables of stone upon which the law was written in the Mount; on these tables are engraved TEN (X) distinct paragraphs, professing of course to be the ten commandments which God gave to Moses. I will read them to you as I transcribed them into my memorandum book in the Cathedral.

### I.

*Diliges Dominum Deum ex toto corde tuo, ex tota anima tua, et ex tota fortitudine tua.*

II.

*Non assumes nomen Domini Dei tui in vanum.*

III.

*Memento ut diem sabbathi sanctifices.*

[From the fourth to the eighth, inclusive, there is no variation from our commonly received version of the decalogue.]

IX.

*Non concupisces domum proximi tui.*

X.

*Nec desiderabis uxorem ejus.*

Here then is a direct mutilation of the ten commandments. It avails not to say, that instead of the first commandment we are furnished with an inspired epitome of the first table—those laws, namely, which relate to God: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength.” This is no part of the record which the Divine Being incised with his own finger upon the tables that were delivered to Moses on the Mount. That record contained a distinct and elaborate proscription against idolatry, and this proscription, the Church of Rome has not kept prominently before the eyes of her members. Where images and pictures abound as they do in Roman Catholic Churches and dwellings, there is the greater need of writing upon every wall of church, college, convent, and school, the distinct commandment against

idolatry, (call it first or second, I care not,) which I now quote from the Douay Bible.

“THOU SHALT NOT MAKE TO THYSELF  
A GRAVEN THING, NOR THE LIKENESS  
OF ANY THING.

“THOU SHALT NOT ADORE THEM, NOR  
SERVE *THEM*.”

I protest also against the note in the Douay Bible appended to the second commandment :

“All such images or likenesses, are forbidden by this commandment, as are made to be adored and served ; according to that which immediately follows, *thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them*. That is, all such as are designed for *idols* or *image-gods*, or are worshipped with *divine honour*. But otherwise images, pictures, or representations, even in the house of God, and in the very sanctuary, so far from being forbidden, are expressly authorised by the word of God.”

We are referred in proof of this to the erection in the tabernacle and temple, of the Cherubim. But were these figures of saints ? No, they were not even figures of angels. Besides, were they erected to be bowed down to by the people ? No, they were hidden from the public gaze—only the High Priest saw them, and that but once a year. Is this circumstance then of sufficient importance to authorize the multiplication of images, and pictures of saints, in every Roman Catholic Church and family, for the purpose, to say the least, of presenting *hyperdulia* or *dulia* to them ? That must be a weak and insecure

system which rests upon so narrow a basis! This note refers also to the erection by the command of God of the brazen serpent, and argues from this that worship may be paid to images. We deny that the serpent of brass was bowed down to; it was looked at, and thus the Israelites were taught the simplicity of faith, but it was not worshipped, at least until some centuries afterwards, and then, so indeed I read in the Douay Bible, on this account it was destroyed; 4 Kings, xviii. "He destroyed the high places, and broke the statues in pieces, and cut down the groves, and broke the brazen serpent, which Moses had made: for till that time the children of Israel burnt incense to it: and he called its name Nohestan."

But let me direct you yet farther to the teaching of the Word of God on this subject. In Deut. xxvii 15, I read the following fearful commination:—"Cursed be the man that maketh a graven and molten thing, the abomination of the Lord, the work of the hands of artificers, and shall put it in a secret place: and all the people shall answer, and say: Amen." In Psalm xcvi, 7, it is said:—"Let them be all confounded that adore graven things, and that glory in their idols." And in Psalm lxxvii, 58, I read again:—"They provoked him to anger on their hills: and moved him to jealousy with their graven things." In Numbers chapter xxiii, 21, it is said approvingly of Israel:—"There is no idol in Jacob, neither is their an image-god to be seen in Israel." And in Ezekiel vi. 4, &c., we have the following terrible denunciation against idol or image worship:—"And

I will throw down your altars, and your idols shall be broken in pieces: and I will cast down your slain before your idols.

“ And I will lay the dead carcasses of the children of Israel before your idols: and I will scatter your bones round about your altars.

“ In all your dwelling-places. The cities shall be laid waste, and the high places shall be thrown down, and destroyed, and your altars shall be abolished, and shall be broken in pieces: and your idols shall be no more, and your temples shall be destroyed, and your works shall be defaced.”

I know you will reply, “ we do not make idols of these images.” Now literally an idol is an image, and an image an idol. The latter is derived from the Greek word *εἰδωλον*, the former from the Latin word *imago*, each however being a literal translation of the other; you say that you do not make idols of these, but I ask is not the obeisance which you present to them, as profound as that which you pay to Jesus Christ Himself? Do you not cross yourselves, and prostrate yourselves, and burn incense before these images? Do you not crown them, and make processions in their honour, as though they had a being? But you ease your conscience by saying we do not present *latria* to these images. Ah, this refinement! How difficult it is, with views so varied, to understand what Roman Catholics mean by the honour which they pay to images. Bellarmine himself distinguishes the Roman Catholic systems of image-worship into three classes. One class he tells us in the second volume of his works

recommends the use of images, but rejects their worship. They honour, they esteem, they respect, they venerate, &c. Amongst the supporters of this tenet, are the following eminent names, Thomassin, Bossuet, Dupin, Gother, and Lauciano. Another class, amongst whom is Bellarmine himself, honours images with an inferior or imperfect worship, but offers no *latria* or supreme adoration to the sculptured or pencilled resemblance. This class maintains the same opinion as the second Nicene council, which represented images as holy, as communicating holiness, and as entitled to the same veneration as the Gospel. This infallible council condemned those who used pictures only for the assistance of the memory, and not for adoration. The council of Trent professed to follow the Nicene in this view, but it is clear that they departed from it, for they expressly declare that these forms are to be regarded as altogether void of virtue. The names of Spondanus, Baronius, Estuis, and Godeau may be added to that of Bellarmine. The third class support the doctrine that the same adoration is to be presented to the image which is presented to the original. The likeness of God or His Son in mental conjunction with the original, is the object of *latria*, or supreme worship. This is the system of Aquinas, Cajetan, Bonaventure, Turrecrema, and others. Which of these systems are we to receive? That of the council of Trent, or of Nice? Whose opinion are we to follow? That of Bossuet, or Bellarmine, or Aquinas? Where is the boasted unity of doctrine of which we so often hear?—But will Roman Catholics deny that supreme worship is paid to the cross? Listen

to the teaching of the angelic doctor, Aquinas, which you will find in the third volume of his works, page 25. "The cross is to be worshipped with *latria*, which is also to be addressed to Jesus and his image." The Pontifical expressly declares that "*latria* is due to the cross." Hence the prayers, absolute prayers, which in the Roman missal are presented to the cross,—“Hail, O cross our only hope, increase righteousness to the pious, and bestow pardon on the guilty. Save the present assembly met this day for thy praise.”—*Roman Catechism*, page 32.

You will not be surprised if I ask, where, in the New Testament, or in even the Old, do you find corresponding practices? Which of the apostles fell down before an image? Who of the New Testament Saints invoked the cross? Where in the whole apostolic writings do you find a religious veneration for relics? Where is the authority for all this in the early Church? It is wanting. Tertullian, in his book "*contra coronandi morem*," most severely inveighs against images, and adds these words, "St. John deeply considering the matter saith, 'My little children keep yourselves from images or idols.'" Origen says, "It is not only a mad and frantic part to worship images, but also one to dissemble or wink at it." Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamine, in Cyprus, who lived in A.D. 390, thus writes to John, Patriarch of Jerusalem, "I entered into a certain Church to pray: I found there a linen cloth hanging in the Church door painted, and having in it the image of Christ as it were, or some other Saint. Therefore, when I did see the image of a man hanging

in the Church of Christ contrary to the authorities of Scripture, I did tear it." Lastly, the worship of images was in the seventh century, forbidden by Pontifical authority. Gregory the great, writing to Serenus, the Massilian Bishop who had demolished images which his flock had adored, blamed the Bishop for breaking these images, but praised him in unqualified language for preventing their adoration. These similitudes, said he, are erected "not for the worship of any, but only for the instruction of the ignorant. Allow images to be made, but forbid them to be worshipped *in any manner.*" But why should I tire you with authorities and proofs? We have seen for ourselves the evils of image and Saint worship. Go into any Roman Catholic country, enter a village, converse with its peasantry, and what do you find? That Saints, and especially the Virgin, are set before Christ; that the true spiritual worship of the Most High God is lost in the worship of images. What is the testimony of our most intelligent travellers? Why that Italy knows more of Mary than of Christ. This is the natural effect of that system against which we have this evening protested, and, though we would do it with all kindness, we must and will faithfully declare our conviction, that the Church of Rome has fallen into the fearful sin of idolatry. We do not affirm that every member of the Roman Catholic Church is an idolator; but he cannot resist the conclusion that so long as he remains within a Church that sanctions such practices as those which we have revealed this evening, he is responsible to God and to his own soul for lending his countenance to a sin which

is abhorrent to the Most High God, and destructive of the social, the moral, and the spiritual interests of humanity. And we would say to every Roman Catholic who has felt shocked at the fearful sentiments which we have quoted from the devotional works of his Church, "Come out from among them and be ye separate and touch not the unclean thing."

And now my beloved hearers you will be prepared to hear, that with us, **THE ONE OBJECT OF RELIGIOUS ADORATION IS THE MOST HIGH GOD.** Every modification and variety of religious adoration but that which is **SUPREME**, and every object of religious adoration but **GOD**, we absolutely renounce. Forasmuch as He will not give His glory to another, neither will we: and forasmuch as he will not give his praise to graven images, neither will we. Angels even, are finite, we worship only the infinite: Saints are creatures like ourselves, we worship only the Creator. We will worship the Lord our God, and him only will we serve. His glorious majesty, his almighty power, his infinite purity, his unbounded wisdom, his overflowing love, all invite us to revere and magnify his name, and to prostrate our hearts in humility before him. The works of his hands, above, around, beneath, in all their magnificent glories, invite us to adoration and praise: The scheme of glorious redemption, the gift of his Son, invite to adoration and love: The offer of a free and perfect pardon, of adopting mercy, of regenerating grace, of a new nature, of victory over death, of a glorious and eternal heaven, invite us to serve and love and glorify our God. How great is Jehovah of Hosts,

how glorious and mighty in his works, how profound in his providence, how rich and plenteous in grace! "O come let us sing unto the Lord, let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation. Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving and make a joyful noise unto him with Psalms. For the Lord is a great God and a great King above all gods. O come, let us worship and bow down let us kneel before the Lord our Maker. For he is the Lord our God, and we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand."

What is adoration? Is it faith? Let us trust in the name of the Lord our God; let us believe his promises; let us confide in his character. What is adoration? Is it praise? Let us sing with the Universal Church: "We praise thee, O God, we acknowledge thee to be the Lord." Let us adopt that beautiful paraphrase:—

"I'll praise my Maker while I've breath,  
And, when my voice is lost in death,  
Praise shall employ my nobler powers;  
My days of praise shall ne'er be past,  
While life, or thought, or being last,  
Or immortality endures."

What is adoration? Is it love? O let us love the Lord our God with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and strength. What is adoration? Is it to offer sacrifice? "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable, unto God, which is your reasonable service." What is adoration? Is it prayer? "Let us

lift our eyes unto the hills, whence cometh our help; our help cometh from the Lord who made heaven and earth." And, if we thus believe, and praise, and love, and pray, on earth, our adoration shall not cease here. No! Transplanted from this world of sorrow and imperfection to the world of bliss and blessing above, we shall surround the heavenly throne, the throne of God and the Lamb, and there we shall *renew* our acts of adoration; with the elders and the Seraphim, with the Apostles and the Marys who surrounded the cross, with the noble army of martyrs and the saints, with all the host of God's elect and redeemed ones, we shall prostrate ourselves before the throne, and serve him day and night in his heavenly temple, ever more praising him, and saying, "Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever."

## NOTES TO LECTURE III.

### I. ORIGINALS OF SOME OF THE QUOTATIONS.

#### 1. Selections from the Italian *Te Dei Matrém.*

“ A Te, Madre di Dio, innalziamo le nostre lodi : \* Te Maria Vergine predichiamo.

“ Te Sposa dell' Eterno Padre \* venera tutta la terra.

“ A Te gli Angeli tutti e gli Arcangeli : \* a Te i Troni e i Principati umili si inchinano.

“ A Te le Podestà tutte e le Virtù superne dei cieli \* e tutte le Dominazioni prestano ubbidienza.

“ A Te i Cori tutti, a Te i Cherubini e i Serafini \* assistono intorno esultanti.

“ A Te le angeliche creature tutte \* con incessante voce di lode cantano :

“ Santa, Santa, Santa Maria \* Genitrice di Dio, Vergine insieme e Madre.

“ Pieni sono i cieli e la terra \* della maestà gloriosa del frutto del tuo grembo.

“ Te il glorioso coro degli Apostoli \* Te Madre del loro Creatore collaudano.

“ O pia Vergine Maria, \* deh ! fa che insieme coi Santi tuoi siamo della eterna gloria remunerati.

“ Salvo sia per te, o Signora, il popolo tuo, \* si che siamo fatti partecipi della eredità del tuo Figliuolo.

“ Sii nostra guida, \* sii sostegno e difesa nostra in eterno.

“ In ciascun giorno, o Maria Signora nostra, \* ti salutiamo.

“ E bramiamo cantare le lodi tue \* cola mente e colla voce in sempiterno.

“ Degnati, dolcissima Maria, ora e sempre \* conservarci illesi da peccato.

“ Abbi, o Pia, di noi misericordia : \* abbi misericordia di noi

“ Fa misericordia ai figliuoli tuoi : \* chè in Te, o Vergine Maria, abbiamo riposta tutta la fiducia nostra.

“ In te dolcissima Maria, noi tutti speriamo : \* difendici in eterno.

“ A Te le lodi, a Te l' impero, \* a Te virtù e gloria pei secoli dei secoli Così sia.”

2. Extract from “ *Il Tesoro dell' Anima.*”

“ O afflittissima anima della Vergine consolatemi.

“ O addoloratissimo Corpo della mia cara Madre confortatemi.

“ O amatissime lagrime della Regina del Paradiso purificatemi.

“ O dolorosissimi sospiri, o gemiti della Madre di Dio, conpungetemi con vera contrizione.

“ O appassionatissimi sensi della mia gran Signora sanate santificate li miei. O spasimi, e morte dell' Imperatrice de' Cieli, siatemi vera allegrezza, e vita.

“ O Maria mare di amarezza per la morte del Figlio defendetemi dal peccato, e dall' inferno.

“ Ricevetemi per vostro servo, che ami, e confidi in Voi. Nell' ora della mia morte ajutatemi, acciò con tutti gli eletti vi glorifichi nei secoli de' secoli. Amen.”

3. Extracts from “ *Le Pouvoir de Marie par Saint Liguori.*”

“ Nous lisons dans les chroniques des Franciscains, que Frère Léon eut une fois cette vision : il vit deux échelles, une rouge au haut de laquelle était Jésus-Christ, et une blanche, au haut de laquelle se trouvait sa sainte mère. Plusieurs s'efforçaient de monter par la première échelle ; ils montaient quelques échelons, puis ils tombaient ; ils revenaient à la charge, mais sans être plus heureux ; aucun n'arrivait jusqu'au sommet. Alors une voix leur cria de se tourner du côté de l'échelle blanche ; et l'ayant fait, ils montèrent heureusement, car la bienheureuse Vierge leur tendait la main pour les aider.”

“ O Marie, mon refuge, combien de fois ne me suis-je pas vu par ma faute l'esclave de l'enfer ! Vous avez brisé mes liens vous m'avez arraché des mains de mes fiers ennemis ; mais je tremble d'y retomber, car je sais que leur rage n'a point de

repos, et qu'ils se flattent que je deviendrai encore leur proie. Vierge sainte, soyez mon bouclier et ma défense ! Avec votre secours, je suis sûr de vaincre ; mais faites que je n'oublie jamais de vous invoquer dans les combats, et principalement dans ce dernier, le plus terrible de tous, que le démon s'apprête à me livrer à mon heure suprême. Mettez vous-même alors votre nom sur mes lèvres et dans mon cœur, et que j'expire en prononçant ce nom, afin que je me trouve à vos pieds dans le ciel ainsi soit-il."

II. Other illustrations of Mariolatry, from "The Graces of Mary," published by "D. & J. SADLER & CO., NEW YORK AND MONTREAL, 1853," bearing the imprimatur of "† JOHN, ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK."

PRACTICES IN HONOUR OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

1. To choose the Blessed Virgin for mother and patroness, to offer oneself to her service, and renew this offering frequently on her festivals.
2. To ask for mediation every morning and night, and run to her in every temptation and trial.
3. To visit her churches and altars, and often protest to her that you love her more than yourself.
4. To recite her Little Office, or at least that of her immaculate conception, frequently.
5. To say the *Angelus* morning, noon, and night.
6. To prepare for her festivals by a novena and some act of mortification on the virgils, &c.
7. To honour her specially on Saturdays, as being dedicated to her.
8. To pray for those souls in purgatory who have been most devout to her.
9. To say the Magnificat and recite the Rosary daily, if possible.
10. To try to make others devout to this Blessed Mother.
11. To read those books that treat of her *glories*, &c., and never to omit the usual practices of devotion to her.
12. To enter into her sodalities, confraternities, &c., and to give alms in her honour.

13. To rejoice in her perfections, to thank her daily for the favours received through her intercession, to honour the saints connected with her, as St. Joseph, St. Joachim, Ste. Anne, &c.

14. To pronounce her holy name frequently, and salute her by the Hail Mary, when the clock strikes.

15. To reverence her pictures and images, and to have one in our oratory.

16. To compassionate her dolours, particularly at the Passion of her blessed Son.

17. To love chastity specially, and say three "Hail Marys" daily to obtain it through Mary, recommending to her at the same time our senses, &c.

18. To ornament her oratories with flowers, &c.

19. To offer to her, especially during the octaves of her festivals, a crown of spiritual flowers, that is, of different acts of virtue performed in her honour.

20. To invoke her daily for a happy death, and that she would specially assist us in our last hour.

#### PRACTICE.

Inquire what indulgences you have in your power to gain by prayers and other devotions addressed to Mary, and recite the following to obtain a happy death, to which an indulgence of 300 days is attached :

Jesus, Joseph, and Mary, I give you my heart and my life.

Jesus, Joseph, and Mary, assist me in my last agony.

Jesus, Joseph, and Mary, may I die in peace in your blessed company.

#### PRAYER.

O queen of the universe and most bountiful sovereign, thou art the great advocate of sinners, the sure port of those who have suffered shipwreck, the resource of the world, the ransom of captives, the solace of the weak, the consolation of the afflicted, the refuge and salvation of every creature. Oh, full of grace, enlighten my understanding, and loosen my tongue, that I may recount thy praises, and sing to thee the angelical

salutation, which thou so justly deservest. Hail, thou who art the peace, the joy, the consolation of the whole world! Hail paradise of pure delight, the assured asylum of all who are in danger, the source of grace, the mediatrix between God and man.



## LECTURE IV.

### THE ONE SACRIFICE FOR SIN.

The subject upon which I have to address you this evening is of infinite moment in the scheme of Christian doctrine, and is associated with the highest, because with the immortal interests of man. That all men are sinners, is a proposition whose truth I do not feel it my duty, this evening at least, to defend by any elaborate argument. Whether you view the simple form of Patriarchal religion, or the more august ritual of the Levitical economy, or the more beautiful and glorious, because more perfect system of Christianity, you discover that each had its origin in the fact of man's sinfulness, and his consequent estrangement from God. In each the doctrine of atonement holds a prominent place. From the time of the fall, men sought to propitiate the Divine Being because they had sinned against him;—Moses stamped the necessity of propitiation upon almost every rite and offering which, as the vicar of the Most High God, he prescribed for the guidance of the Israelites;—and in the establishment of Christianity, it is expressly declared that its founder received his name from the fact that he should save his people from their sins, that he became the Lamb of God for the purpose of bearing away the sin of the world, and that the offering which he presented upon the cross was emphatically a *sin* offering.

Whatever differences of opinion then we may entertain upon other subjects, on this I apprehend there will be no disagreement. Be we Protestant or Catholic, we shall be unwilling to deny that every one of us is a sinner against God, because every one of us has a heart which is, by nature at least, opposed to goodness, and that every one of us therefore needs mercy and forgiveness from God. How important then is it for us to inquire whether there is any ground to hope that mercy can and will be extended to sinners; whether any feasible and palpable scheme of relief for sinners has ever been disclosed to the world. I solve this inquiry by reading out of the Douay Bible the last five verses in the 9th chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews :

“For Jesus is not entered into the Holies made with hands, the patterns of the true : but into heaven itself, that he may appear now in the presence of God for us.

“Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entereth, into the Holies, every year with the blood of others :

“For then he ought to have suffered often from the beginning of the world : but now once at the end of ages, he hath appeared for the destruction of sin, by the sacrifice of himself.

“And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and, after this, the judgment :

“So also Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many ; the second time he shall appear without sin, to them that expect him unto salvation.”

These verses open to us the door of the glorious temple of the Christian dispensation. Looking through

the vista of by-gone years, we gaze upon the imposing ceremonies of the day of atonement. The high altar of the cross is erected in the midst; a lamb without blemish and without spot is provided for a sin-offering; the great High Priest of the Christian economy stands forth; the representatives of a guilty world surround the sacred enclosure; the solemn sacrificial hour arrives; the altar receives the Lamb of God; the precious blood of Christ flows down and stains the altar; the victim writhes beneath the sacrificial knife, groans out, in deepest agony, "It is finished," and gives up the ghost! Angels exult in heaven, devils tremble in hell, and on earth, the rocks rend, the earth quakes, the graves yield up their dead, and an astonished world exclaims, "Truly this is the Son of God, who hath appeared once in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

The clauses in the text to which I invite your special attention are these:—

"NOR YET THAT HE SHOULD OFFER HIMSELF OFTEN.

"NOW ONCE AT THE END OF AGES, HE HATH APPEARED FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF SIN BY THE SACRIFICE OF HIMSELF.

"CHRIST WAS OFFERED ONCE TO EXHAUST THE SINS OF MANY."

Whether or not we are all agreed as to the origin of sacrifice; whether all the members of the congregation are able to subscribe to the views of the preacher that animal sacrifices can only be accounted for on the supposition that they were appointed immediately by God, are questions which it is not now of importance to

determine ; it is, however, of great importance to know that on some leading points in the doctrine of sacrifice for sin both Protestants and Roman Catholics are precisely agreed. They believe, for instance, that the animal sacrifices of the Mosaic law shadowed forth the gospel sacrifice ; that whatever efficacy they possessed in the purging away of sin, was derived from Christ in whom they all terminated ; and they believe in the atoning character of Christ's sacrifice, that it was substituted for the punishment of sin, and that it was presented as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. I find in the Douay Bible, under the 12th verse of this chapter the following beautiful note : " By that one sacrifice of his blood, once offered on the cross, Christ our Lord paid and exhibited, once for all, the general price and ransom of all mankind, which no other priest could do." The following supplication taken from the service of the Mass contains the germ of this doctrine : " Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us !"

The importance of the doctrine of Christ's sacrificial death may be inferred from the marked prominence which it received in the epistles, conversations and sermons of the blessed Apostles. " Christ crucified" was, of all others, the doctrine which they exhibited ; to know this, to teach this, to impress this upon the attention and hearts of the people, was their chief aim ; to set forth the Lord Jesus as bearing our sins in his own body on the tree, to proclaim that through Him the world has received the atonement, that He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, that through His

blood we have redemption, even the forgiveness of our sins, and that through the same blood our unrighteousness is cleansed away, was regarded by them as their chief business. These are truths with which they addressed men of all ages, ranks and classes, truths with which they interwove every page of inspiration.

Let us pause for a moment to observe how impressive is the view which is imparted to the attributes of the Divine Being, by the doctrine of Christ's sacrificial death. Where have you such a manifestation of the spotless purity and inflexible justice of God as upon the cross, in the agonies and cries of the blessed Saviour? Where have you such an illustration of the infinite Wisdom of the Most High, as in that scheme of redemption which was consummated by the sacrifice of Christ? Where shines the love of God with so great splendour, as upon and around the hallowed precincts of Calvary, on whose heights the only begotten Son of God, by His eternal Father's appointment, suffered and died? See how mercy and truth here meet together, see how righteousness and peace here embrace each other; see how the rays of the divine glory are concentrated in this sacred point, this crucifical altar, this spotless sacrifice! Where else could you so effectually study the Divine character? In the heavens? No, not even with the modern aids and discoveries of astronomy? On the sea? No, not even with the wonderful appliances of steam? In the bowels of the earth? No, not even with all the light which geology has reflected upon the mighty power and infinite wisdom of God. Where else, but on the cross could you so effectually study the

divine characters? On the mountains and the plains of the earth? in her forests and her fruitful fields? No! We learn *much* of God in the works of his hands; the glories of creation reflect the glories of his character; that His name is great His wondrous works declare; but when you come within the circumference of light which is radiated by the cross, you behold an intensity of justice, and a depth of wisdom, and a majesty of love, all too in glorious and perfect harmony, which no other sight could afford.

“ Part of thy name divinely stands  
On all thy creatures writ,  
They show the labour of thy hands,  
Or impress of thy feet.

“ But when we view thy strange design  
To save rebellious worms:  
There vengeance and compassion join  
In their divinest forms.

“ Here the whole Deity is known,  
Nor dares a creature guess,  
Which of the glories brighter shone,  
The justice or the grace.”

You will be prepared now for this general statement :  
PROTESTANTS REGARD THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST,  
FINISHED UPON THE CROSS, AND THEREFORE ONCE  
OFFERED AND NEVER TO BE REPEATED ; AS THE ONE  
SIN-OFFERING OF THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

The Roman Catholic doctrine concerning the sacrifice of Christ is that it is repeated in every celebration of the Eucharist or the supper of the Lord ; and that by a

process which the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation, every priest of that Church offers in holy sacrifice upon the altar, the Lord Jesus Christ, offers Him to God, as completely as Aaron and his successors offered the sacrifices of the law.

Against this view the Reformed Churches enter their solemn PROTEST, which may be conveniently divided into two parts.—They protest against transubstantiation, and they protest against the sacrifice of the Mass.

FIRST,—THEY PROTEST AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

This doctrine I shall not attempt to describe in my own language, because I know how easy it would be to colour and to misrepresent the views of others, where so much of mystery and incomprehensibleness is involved. The first description which I shall present to you is taken from Dr James Butler's Catechism, recommended by the four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland.

“ Q. What is the blessed Eucharist ?

“ A. The body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, under the appearance of bread wine.

“ Q. What means the word Eucharist ?

“ A. A special grace or gift of God ; and it means also, a solemn act of thanksgiving to God, for all his mercies.

“ Q. What do you mean by the appearances of bread and wine ?

“ A. The taste, colour, and form of bread and wine, which still remain, after the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ.

“ Q. Are both the body and blood of Christ under the appearance of bread and under the appearance of wine.

“ A. Yes ; Christ is whole and entire, *true God* and *true Man*, under the appearance of each.

“ Q. Are we to believe, that the God of all Glory is under the appearance of our corporal food ?

“ A. Yes ; as we also believe, that the same God of all Glory suffered death, under the appearance of a criminal on the cross.

“ Q. How can the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ ?

“ A. By the goodness and power of God, *with whom no word shall be impossible.* *Luke*, i. 37.

“ Q. Are we assured, that Christ changed bread and wine into his body and blood ?

“ A. Yes ; by the very words which Christ himself said, when he instituted the blessed Eucharist at his last supper.

“ Q. Which are the words Christ said, when he instituted the blessed Eucharist ?

“ A. *This is my body—this is my blood.* *Matt.* xvi.

“ Q. Did Christ give power to the priests of his church, to change bread and wine into his body and blood ?

“ A. Yes ; when he said to his apostles at his last supper : *Do this for a commemoration of me.* *Luke*, xxii. 19.

“ Q. Why did Christ give to the priests of his church so great a power ?

“ A. That his children throughout all ages and nations, might have a most acceptable sacrifice to offer to

their Heavenly Father—and the most precious food to nourish their souls.”

The Canons which were passed at the thirteenth Session of the Council of Trent are more full and explicit. I will read those which expressly relate to the doctrine of transubstantiation.

“*Canon* (1.) Whosoever 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; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign and figure, or by his power; let him be accursed.

“(2.) Whosoever shall affirm, that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there remains the substance of the bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and shall deny that wonderful and peculiar conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood, the species only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most fitly terms ‘transubstantiation;’ let him be accursed.

“(3) 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 accursed.

“(4.) Whosoever shall affirm that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not present in the admirable eucharist, as soon as the consecration is performed, but only as it is used and received, and neither before

nor after ; and that the true body of our Lord does not remain in the hosts or consecrated morsels which are reserved or left after communion ; let him be accursed.

“(5.) Whosoever shall affirm that remission of sins is the chief fruit of the most holy eucharist, or that other effects are not produced thereby ; let him be accursed.

“(6.) Whosoever shall affirm that Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy eucharist with the external signs of that worship which is due to God ; and therefore that the eucharist is not to be honoured with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rites and customs of holy Church, nor publicly presented to the people for their adoration ; and that those who worship the same are idolaters ; let him be accursed.

“(7.) Whosoever shall affirm that it is not lawful to preserve the holy eucharist in the sacristy, but that immediately after consecration it must of necessity be distributed to those who are present ; or that it is not lawful to carry it in procession to the sick ; let him be accursed.

“(8.) Whosoever shall affirm that Christ, as exhibited in the eucharist, is eaten in a spiritual manner only, and not also sacramentally and really ; let him be accursed.

The Creed of Pope Pius IV, which every Roman Catholic professes to believe, has the following article :

“ 7. I profess, likewise, that in the mass is offered to

God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead ; and that in the most holy sacrifice of the eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation."

In Den's theology vol. v, p. 276, Maynooth edition, I read, "the word 'body' is received properly and strictly, forasmuch as it is distinguished from the blood ; comprehending the flesh, the bones, the nerves, &c.," (*—comprehendens carnem ossa, nervos, &c.*)

In the catechism of the Council of Trent, which Dr. Doyle calls "a most authentic exposition of the precepts of the Church, the Mass, and the Sacrament, as they are received by all Catholics," we have the following : "It is also in this place to be explained by the pastors, that there is contained in this sacrament, not only the true *body* of Christ, and whatever belongs to a true condition of a body, such as bones and nerves, but also a whole Christ."

And lastly, in the Roman Missal I find the following on this subject of the consecration of the Mass :

"If any one shall leave out or change any part of the form of the consecration of the body and blood, and, in the change of the words, such words do not signify the same thing, there is no consecration.

"If the Priest vomit the Eucharist, and the species appear entire, he must piously swallow it again ; but if

a nausea prevent him, then let the consecrated species be cautiously separated, and put by in some holy place till they be corrupted, and after, let them be cast into holy ground; but if the species do not appear, the vomit must be burned, and the ashes thrown into holy ground.”\*

These extracts, which I have selected with honesty and care, will convey to you a tolerably correct idea of those doctrines of Eucharistic transubstantiation against which we protest. From them we deduce the following proposition, to each one of which Roman Catholics are bound to assent, unless indeed they choose to deny their own formularies and creeds, and thus to do what Protestants have done before them.

1. That when the bread and wine are first laid upon the altar, in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, that is before consecration, they are truly bread and wine, containing all the attributes, elements and constituents of bread and wine.

2. That during that part of the service of the Mass, previous to the utterance of the words of consecration the bread and the wine undergo no change.

3. That until every word of the form “*Hoc est enim Corpus meum*” is uttered, the bread and the wine remain unchanged.

4. That if there is any defect on the part of the officiating Priest in the enunciation of the verbal form of consecration, the substance of the bread and wine remain unchanged, and the people receive and worship not Christ’s body, but bread and wine.

\* See note at the end of this Lecture.

5. That as soon as the words are uttered by the Priest, the bread is immediately transformed or converted into the body, the blood, the soul and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

6. That the wine also is converted into the body, the blood, the soul, the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

7. That this change, though real, is not evident to the senses; that the remaining substances taste like bread and wine, smell like bread and wine, feel like bread and wine, retain the same form as bread and wine, and reflect the same colour as bread and wine.

8. That notwithstanding this retention of form, colour, taste and smell, there is no particle of bread or drop of wine remaining upon the altar.

9. That in the wafer or bread, separately, and in the wine contained in the chalice separately and equally, there is contained a whole and perfect Christ; His body with its bones, muscles, nerves, flesh, veins, skin, hair, &c.; His soul with its will, its affections, its desires; His divinity with all its attributes of power, holiness, wisdom and love.

10. That every individual, good or bad, when he receives the holy Eucharist eats and feeds upon the body, the soul, and the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

11. That every particle even the minutest of the consecrated bread, and every drop of the consecrated wine, as thoroughly and properly contain a whole Christ, as all the bread and the wine that may be consecrated by the Priest; that indeed in every such particle, Christ's body, soul and divinity, are as absolutely present as they now are before His Father's throne.

12. That the body of Christ can exist in heaven and in ten thousand places upon earth at the same moment of time, that in each place a whole Christ exists, and yet that there is only one Christ in the Universe.

13. That the body, soul and divinity of the Son of God may be vomited, and under these circumstances must be burned in fire, and the ashes thereof buried.

14. That the body, soul and divinity of Christ may moulder and decay, and so "see corruption."

I am sure you will all feel with me how difficult it is to discuss this matter with such seriousness as should ever pertain to sacred subjects, and to the house of God. You will see the danger to which one is exposed of treating ironically such propositions as have now been fairly deduced from Catholic authorities. You will see how strong the temptation is to meet them with the *argumentum ad absurdum*. I shall endeavour, notwithstanding, rigidly to maintain the principle upon which I set out, that of respecting the prejudices and feelings of my Roman Catholic friends.

We protest against the teaching of the Church of Rome on the subject of transubstantiation.

*First*,—On the authority of the Word of God.

This word expressly declares that Jesus Christ has left the world, that he has gone to the Father, that he sitteth at the right hand of God; and also, that from the moment of his ascension into heaven, to the moment of his second coming in clouds and glory, the Church would have no right to expect his bodily presence in her midst.

Let me remind you of the expressions which occur

in the text. These declare that Jesus Christ has entered into heaven itself, and that he now appeareth in the presence of God for us. Again it is said, "The second time he shall appear without sin, i. e. a sin offering, unto salvation." I refer you also to the twelfth chapter of St. John's Gospel, in the eighth verse of which the Saviour is represented as saying, "For the poor you have always with you; but me you have not always." Did Christ mean that his bodily presence would be altogether removed from his disciples, or did he not? If he did, then would his declaration be opposed *in toto* to the doctrine of transubstantiation; if he did not, his words were vain and meaningless. Let us now examine the eleventh verse of the first Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand you looking up to heaven? This JESUS who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come as you have seen him going into heaven." And let us in connection with this, look at the twenty-first verse of the third chapter of the same book: "Whom heaven indeed must receive until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets from the beginning of the world." Now I ask, can any language be found more explicitly declarative of the Protestant belief, that until Christ comes in his glory the second time, he comes not at all? I speak of his corporeal presence. I will refer you also to a passage which the advocates of transubstantiation often adduce, and which is found in the twenty-sixth verse of the eleventh chapter of first Corinthians: "For as often as you shall eat this bread and

drink the chalice you shall show the death of the Lord *until he come.*" A very clear announcement on the part of St. Paul, that he did not understand the body, the soul and the divinity of Christ to be in what was eaten, or to exist in the chalice; for how, in such a case, could he have used the expression, "*until he come.*" The last Scripture which I shall adduce is taken from St. Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, and may be found in the sixteenth verse of the fifth chapter: "Henceforth know we no man after the flesh. And if we have known Christ according to the flesh; but now we know him so no longer." But how could this be affirmed by the Apostle, if it were true that on every occasion in which he consecrated the bread and wine in the Eucharist, he ate and adored the body the flesh and the blood of Emanuel? I ask with confidence, whether these passages, so far from favouring, do not completely oppose the notion that Christ Jesus comes in his proper person, comes in his flesh, his blood, his bones, his sinews, his nerves, comes in his true body, every time a priest of the Church of Rome celebrates the Eucharistic Sacrament?

But it is only fair that I should present to you the arguments which Roman Catholics themselves draw from the word of God in support of this wonderful theory. I will, then, quote from that great champion of the Papal faith, Dr. Milner, who in his work, "The end of the Controversy" p. p. 246, 247, speaks as follows:—

"Nothing proves more clearly the fallacy of the Calvinists and other dissenters, as likewise of the

established church men in general, who profess to make the Scripture, in its plain and literal sense, the sole rule of their faith, than their denial of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, which is so manifestly and emphatically expressed therein. He explained and promised this divine mystery near one of the Paschs, John vi. 4, previous to his institution of it. He then multiplied five loaves and two fishes, so as to afford a superabundant meal to five thousand men, besides women and children, *Mat.* xiv. 21; which was an evident sign of the future multiplication of his own body on the several altars of the world; after which he took occasion to speak of this mystery, by saying, *I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world.* John vi. 51. The sacred text goes on to inform us of the perplexity of the Jews, from their understanding Christ's words in their plain and natural sense, which, he, so far from removing by a different explanation, confirms by expressing that sense in other terms still more emphatical. *The Jews therefore strove amongst themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them: Verily, verily, I say unto you: except ye eat of the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.—For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.* Ver. 52, 53, 55. Nor was it the multitude alone took offence at this mystery of a real and corporal reception of Christ's person, so energetically and repeatedly expressed by him, but also several of his own beloved

disciples, whom certainly he would not have permitted to desert him to their own destruction, if he could have removed their difficulty by barely telling them that they were only to receive him by faith, and to take bread and wine in remembrance of him. Yet this merciful Saviour permitted them to go their ways, and he contented himself with asking the apostles if they would also leave him. They were as incapable of comprehending the mystery as the others were, but they were assured that Christ is ever to be credited upon his word, and accordingly they made that generous act of faith, which every true Christian will also make, who seriously and devoutly considers the sacred text before us. *Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this, said : This is a hard saying : who can hear it ? From that time many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him. Then Jesus said unto the twelve : will ye also go away ? Then Simon Peter answered him : Lord, to whom shall we go ? thou hast the words of eternal life.* Ver. 60, 66; 67, 68.

The Apostles thus instructed by Christ's express and repeated declaration, as to the nature of this sacrament, when he promised it to them, were prepared for the sublime simplicity of his words in instituting it. For *whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said : take ye and eat : THIS IS MY BODY. And taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying : drink ye all of this ; FOR THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION*

OF SINS. *Mat.* xxvi. 26, 27, 28. This account of St. Matthew is repeated by St. Mark, xiv. 22, 23, 24, and, nearly word for word, by St. Luke, xxii. 19, 20, and St. Paul, *1. Cor.* xi. 23, 24, 25; who adds: *Therefore whoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord—and eateth and drinketh judgment* (the Protestant Bible says *damnation*) to himself." *1 Cor.* xi. 27, 29.

On this passage I remark :

Istly. That the author has given us no proof whatever that the multiplied loaves and fishes with which Jesus Christ fed the five thousand men were "an evident sign of the multiplication of His own body on the several altars of the world." Who says so? Does the Saviour? No! Do the Apostles? No! You cannot produce even the *shadow* of an evidence that such was the signification of this miracle.

2ndly. That it is mere assumption on the part of Dr. Milner to assert that the words of Christ in John John vi., 52, &c., refer to the sacrament of the Eucharist. Again we ask who says so? Do the Fathers? No? Do the Doctors of the Church? No! They saw plainly that the argument proves too much, for it proves that no one who does not eat the real flesh and drink the real blood of the Son of God in the sacrifice of the Mass, can have life. I rather interpret the words with St. Augustine, who, as we shall immediately see interpreted them spiritually. I interpret them by the 35th verse.

"Jesus said to them : I am the bread of life, he that

*cometh* to me shall not hunger; and he that *believeth* in me shall never thirst." How natural it was that now, having fed the multitude, he should speak of himself under the figure of manna, heavenly manna, of bread, living bread; just as he spoke of himself under the similitude of water in his conversation at Jacob's well with the Samaritan woman! Are we then, on a merely gratuitous assumption, to receive a dogma which Roman Catholics themselves acknowledge to be contrary both to our sensations and to our reason? But what will my friends who hold this doctrine say to the statement which I shall now make and prove, that Dr. Milner in this interpretation is opposed by some of the most learned and illustrious writers and ecclesiastics of his own communion? Thomas Aquinas expressly declares that the words mean "spiritual eating," [*manducationem spiritualem*]. Cardinal Cajetan declares that the literal sense of this passage would destroy the sufficiency of baptism, and such an interpretation therefore is inconsistent with the Christian faith. Labbeus in the twentieth vol. of his works, printed at Venice in 1728, declares that the Constantine, Basilian and Trentine Fathers, as explained by Mauricius, Ragusa and Villetan, reject the literal, and accept the spiritual interpretation. "Our Lord," say they, "in John's Gospel, points to spiritual participation in his flesh and blood by faith, of which all who believe partake in baptism, and without which neither child nor adult can obtain salvation." I ask then, which of these Catholic expositors am I to follow? Dr. Milner or the sainted Dr. Aquinas, and Cardinal Cajetan? Again, if this passage refers to the Lord's

Supper as Dr. Milner here asserts, how is it that the literal words of Christ are not carried out by the practice of the Roman Catholic Church? Christ says, "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." Do the laity of the Catholic Church *drink* Christ's blood? You reply, the blood is contained in the host; but I keep you to the literal sense, and I affirm that **THE BLOOD IS NOT DRANK** in the host; yet, saith Christ, "except ye **DRINK** ye have no life in you."

3rdly. In compliance with Dr. Milner's invitation, we shall now examine those passages in the New Testament which speak of the direct institution by the Lord Jesus Christ of this holy sacrament. He bids us turn to the Gospel by St. Matthew: I do so, and in chapter xxvi, verse 26, 27, 28, I read as follows:—

"And whilst they were at supper, JESUS took bread, and blessed, and broke: and gave to his disciples, and said: Take ye, and eat: This is my body.

"And taking the chalice he gave thanks: and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this.

"For this is my blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins."

Mark! the Saviour said, "This is my blood which *shall* be shed for many." Then was it not yet shed, and therefore was not in the chalice. Observe also, that after the words of consecration were pronounced, he said, "I will not drink from henceforth of *this fruit of the vine* until that day when I shall drink it with you new in the kingdom of my Father." Could the Divine Teacher have expressed himself thus, if the transubstantial theory

were orthodox and evangelical? This account is repeated by St. Mark; and, Dr. M. observes, in the paragraph which I have just read, is repeated by St. Luke "nearly word for word;" not quite remember, and therefore it may be as well to mark the difference. I will read from the Douay Bible.

"For I say to you, that from this time I will not eat it, till it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

"And having taken the chalice he gave thanks, and said: Take, and divide *it* among you.

"For I say to you, that I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, till the kingdom of God come.

"And taking bread, he gave thanks, and brake: and gave to them, saying: This is my body which is given for you. Do this for a 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."

"Do this for a commemoration of me" is an expression which could scarcely be used if Christ were always present, corporeally present, in the Eucharist. "In like manner the chalice also, after he had supped saying, this is the chalice the New Testament in my blood." The vulgate says, "*Hic est calix novum testamentum in sanguine meo,*" the more natural rendering of which is "This chalice is the New Testament, in my blood." Our Roman Catholic friends abhor the very notion of our Lord's having spoken here under a trope or figure; but will they in this instance accept the literal exposition? Will they admit that the chalice is the New Testament? And yet the Saviour as expressly declares of the chalice,

that it is the New Testament, as he does of the bread, that it is his body. The last Scriptural account which we have of the institution of this Sacrament is from the pen of the apostle Paul who was favoured from the Lord with a special revelation on this subject. I will read it from the Douay Bible—

“For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, And giving thanks, broke, and said: Take ye and eat: this is my body which shall be delivered for you: this do for the commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying: This chalice is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me. For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord, until he come.”

“Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.

“For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.”

In this passage the apostle informs us that Jesus said, “This is my body that *shall* be delivered,” but the doctrine of transubstantiation requires us to believe that the body of Jesus Christ was then already delivered in the Sacrament. Again: “This chalice is the New Testament in my blood” Here, as in St. Luke’s gospel, we are all obliged to regard the words of Jesus as figurative, for no Catholic believes the chalice to be the

New Covenant. But let us proceed, "For as often as you shall eat this *bread!*" This BREAD!! But how could the apostle call that "bread" which the Roman Catholic theory declares to be not bread, but the body, soul and divinity of the blessed Saviour? "And drink this chalice!" This surely is a figure and a bold figure. Does the Catholic Church act upon the literal interpretation of this and oblige every priest to drink the chalice?

These passages are the entire sum of the Scriptural authority upon which the Roman Catholic Church builds the romantic fabric of transubstantiation. I ask you to consider candidly whether they constitute a sufficient basis for so transcendent an edifice. Do these proofs suffice to convince you that a miracle is wrought in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, not above merely, but contrary to your reason, and to the evidence of your senses? You say that we are not to interpret the words of the institution figuratively, while at the same time you yourselves are giving or are obliged to give a figurative explanation to some of them. Figures! Is there not a figure in the words "This chalice is the New Testament or Covenant?" Is there not a figure in the words, "As often as ye drink this chalice." Who then will contend that we have not the right to suppose that the Saviour spoke as much in a figure when he said, "this is my body," as he did in the words, "this chalice is the New Testament?" Why, the Roman Catholic Church does not interpret the words, "this is my body," literally, for they say the bread is not merely changed into Christ's body, but into his soul, his divinity.

“This is my body which shall be delivered for you”—That is, it represents this body which is to hang upon the tree for your sins, this body of mine which is to be outstretched upon the cross for your iniquities. “This is my blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins”—That is, it represents my precious blood which is to be poured forth upon the altar of the cross—that blood which, flowing from my head, my hands, my feet, my side, shall constitute that fountain which is to be opened for sin and for uncleanness.

Let me take you back to survey the circumstances which attended the institution of the Passover, that rite, or sacrament rather, which shadowed forth the Christian Eucharist. I will read then the eleventh verse of the twelfth chapter of Exodus:—

“And thus you shall eat it: you shall gird your reins, and you shall have shoes on your feet, holding staves in your hands, and you shall eat in haste: for it is the Passover (that is the Passage) of the Lord.”

Mark the expression—“It is the PASSAGE of the Lord.” Was it really so? By no means. The paschal lamb was THE SIGN and THE PLEDGE to Israel of the passage of the Lord, or the passover, as we more usually designate it. “The blood, said the Lord, shall be unto you for a sign in the houses where you shall be, and I shall see the blood and shall pass over you.” If you oblige me to interpret literally, I oblige you to interpret in the same literal manner when the Saviour says, “I am the vine,” “I am the door”; or the apostle says, “this rock is Christ”: or when the son of God in the

Apocalypse said to John, "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches," and "The seven candlesticks are the seven Churches."

*Secondly*,—I shall refer you to the authority of the Fathers in support of the Protestant disclaimer.

I think I have before referred to the value to be set upon patristic authority, viz. : that it is only worthy of confidence when it accords with the written word of God. There is this remarkable difference between the Scriptures and the Fathers. All the scriptural writers agree, they never contradict either themselves or each other, the Fathers do both. But forasmuch as the Fathers are of some authority in the Roman Catholic Church, and forasmuch as her ministers are forbidden to interpret any passage of Scripture except by the *unanimous* consent of the Fathers, it is only right that we should refer to them in any discussion of Roman Catholic doctrine.

Now I candidly acknowledge that there are passages in the Fathers which seem to favour the doctrine of transubstantiation, but there are in the same Fathers passages which oblige us to regard them either as using figurative language when they thus speak, or as being manifestly inconsistent with themselves.

St. Ignatius who was one of the earliest Fathers, has the following passage which is much dwelt upon by our Roman Catholic friends. Speaking of some persons whom he describes as heretical, he says, "They abstain from the Eucharist and prayer because they do not believe the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which flesh suffered for our sin, and which

flesh in His goodness the Father resuscitated." How are we to understand this language? Surely you will agree with me that the fairest way will be to let Ignatius, if he will, interpret his own words. Well then, in his epistle to the Trilestians he distinctly disavows, as it seems to me, all belief in transubstantiation, for he says, "Establish yourselves, *εν πιστει η̄ εστι η̄ σαρξ και εν αγαπη η̄ εστι το αιμα του Χριστου* in faith which is the flesh, and in love which is the blood of Christ." This language could not be employed by any one who subscribes to those Canons of the Council of Trent, which we read at the commencement of the discourse. I could transcribe passages from Tertullian, from Cyprian, from Clement of Alexandria, from Origen, from Athanasius, from Cyril of Jerusalem, and from Jerome, showing, that however strongly they spoke of eating and drinking the flesh and the blood of the Lord Jesus, they intended to employ their expressions figuratively and spiritually. But there is one Father who is spoken of by the advocates of transubstantiation as beyond any other "more copious and more nervous in explaining this doctrine, so that a child might understand him." I refer to St. Augustin. Now I hold in my hand the Homilies of this very Father on the Gospel of St. John. I turn then to the homily on that part of the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel, on which so much reliance is placed by Roman Catholics, and I find so much in it that favours the spiritual interpretation of our Saviour's words that I am sorry not to have time to read it to you from beginning to end:—

"This, then," says he, "it is, that He hath taught

and admonished us in MYSTICAL words, that we be in His body, under Himself the Head in His members, eating His flesh, not forsaking the unity of Him. Howbeit, they that were present, the more part by not understanding were offended, for, in hearing these things they thought but of flesh, which they were themselves. But the Apostle saith, and saith truly, *To be carnally minded*—to understand according to the flesh—is death. His flesh the Lord giveth us to eat, and *to understand according to the flesh is death*; while yet of His flesh he saith, that in it is life eternal. Therefore even the flesh we must not *understand after the flesh*, as in these words following . . . . . *The words*, saith He, *which I have spoken to you are Spirit and Life*: For, we have said, that what the Lord hath given us to understand in the eating of his flesh and drinking of His blood is, **THAT WE SHOULD DWELL IN HIM AND HE IN US.**”

I have referred you to both Scripture and the Fathers in support of the Protestant disclaimer against the doctrine of transubstantiation. Let me now direct your attention,

*Thirdly*,—To the differences of Roman Catholics themselves respecting this doctrine. It may, perhaps, surprise you to learn that in the Catholic Church where all is represented as unity—where “her doctrines, her liturgies, her practice, are,” as Dr. Milner says, “ONE,” there are four distinct opinions on the subject of transubstantiation.

The *first* opinion is that of the Dominicans, who at the Council of Trent differed from the Franciscans on

this subject. They maintain the Trentine doctrine, that there is an annihilation of both the bread and the wine by the consecration of the Priest, and that they are transubstantiated into our blessed Lord's body and blood, which body and blood possess all the chief properties of matter; e. g. quantity, extension, visibility, motion, and locality.

The *second* opinion is that of the Franciscans, who affirm that the substance of the sacramental elements remains unchanged, while the substance of our Lord's body takes its place. To this theological section belong Aquinas, Bonaventure, Cajetan, Gabriel, Varro, and many others. They further say, that Jesus in the host occupies no place, and possesses no locality. He fills no space. He has no parts, no length, breadth, or thickness. He cannot be seen, touched, felt, tasted or broken.

The *third* opinion ascribes to the soul of Christ in the sacrament all the principal powers and operations of the mind. He possesses in the estimation of those who hold this opinion the same intellect and sensation upon the altar as he possesses in heaven. Like another human being he can see, hear, feel, move, act, and suffer. Some indeed have assigned the power of singing, and warming the officiating Priest's hands. This statement is such a tax upon your credulity that I must give you the very words, "*Christum in sacramento posse videre, canere, audire, et facere et pati omnia, quæ cæteri homines pati et agere. Ut est in sacramento posse propriam manum sacerdotum calefacere, et ab ipsa calefieri.*"

A *fourth* opinion rejects this theory, and stripping the Son of God in the host of all sensation, asserts that he lies upon the altar as a dead body, "*mortuum modo*." He has, say its supporters, spiritual without corporal life.

I have enumerated these differences of opinion to convince you, that notwithstanding the boasted unity of which we daily hear, there exist in the Church of Rome the most opposite opinions on even the distinctive doctrines of their faith. I have enumerated them also for the purpose of showing that there are in the Catholic community men of independence who reject many of these dogmas, a noncompliance with which secures for them *ipso facto* the solemn anathema of their Church. Would that they broke off every remaining link that binds them to doctrines which can be upheld by neither Scripture nor reason.

*Fourthly*,—We protest against the doctrine of transubstantiation because it is opposed to both reason and sense.

There are many things both in nature and in revealed religion which are above reason, but there is nothing in either which is opposed to reason. The doctrine of the tri-unity of Jehovah is often compared by the Roman Catholics with that of transubstantiation, but it is absurd to constitute this sacred mystery, which all admit does not come under the cognizance of our senses, a parallel to that which is sensible and material. To make it a perfect parallel you must prove that Protestants believe the one Jehovah to have been miraculously spoken into three persons by an officiating minister. What parallel is there between the sacred mystery of the godhead and

a miracle? The Catholic Church affirms that by the enunciation of the words "*Hoc est enim corpus meum,*" a great miracle is wrought by her Priests; that indeed, bread and wine, which are laid upon the altar in their natural state, become by this simple utterance on the part of the Minister, the true body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ. Now all who understand the nature and office of miracles will at once see that it is the duty of the Church of Rome to prove this transubstantiation. We ask to have it submitted to the evidence of our natural senses. For you to say it is a spiritual matter, and is not therefore to be understood through the medium of the senses, will be vain; it is not a spiritual, but a natural doctrine; it relates to matter; to flesh, and blood, and bones, and sinews. When Christ cured the leper, the miracle was evident both to the man himself and to his friends, and the Saviour submitted it to the ordinary sanitary test,—“Go show thyself to the Priest;” but when the Priest of the Church of Rome works *this* miracle it is not evident either to himself or to the people for whom it is wrought. When Christ at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, transubstantiated water into wine, the miraculous effect was manifest to the taste, the smell, the sight of those in whose presence, and for whose use, the prodigy was performed; but when the Priest of the Church of Rome transubstantiates sacramental wine into the blood of Christ, it is not evident either to his taste, or smell, or vision. Where is the evidence, we ask again, that Christ's true and proper body, his flesh, his blood, his bones, his nerves, his sinews, lie upon the altars of

Roman Catholic Churches? If you analyse the host, will you find the component parts of bones, of flesh, of nerves, &c. No! Roman Catholics tell us, "No." They acknowledge that the taste, the smell, the form, the color of the bread and the wine, are still on the altar, but that the bread and wine themselves are not there; they have gone never again to return! We say they have not gone, and thus throw the burden of proof upon the advocates of transubstantiation. The bread is there. Do you ask how I know? I reply, there is the substance of the bread, there is the shape of the bread, there is the color of the bread, there is the smell of the bread, there is the taste of the bread; and more than this, were you to form two wafers precisely similar, and were the officiating Priest to consecrate one and not the other, that Priest himself could not detect by examination which was the wafer, and which the body of Christ. The wine is there. You ask me how I know? I reply, there are the smell, the taste, the color, the every property, indeed, of wine. My Roman Catholic friend says, it is not wine, it is blood. Now let me ask him, does it contain the properties of blood? Does blood contain alcohol? Will blood intoxicate? No. But if I can prove that the intoxicating quality of the wine remains after consecration, I go far, I think, towards proving that it is not blood, and that the nature of the wine has undergone no change. I read in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, that certain members of that Church when they partook of this holy sacrament became drunken—they drank to excess. Was it blood then that they drank? Was it a whole Christ

that they partook? Did the body and blood of Christ throw those Corinthians into a state of intoxication? You reject the blasphemy—every Catholic rejects it. And yet if the canons of the Council of Trent are true, the conclusion is irresistible that these converts became inebriate by drinking, in the chalice of the Holy Sacrament, the blood, the body, the soul, and the divinity of the blessed and glorious Saviour!

We demand that the miracle be submitted to the ordinary test. Moses, by the power of God transubstantiated the waters of the Nile into blood. How did the people—how did the lawgiver himself know that the miracle was wrought? By the fact that the transubstantiated water lost all the properties of water. By their senses they determined that the smell, the color, the specific gravity were changed. The Catholic Priest forbids an investigation of the *Corpus Christi*. How different is this from the spirit and condescension of Him whose servant he professes to be. After the resurrection of Christ there was found amongst the eleven disciples, one who was rather more faithless than the rest. He could not be brought to believe that the Saviour was risen from the dead. He must have the evidence of his senses, he must put his fingers into the print of the Saviour's nails, he must thrust his hand into His side. How did Jesus meet him at their first interview? Did he upbraid him? No. Did he command him to stand at a distance and to believe at his word? No. How condescendingly did he meet his infirmity! "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side and be not

faithless but believing." We are unbelievers in the doctrine of transubstantiation, we approach a Roman Catholic altar, and we say to the ministering Priest, we cannot believe that our blessed Jesus in his body, his soul, his divinity, rests upon that altar. What is his reply? Does he say draw near, and examine for yourself? No. He forbids our approach, he frowns upon our unbelief, he commands us to take the word of the Church for it. How unlike the son of God! Why does he not say, Reach hither your hand, behold the head, the feet, the bones, the flesh of Jesus? Reach hither your fingers, behold here is Christ in his power, glory, divinity? My dear friends, do you expect me to subscribe, do you yourselves subscribe to the declaration of Pope Urban, who in the midst of a Roman Council said, "The hands of the Pontiff are raised to an eminence granted to none of the angels, of creating God, the creator of all things, and of offering him up for the salvation of the whole world?" Do you expect me to believe what Cardinal Biel said of himself and all Priests, "He that created me, gave me if it be lawful to tell, to create himself; Mary once conceived the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world; while the priest daily calls into existence the same deity?" Do you expect me to receive the doctrine that I am to adore that which I eat, and that I am to eat that which I adore? Do you expect me to believe, that the Lord Jesus Christ in the sacrament, body, soul and divinity, may moulder and become corrupt, may be carried away and eaten by a mouse? My reply is, "I cannot." Where, I ask, in the Word of God, do you

find authority for all this? Where is the command for the adoration of the host? The apostles, who were quite as jealous for the glory of Christ as any Roman Catholic priest, made no provision for the protection of the host, the body of Christ, after the celebration of the Eucharist. Your reply is, that "all things are possible to God." This I deny; God cannot lie—falsehood, therefore, is impossible to him. He cannot sin—He cannot act inconsistently with his own character and nature, He cannot perpetrate an absurdity. I do not deny that the Divine Being can convert bread into a human body, but the doctrine of transubstantiation requires me to believe that this conversion is effected in a body, without any change in appearance, color, shape, solidity, or extension. Then again I am required to believe that this bread is transubstantiated into the very same body that is in heaven, and that remains in heaven; yea, and that this is repeated ten thousand times every day; so that ONE Christ, and only one, is, at the same time, body, soul, and divinity, in ten thousand places.

Oh, brethren! fly with me from these contradictions, from this materialism, to the pure spirituality of Christ's gospel. Here, in his own word, here in his own ordinances, let our souls feed upon Christ by faith. He is the living manna, let us go forth over the gospel plains, and with the hands of faith let us gather up this divine, this heavenly food, and let us eat that we may live for ever; and while thus employed, let us remember that he is that living water whose streams make glad the world's wilderness, and of that water let us freely drink

that we may live for ever. Here is food for the hungry, here are streams for the thirsty spirit! Who art thou that desirest this divine food? Blessed art thou; for thou shalt be filled; Blessed art thou, for whoso, saith Christ "eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

SECONDLY,—It will not demand a lengthened discussion, or an elaborated argument, to sustain the other part of the protest which we recorded this evening, that, namely, which relates to **THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS**. And here, I ask, what is the sacrifice of the mass without transubstantiation? It is a gorgeous and magnificent temple falling into ruins, because it has no foundation. Had we, however, failed to maintain our protest against transubstantiation, we should yet have been prepared to prove that the sacrifice of the mass is unscriptural and unnecessary.

My first duty will be to present from authorized standards a brief view of the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on this subject.

Listen then to one or two Canons of the Council of Trent:—

"If any one shall say that the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be accursed."

Attend also to the following sentences from the Catechism of the Council of Trent:—

“ We confess that the sacrifice of the mass is one and the same sacrifice with that upon the cross: the victim is one and the same Christ Jesus, who offered himself, once only, a bloody sacrifice on the altar of the cross. The bloody and unbloody victim is still one and the same, and the oblation of the cross is daily renewed in the eucharistic sacrifice, in obedience to the command of our Lord, ‘ This do for a commemoration of me.’ The Priest is also the same Christ our Lord: the Ministers who offer this sacrifice consecrate the holy mysteries not in their own but in the person of Christ. This the words of consecration declare: the Priest does not say, ‘ This is the body of Christ,’ but, ‘ This is my body;’ and thus invested with the character of Christ, he changes the substance of the bread and wine, into the substance of his real body and blood. That the holy sacrifice of the mass, therefore, is not only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross, but also a sacrifice of propitiation, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious, the Pastor will teach as a dogma defined by the unerring authority of a General Council of the Church. As often as the commemoration of this victim is celebrated, so often is the work of our salvation promoted, and the plenteous fruits of that bloody victim flow in upon us abundantly through this unbloody sacrifice.”

Read with me, lastly, the following extracts from the Roman Missal concerning the defective and non-defective offering of the mass:

“ Mass may be defective in the Matter to be conse-

crated, in the Form to be used, and in the officiating Minister. For if in any of these, there be any defect, viz: due matter, form, with intention, and priestly orders in the celebrator, no sacrament is consecrated.

“If any one shall leave out or change any part of the form of the consecration of the body and blood, and in the change of the words, such words do not signify the same thing, there is no consecration.”

*First*.—We contend that this doctrine is not sustained by Scripture. The chief ground of the Protestant disclaimer is to be found in the use of the word propitiatory. Protestants believe with Catholics, that sacrifices are daily offered unto God in the church. It is not to be questioned, that, in this congregation there have been offered to the Divine Being this evening sacrifices which he has accepted. One penitent tear, one contrite sigh is to God an acceptable offering, for “a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.” One fervent song of praise, one simple, unadorned supplication, one fervent breathing after God, is a sacrifice which he receives. But does the Word of God lead you to suppose that there is daily offered in the Christian Church a propitiatory sacrifice for sins? It has seemed to me in investigating this awful subject, that if St. Paul had intended to produce a simply great and conclusive polemical pamphlet against the sacrifice of the mass, he could not have done this more effectually than he has done in his Epistle to the Hebrews. The very note from the Douay Bible, on the twelfth verse of the ninth chapter, is a standing refutation of the practice, and a convincing

argument that the language of Paul, taken in its natural sense, is opposed to it. "By that one sacrifice of his blood, once offered on the cross, Christ our Lord paid and exhibited, once for all, the general price and ransom of all mankind; which no other priest could do." A Protestant commentator could not have spoken more decisively.

Listen again to two other notes which follow:—

"Christ shall never more offer himself in sacrifice, in that violent, painful and bloody manner, nor can there be any occasion for it; since by that one sacrifice upon the cross, he has furnished the full ransom, redemption, and remedy for all the sins of the world. But this hinders not that he may offer himself daily in the sacred mysteries in an unbloody manner, for the daily application of that one sacrifice of redemption to our souls."

*To exhaust.* That is, to empty or draw out to the very bottom, by a plentiful and perfect redemption."

One of the passages which Roman Catholics urge in favour of the sacrifice of the mass is Malachi i, 11. "For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts." The note on this text asserts that this *clean oblation* is "the precious body and blood of Christ in the Eucharistic sacrifice," but it does not state the authority upon which this assertion is made. Is it possible, if the sacrifice of the mass was intended to be a standing

institution of the Church, that there should be found no direction for its celebration. If going to mass was designed to be so large and important a part of Christianity as our Roman Catholic friends seem to think, you must acknowledge it to be inconceivable that in the epistle to the Hebrews which treats of the Christian ritual, there should be no account or explanation of it given, and no rules respecting it laid down, for the guidance of Christian Ministers. Do the Sacred Scriptures sanction, in any way, the sacrifice of the mass? Christ certainly made no elevation of the host; and the apostles did not worship the sacrament. In apostolic times there were none of the constituents of a sacrifice in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Cardinal Bellarmine freely confesses all this, for he says, "The oblation which follows consecration belongs to the integrity of the sacrament and not to its essence: this," he continues, "is proved by our Lord not having made any oblation, nor even the apostles in the beginning, as we have demonstrated from Gregory." The Jesuit, Salmeron, in the first book of his commentaries on St. Paul's epistles gives an enumeration of certain unwritten traditions in which he mentions the ecclesiastical hierarchy, i. e. the Papal Monarchy, the mass, the mode of sacrifice, and the tradition that Jesus offered a sacrifice in bread and wine. Cardinal Baronius makes a similar confession. We do not wonder that these learned men abandoned the plea for the mass on Scriptural authority. Paul in his epistle to the Romans says, "For in that he died to sin, he died ONCE." In that to the Hebrews, "In the which will we are

sanctified by the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ ONCE ;” “For by ONE oblation he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.” Then where is the necessity for the perpetration of this sacrifice. The Catholic Church says that the unbloody sacrifice of the mass is a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the dead and living ; now, I say, that it therefore lacks the main characteristic of a propitiatory sacrifice, for the apostle Paul, as I read in the Douay Bible, says in this very chapter, that “without shedding of blood there is no remission.”

SECONDLY,—This doctrine and practice are not sustained by remote antiquity. I give you one passage from Justin Martyr’s celebrated description of a Sabbath service in a Christian congregation contained in his apology for Christians. It may be found in the second volume of his works, Paris edition, page 97.

“Then the bread and the cup of the water and of the wine mixed with it, is offered to the president of the brethren, and he, taking it, offers up praise and glory to the Father of all, in the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and at some length he performs a thanksgiving, for having been honoured with these things by him. When he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present, joyfully cry out, Amen. Amen signifies, in the Hebrew tongue, so be it. But the president having returned thanks, and all the people having joyfully cried out, those who are called by us deacons, give to each of those who are present, a portion of the bread and the wine and the water, over which a thanksgiving has been performed, and they carry away

some for those who are not present. And this food is called by us the Eucharist, of which no one is permitted to partake but he who believes that the things taught to us are true, and who has been washed for the remission of sins and for regeneration, and who lives as Christ has enjoined. For we do not receive these things as common bread, or common drink; but as the incarnate Jesus became, by the Word of God, Christ our Saviour, and received flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught that the food which is made the Eucharist by the prayer, according to his word, by which our flesh and blood are nourished, is both the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus. For the apostles, in the histories which they have written, which are called gospels, have thus recorded that Jesus commanded them; that he taking bread and giving thanks, said, 'Do this in remembrance of me, this is my body;' and that he, in like manner, taking the cup and giving thanks, said, 'This is my blood.' And, in all that we offer, we bless the Maker of all things by his Son Jesus Christ, and by the Holy Spirit. And on the day that is called Sunday, there is an assembly in the same place, of those who dwell in towns or in the country, and the histories of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read, whilst the time permits; then, the reader ceasing, the president verbally admonishes and exhorts to the imitation of those good things. Then we all rise in common and offer prayers, and, as we have already said, when we have finished our prayers, bread and wine and water are offered, and the president, in like manner, offers prayers and thanksgivings as far

as it is in his power to do so, and the people joyfully cry out, saying, Amen. And the distribution and communication is to each of those who have returned thanks, and it is sent by the deacons to those who are not present. Those who are rich and willing, each according to his own pleasure contributes what he pleases, and what is thus collected is put away by the president, and he assists the orphans, and widows, and those who, through sickness, or any other cause, are destitute, and also those who are in bondage, and those who are strangers journeying, and in short, he aids all those who are in want. But we all meet in common on Sunday, because it is the first day in the which God, who . . . . . made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day arose from the dead."

Roman Catholics sometimes taunt us with the assertion that there is no true Church amongst us, because we have no altar, no priest, no sacrifice. No altar! We have an altar whose foundations are the glorious attributes of God, cemented together by divine love, whose superstructure is the world; an altar around which shines the radiant glory of the everlasting covenant! No altar! We have an altar which is stained with the precious blood of God's eternal Son, and upon which has descended the approving fire of heaven. WE HAVE AN ALTAR. Sometimes we find it on the cragged rock, at others in the groves of the mantled forest; sometimes on the silent beach, at others on the top of the ocean wave; it may not be adorned with the gold and the silver, the tapestry and

the paintings, the statues and the candelabra which deck the altars of our Roman Catholic friends ; but all nature adorns our altar ; the glorious firmament is its over-hanging canopy, and the candles which have been lit around it are those orbs of light which illumine day and night. Wherever the true Christian goes he finds an altar. Sometimes he is like Abraham, who found an altar in the vale of Mamre ; or like Isaac, whose evening altar were the fields in which he prayed. Sometimes he is like Jacob whose pillow of stone became his altar ; or like David, when he fled from Saul and found an altar in the caves of the wilderness ; or like Solomon, who erected his altar in a magnificent edifice. With Paul the Christian sometimes finds his altar on the wreck of a ship, or with Brainerd, in the forests of America within sound of the Indian war whoop, or with Judson, on Eastern sands and plains. The Christian may be on the mountain top, or in the busy town ; he may be on the lonely island, or in the peopled city ; he may find himself gliding down the flowing river, or tossed upon the rolling billow,—“ ’Tis nought to him,” he has an altar,

“ Since God is ever present, ever felt,

“ In the dark waste as in the city full :

“ And where He vital breathes there must be joy.”

Sometimes we are told that we have no priest. No priest, while JESUS lives in heaven ! Jesus who once for all hath offered himself without spot to God, for our sins and for our uncleanness ! Jesus who hath passed within the glorious vail of the temple of the Universe not without blood, Jesus who hath presented himself before

the throne of the Eternal with a propitiatory sacrifice! No priest! While HE is there who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities—He the Son of God who is able to succour them that are tempted—He who ever liveth to make intercession for us—He who is able to save unto the uttermost all who come unto God by him. No priest! While he stands before the throne of the Eternal with the golden censer in his hand sanctioning by his presence the access of every sinner who cometh to that throne with a humble and contrite spirit! “But you have no *visible* priest.” No visible priest! While every saint in the company of Christ’s faithful ones belongs to the Royal Priesthood of the Christian dispensation. No visible priest! While the voice of every saint of God is privileged to exclaim, “unto Him that hath loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us kings and priests unto God, and his Father be glory and dominion for ever and ever!” God’s people are the priests of the Christian temple, and wherever you find a Christian, you find a priest of the most High God.

And who are they that affirm, “You have no sacrifice!” The Lamb of God is our sacrifice; perfect, spotless, precious, infinite; once offered—“ONCE FOR ALL”—offered for me, for you, for every child of the family of Adam. No sacrifice!—

“Jesus, my Great High-Priest,  
Offer’d his blood and died;  
My guilty conscience seeks  
No sacrifice beside;  
His powerful blood did once atone,  
And now it pleads before the throne.’

No sacrifice! Through HIM, wherever there is a broken and a contrite spirit, there is a sacrifice which God doth not despise. No sacrifice! Wherever there is a humble, grateful Christian ready to present his body upon the altar of consecration, there is a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God. No sacrifice! So long as a Christian believer is to be found with a prayer to breathe to heaven, or a note of praise to waft to the throne of Eternal Majesty, there is an offering, a sacrifice, which ascends as incense, and as a savour of a sweet smell before the Heavenly altar. We have an altar: We have a priesthood: We have sacrifices. O come to this altar of Christianity, the altar of the cross; come to the Holy of Holies through the sacrifice of God's Divine Lamb; come with all your guilt and all your pollution, remembering that you have a High Priest who advocates your cause, and who is both able and willing to "SAVE UNTO THE UTTERMOST ALL WHO COME UNTO GOD BY HIM."

## NOTE TO LECTURE IV.

### *“ De defectibus Panis.*

1st. “ If the bread be not of wheat, or if of wheat, it be mixed with such quantity of other grain, that it doth not remain wheaten bread ; or if it be in any way corrupted, it doth not make a sacrament.

2d. “ If it be made with rose or other distilled water, it is doubtful if it make a sacrament.

3d. “ If it begin to corrupt but is not corrupted : also, if it be not unleavened according to the custom of the Latin church, it makes a sacrament ; but the priest sins grievously.”

### *“ De defectibus Vini.*

“ If the wine be quite sour, or putrid, or be made of bitter or unripe grapes : or if so much water be mixed with it, as spoils the wine, no sacrament is made.

“ If after the consecration of the body, or even of the wine, the defect of either kind be discovered, one being consecrated ; then, if the matter which should be placed cannot be had, to avoid scandal, he must proceed.”

### *“ De defectibus Ministri.*

“ The defects on the part of the minister, may occur in these things required in him, these are first and especially *intention*, after that, *disposition* of soul, of body, of vestments, and disposition in the service itself, as to those matters which can occur in it.

“ If any one *intend not* to consecrate, but to counterfeit ; also, if any wafers remain forgotten on the altar, or if any part of the wine, or any wafer lie hidden, when he did not intend to consecrate but what he saw ; also, if he shall have before him eleven wafers and intended to consecrate but ten only, not

determining what ten he meant, in all these cases there is no consecration, because *intention* is required.

“Should the consecrated host disappear, either by accident, or by wind, or miracle, or be devoured by some animal, and cannot be found; then let another be consecrated.

“If after consecration, a gnat, a spider, or any such thing fall into the chalice, let the priest swallow it with the blood, if he can; but if he fear danger and have a loathing, let him take it out, and wash it with wine, and when mass is ended, burn it, and cast it and the washing into holy ground.

“If poison fall into the chalice, or what might cause vomiting, let the consecrated wine be put into another cup, and other wine with water be again placed to be consecrated, and when mass is finished, let the blood be poured on linen cloth, or tow, remain till it be dry, and then be burned, and the ashes be cast into holy ground.

“If the host be poisoned, let another be consecrated and used, and that, be kept in a tabernacle, or a separate place until it be corrupted, and after that be thrown into holy ground.

“If in winter the blood be frozen in the cup, put warm clothes about the cup; if that will not do, let it be put into boiling water near the altar, till it be melted, taking care it does not get into the cup.

“If any of the blood of Christ fall on the ground by negligence, it must be *licked up with the tongue*, the place be sufficiently scraped, and the scrapings burned; but the ashes must be buried in holy ground.”

## LECTURE V.

### THE ONE MEDIATOR BETWEEN GOD AND MEN.

It is hardly necessary for me to state, to my hearers, unless, indeed, it be by way of constructing a link which shall complete the chain of argument and observation now to be employed, that man, in his primeval state, was ONE WITH DEITY. God dwelt in him, and he in God. Man took the highest delight in his Creator, and God in his creature. All was peace, harmony and love. No *medium* of access to God was necessary for man, because the intercourse and the fellowship were immediate and absolute. To how great an eminence, to how divine a height, was our nature raised, in the person of Adam!

Who needs to be told that from this lofty height, man fell? Sin separated between him and God. Those who had been so intimately united, were now severed and placed at an infinite distance from each other; those who had been friends, were now enemies. All intercourse with the Divine Being was cut off, and man found himself at enmity against an all-powerful and infinitely holy God. Had he endeavoured to find his way back again to God, every attempt which he could have made must have failed: for between him and Divinity there was fixed an impassable abyss, with no way around it, and no way over it. In the distance, but

within his trembling view, there was seen the lightning's flash, reminding him that God is a consuming fire; and from that distance, there fell upon his trembling ears, the thunders of Almighty vengeance, a revelation of His wrath from heaven against all ungodliness. A flaming sword guarding the Paradise of the Divine presence, warned man that any attempt to enter it, would be visited with instant judgment.

By what device could this breach be healed? What power could erect over this fearful gulph of separation a sufficient bridge—a bridge over which man might walk in safety to his God? What skill and energy could repair the fracture which sin had produced? Who could discover a medium of access for the sinner to his God? Who could penetrate the depths of the divine mind to ascertain whether there existed in those depths, the pure gem of redeeming mercy! What advocate could be found to plead before the offended majesty of heaven, the cause of rebel man?

Wonder O heavens, and be astonished O earth! The skill, the power, the compassion are all at hand, for they are all in God. Yea, the way is already opened; the bridge has been erected by our Divine Architect; the scheme of reconciliation is completed; the breach is healed; the serpent's head is bruised; the eternal Word, the Son of God, Jehovah's fellow, appears, arrays himself in our flesh, assumes our entire humanity, places himself in contact with the vengeance-charged cloud, receives its fearful shock, stands our Advocate before the throne of Heaven, and from that throne exclaims to us who seek after God, if haply we may

find Him, "I AM THE WAY, THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE, no man cometh to the Father BUT BY ME."

The question which we have to discuss and settle this evening, is not whether there is any necessity for the services of a mediator between God and men; this is a point upon which both Catholics and Protestants are agreed. What we have to determine is, whether of these two is the more scriptural—the doctrine of the Reformation, that there is but ONE mediator, or the practice of the Church of Rome, that there are MANY mediators. The passage of Scripture which I have selected as a text may be found in the Apostle Paul's first epistle to Timothy, the second chapter at the fifth verse. It is thus rendered in the Douay Bible:—

"THERE IS ONE GOD AND ONE MEDIATOR OF GOD AND MEN, THE MAN CHRIST JESUS."

*If we take a comprehensive view of the doctrine of Christ's mediation, we shall find that it covers the whole history of man from the period of his fall.*

For as soon as man sinned, as we have already seen, immediate intercourse between him and God was interrupted. The scheme devised and proposed in the mind of Deity was, that thenceforward man should be governed and treated with, through the intervention of a mediator. In harmony with all the arrangements, I mean ordinary arrangements, of both the works and the providence of God, this scheme was gradually developed. It did not burst suddenly upon the world in all the splendours of its light and glory; it rather followed that beautiful ordination of the Creator which we daily behold in the gradual development of the

morning light. But that Jesus Christ was mediator between God and men equally in the days of Abel and of Caiaphas the High Priest, equally in the days of Moses and of Peter and Paul, is a doctrine which is admitted by the most celebrated divines both Catholic and Protestant. We all detect the doctrine of Christ's mediation in the sacrifice of Abel, and in the offering of Abraham; we recognize our glorious Mediator in the Angel of the Covenant, and in the Captain of the Lord's Host; we see the doctrine of mediation shadowed forth in the appointment of the High Priest, in the daily offering of sacrifices, and in the yearly atonement; we recognize Christ crucified in the sin offerings of the priests, in the predictions of the prophets, and in the praises of the Psalms. For this Old-Testament recognition of Christ our Mediator, we have his own authority. The Evangelist Luke describes a conversation which Jesus had with his disciples, in the following words:—"These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things might be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets and in the psalms concerning me."

*A comprehensive view of Christ's mediatorship embraces also his mediatorial qualifications.*

Mediator is a word that is transferred from the Latin to the English language without any variation; it is a translation of the Greek word *μεσίτης* which means a middle person—one who comes between two adverse parties and reconciles them. Whatever lower meaning may be given to the word as applied by St. Paul to Moses, it is clear that whenever it is applied in the New

Testament to Jesus Christ, it includes the doctrine of reconciliation by atonement. Hence in the verse immediately following our text it is said :—" Who gave himself a redemption for all." The qualifications of the Lord Jesus Christ to interpose between God and men, are seen—

*First*, In his possessing in his own person the nature of each of the estranged parties. To employ the language of the Nicene Creed, he was " true God of true God," and yet, not less truly, " was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary and was made man." These qualifications are seen

*Secondly*, In his possession, as an infinite Being untainted by sin, of an infinite merit. And

*Thirdly*, In his offering himself as a ransom, an atonement, a satisfaction, for the sin, and consequent demerit of the offending party.

*A comprehensive view of Christ's mediation embraces also his every office and his entire work.*

" All the offices of Christ arise out of his gracious appointment as Mediator between the offended God and offending man. He is the PROPHET who came to teach us the extent and danger of our offences, and the means by which they may be remitted. He is the GREAT HIGH PRIEST of our profession, who having offered himself without spot to God has entered the holiest to make intercession for us, and to present our prayers and services to God, securing to them acceptance through his own merit. He is the KING ruling over the whole earth for the maintenance and establishment, the defence and enlargement of his Church, and the

punishment of those who reject his authority.”\* He teaches us as our Mediator, he atones for us as our Mediator, he intercedes for us as our Mediator, he rules over us and defends us as our Mediator. His entire work as the God-man is mediatorial. The Gospel is mediatorial, the Christian dispensation or covenant is mediatorial; all that we in this state of being have to do with God, and all that God has to do with us is mediatorial.

*A comprehensive view of Christ's mediation comprehends his absolute unity as Mediator.*

He stands forth in the Gospel single and alone; needing no helper, rejecting all aid, in the peculiar functions of his office. It is as certainly a scriptural truth that there is but one mediator, as it is that there is but one God: the two doctrines seem to be cognate, or rather the unity of Christ as mediator arises out of the doctrine, “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.” Adapting the truth contained in the text to the phraseology employed by Moses, we may say, “Hear ye children of our Christian Israel, the Lord Jesus, our Mediator, is ONE MEDIATOR.”

There is not, probably, an intelligent Roman Catholic present who would be disposed to question the scriptural accuracy and the general orthodoxy of these views. And, we will not be backward to admit that the *written teaching* of the Church of Rome on these subjects is generally correct. The divinity of Christ, his infinite merit, the satisfaction which he paid down for the sins of the whole world, the reconciliation which he effected

\* Farrar's Biblical Dictionary *sub voce*.

between God and sinners, and the unity of the Divine Mediator, are exhibited with more or less clearness in the authorised canons and liturgies of that Church. Candour, however, obliges us to state that these gems of original gospel truth are so imprisoned within modern incrustations as not to be easily detected. It is only by taking the hammer of God's word that we reach them at all. For instance, I find in the "Key of Heaven," a devotional work recommended by Archbishop Murray, at page 171, the following sentiments :—

"And that my petition may find acceptance, I appeal to thee, sweet Jesus, Son of the living God, the Advocate and Mediator betwixt us sinners and thy eternal Father, humbly beseeching thee, through that infinite charity which brought thee from heaven to the ignominy of the cross, and thy precious blood spilt thereon, that I may now partake of the benefit of thy sufferings, and be cleansed from all my offences : that by thy assistance I may sincerely repent and amend of all my failings : that dying to myself and the world, I may live only to thee, and never suffer either passion or pleasure to divide me from thee any more."

I find also the following sentence in the Catechism of the Council of Trent :—"True there is but one Mediator, Christ the Lord, who alone has reconciled us through his blood ; and who having accomplished our redemption, and having once entered into the holy of holies, ceases not to intercede for us." Nothing could be more scriptural than this, but then there are added these words, "it by no means follows that it is therefore unlawful to have recourse to the intercession of saints."

I could in this way pick out from authorised Roman Catholic works numberless sentences, phrases and expressions, which clearly acknowledge the New Testament doctrine of Christ's mediation. I shall, however, content myself with one other taken from page 43 of Bishop Butler's Catechism :—

“ Q. What conditions are necessary to render our prayers acceptable ?

“ A. We must always offer them with an humble and contrite heart ; with fervour and perseverance ; with confidence in God's goodness ; with resignation to his will, and in the name of Jesus Christ.”

Now, what Protestants remonstrate against is, the want of unity and consistency which pervades the teaching of the Church of Rome on this subject. In some authorised utterances of the Church, there is an avowal that only one mediator exists between God and men ; but in other utterances of equal authority, saints, angels, and men are invested with mediatorial attributes, and clothed with mediatorial prerogatives. It appears to me that the protest of the Reformed Churches, that protest, I mean, which relates to the subject now under consideration, may be thus expressed :—

“ WE PROTEST AGAINST THE CHURCH OF ROME BECAUSE SHE PRACTICALLY SUBSTITUTES OTHER MEDIATORS FOR JESUS CHRIST, AND AVOWEDLY RECOGNIZES THE EXISTENCE OF SECONDARY MEDIATION IN THE INVISIBLE WORLD.

You will say, perhaps, that this protest involves a grave charge against our Roman Catholic brethren ;

and you will ask, "Does the Church of Rome really usurp the mediatorial position of the Son of God, by placing in his stead others than he?" Listen with attention for a few minutes, and you will see how easily the charge can be sustained out of the writings and the mouths of Catholics themselves.

Observe, however, that we do not charge the Church of Rome with investing men, or saints, or angels, with all the attributes and powers of Christ as mediator; but we do charge her with investing them with some of these powers—powers which distinctively and solely attach to Him as the God-man. Two instances out of many shall now be given: Forgiveness of sins, and Intercession with God.

#### I. FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

I open the Douay Bible on the fifth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and I find at the thirty-first verse, the following passage: "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be Prince and Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins." Here, as I conceive, we have a distinct announcement, that the divine prerogative of pardoning sin is transferred to Christ, and to him alone, as the mediator of the New Testament; and that to invest in any other being, man, saint or angel, the powers of this prerogative, is to substitute another mediator in the place of Christ, the only mediator.

Our Roman Catholic friends have done this; their doctrine, and their practice too, place the priests of their Church, instead of Jesus Christ, between the people and their God. We are quite aware that ministers of the

gospel sustain the position of ambassadors for Christ, we do not forget that Paul the Apostle represents them as standing in the stead of Christ; but for what purpose are they invested with the high dignity of Christ's ambassadors? Why do they stand in Christ's stead? For the sole purpose of "beseeching" sinners to be "reconciled to God." But in the Church of Rome the Priest absolves the sinner, and does this not as a minister but as a judge; as God:—for in the fourteenth Session of the Council of Trent, the following Canon was passed: "Whoever shall affirm that the Priest's sacramental absolution is not a judicial act, but only a ministry to pronounce and declare that the sins of the party confessing are forgiven, so that he believes himself to be absolved even though the Priest should not absolve seriously, but in jest; or shall affirm that the confession of the penitent is not necessary in order to obtain absolution from the Priest; let him be accursed." "The Council farther teaches, that even those Priests who are living in mortal sin exercise the function of forgiving sins, as the Ministers of Christ, by the power of the Holy Spirit conferred upon them in ordination; and that those who contend that wicked Priests have not this power hold very erroneous sentiments. Whoever shall affirm that Priests living in mortal sin have not the power of binding and loosing, or that Priests are not the only Ministers of absolution, &c.; let him be accursed." The Catechism of the Council also declares: "Our sins are forgiven us by the absolution of the Priest. The voice of the Priest, who is legitimately constituted a Minister for the remission of sins, is to be

heard as that of Christ himself, who said to the lame man, 'Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee.'" "The absolution of the Priest, which is expressed in words, seals the remission of sins, which it accomplishes in the soul." "Unlike the authority given to the Priests of the old law, to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy, the power with which the Priests of the new law are invested is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but, as the Ministers of God, really to absolve from sin; a power which God himself, the author and source of grace and justification, exercises through their ministry."

I put it to any ordinary understanding, whether this teaching does not invest man, aye, even a wicked man, with the prerogative of our divine mediator, that of forgiving sins? The Scribes and the Pharisees could have taught our friends that it is no less than blasphemy for any creature to assume this power. "Who can forgive sins but God only?" And yet the Catechism of the Council of Trent declares, that "the voice of the Priest is to be heard as the voice of Christ himself, who said to the lame man, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee!" We protest against these assumptions; they rob God of his honor, they denude Christ of his prerogative. But I need not longer dwell upon this branch of our subject, because the next lecture will embrace the whole subject of a sinner's pardon, or justification before God.

II. INTERCESSION WITH GOD IN THE INVISIBLE WORLD  
IS ANOTHER OF THOSE MEDIATORIAL PREROGATIVES  
WHICH THE CHURCH OF ROME HAS TRANSFERRED  
FROM CHRIST, TO BOTH SAINTS AND ANGELS.

Who, with the New Testament in his hand, can doubt the belief of the Apostles to have been that Christ was that only intercessor through whom they could approach to the Father? Do you ever find an apostle presenting a supplication through any other than Christ, pleading any merits but those of Christ, flying to any other Refuge, or laying hold of any other Hope than that of Christ? Is not the intercession of Christ indeed represented here as his chief function in that world whither he has ascended? Already has he borne our sins in his own body; already, in our stead, magnified the law and made it honorable; already has he completed his atoning work; by his one offering, as we saw in the last lecture, he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified; and now, by virtue of his atoning work, by virtue of his sprinkled blood, by virtue of his infinite merit, he hath passed into the heavens, and ever liveth in the presence of God to make intercession for sinners. Turn to the epistle to the Hebrews, and you will find text upon text confirmatory of the sole intercessorship of Christ. Sole it must be, for his merits are the ground of his intercession. He now, saith the apostle, appears in the presence of God for us. But let me read to you a few verses from the tenth chapter of this epistle: "Having therefore, brethren, a confidence in the entering into the Holies by the blood of Christ: A new and living way which he hath dedicated for us

through the veil, that is to say, his flesh, and a high priest over the house of God: let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with clean water." Here there is pointed out to the Church of the Hebrews no other way but Christ. Are we to draw near? It is to be through him. Have we, as the saints of God, an entrance into the presence of the Holy One? It is through his blood. Let me read to you again out of the first Catholic epistle of John; "But if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world." All that we ask of Roman Catholics is, that they will furnish us from the word of God, with one instance of prayer and supplication having been offered to God or to Jesus Christ, through the virgin Mary, or, indeed, any other saint. Then, will we, with them, make pilgrimages to the shrines of Mary, and we will entreat the saints, as they do, to protect us by their power, and to plead with God for us by virtue of their merits. But the Scriptures are against them, the practice of the apostles is against them, the genius of Christianity is against them; "Through Christ we have access by one Spirit unto the Father."

But, I must make good the ground of our protest; and in doing this, will remind you of the deep sensation which you experienced a few evenings ago, when we furnished so overwhelming a testimony that the Church of Rome, in her ritual, is guilty of presenting to the Mother of Christ, the honors of supreme adoration.

The subject which we are now discussing is the intercession, rather than the adoration of saints ; but you will at once see that each is in a great degree involved with the other ; so much so in this case, that Protestant Divines in discussing the two questions generally associate them under the general title of " The invocation of saints."

The teaching of the Church of Rome on this subject, as enunciated by the Council of Trent, is as follows :—

" The holy Council commands all Bishops and others, who have the care and charge of teaching, that according to the practice of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the first beginning of the Christian religion, the consent of venerable Fathers, and the decrees of holy Councils, they labour with diligent assiduity to instruct the faithful concerning the invocation and intercession of the saints, the honour due to relics, and the lawful use of images ; teaching them, that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men ; that it is a good and a useful thing suppliantly to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers, help, and assistance ; because of the benefits bestowed by God through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour ; and that those are men of impious sentiments who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked ; or who affirm that they do not pray for men, or that to beseech them to pray for us, is idolatry ; or that it is contrary to the word of God, and opposed to the honour of Jesus Christ, the one Mediator between

God and men ; or that it is foolish to supplicate, verbally or mentally, those who reign in heaven."

The Catechism of the Council says, "The veneration and invocation of angels and saints, who enjoy the glory of heaven and the honour which the (Roman) Catholic Church has always paid, even to the bodies and ashes of the saints, are not forbidden by the first commandment.—Their intercession, therefore, we invoke, because they always see the face of God, and are constituted by him the willing advocates of our salvation.—To honour the saints who sleep in the Lord, to invoke their intercession, and to venerate their sacred relics and ashes, far from diminishing, tends considerably to increase, the glory of God ; in proportion as the Christian's hope is thus animated and fortified, and he himself excited to the imitation of their virtues.—True, there is but one Mediator, Christ the Lord, who alone has reconciled us through his blood ; and who, having accomplished our redemption, and having once entered into the holy of holies, ceases not to intercede for us ; but it by no means follows, that it is therefore unlawful to have recourse to the intercession of the saints."

The Church of Rome ascribes to the Virgin Mary and other saints the highest prerogatives of Christ as intercessor. What are these prerogatives ? I reply in the words of St. Paul in the Hebrews : " He is able also to save for ever them that come to God by him : always living to make intercession for us." As intercessor, Christ *saves*,—this is his right, his peculiar right as our High Priest. Let us see whether this charge can be sustained.

My *first* proof is taken from a work entitled, *The Devotion and Office of the Sacred Heart of our Lord Jesus Christ, including the Devotions to the Sacred Heart of Mary. Twelfth Edition, with an Appendix and the Indult of his Holiness, Pope Pius, in favour of it. For the use of the Midland District.* Keating and Brown.

“Go then, devout client, to the heart of Jesus, BUT LET YOUR WAY BE THROUGH THE HEART OF MARY.

“Come, then, hardened and inveterate sinner, how great soever your crimes may be, come and behold. Mary stretches out her hand, opens her breast to receive you. Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, though unfortunately proof against the most engaging invitations of the Holy Ghost, fling yourself at the feet of this powerful advocate.

“Hail Mary, lady and mistress of the world, to whom all power has been given both in heaven and earth.

“YOU ARE THE GREAT MEDIATRIX BETWEEN GOD AND MAN, obtaining for sinners all they can ask and demand of the Blessed Trinity.”

My *second* proof is taken from the Key of Heaven, a work in common use in this city. On page 81, I read the following prayer:—

“Ever glorious and blessed Mary, Queen of Virgins, Mother of Mercy, hope and comfort of dejected and desolate souls, through that sword of sorrow which pierced thy tender heart whilst thine only Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, suffered death and ignominy on the cross: through that filial tenderness and pure love he had for thee, grieving in thy grief, whilst from his cross

he recommended thee to the care and protection of his beloved disciple, St. John, take pity, I beseech thee, on my poverty and necessities ; have compassion on my anxieties and cares ; assist and comfort me in all my infirmities and miseries, of what kind soever. Thou art the Mother of Mercies, the sweet Consolatrix and only refuge of the needy and the orphan, of the desolate and afflicted. Cast, therefore, an eye of pity on a miserable forlorn child of Eve, and hear my prayer ; for since in just punishment of my sins, I find myself encompassed by a multitude of evils, and oppressed with much anguish of spirit, whither can I fly for more secure shelter, O amiable Mother of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, than under the wings of thy maternal protection ?”

My *third* proof is taken from the “Power of Mary,” a work by St. Liguori.

I told you before who Liguori was, and reminded you that not only is this work printed by permission of the superiors, but that the author was himself canonized some years since for his writings and his devotion to the Church of which he was a member.

In this book I find the following sentiments :—

Page 217. “St. Bernard did not fear to assert that ‘all things are submitted to the Holy Virgin, even God himself.’ ”

Page 218. “Mary is all powerful, for, following all laws, the queen enjoys the same privileges as the king, and in order that the power may be equal between the son and the mother, the son who is all powerful has made his mother all powerful. The one is all powerful

by nature, the other by grace, i. e. as it was revealed to St. Bridget, our divine Christ is obliged not to reject any commands of his mother's."

Page 219. "It is then with great reason, O our advocate, that St. Bernard and St. Anselm say that it sufficeth you only to wish a thing to be done; thus you can at your will elevate the most unworthy sinner to the highest degree of sanctity."

Page 217. "Damien says that the 'Virgin when she presents herself before the altar of reconciliation, appears less to supplicate than to dictate laws.'"

But the authorized liturgies of the Roman Catholic Church are full of such sentiments. In "the Garden of the soul," a work with which every Roman Catholic is acquainted, I find a Hymn to the Virgin Mary, from which I take the following stanzas :—

"Hail thou resplendent star which shinest o'er the main  
 Blest Mother of our God, and ever virgin queen.  
 Hail happy gate of bliss greeted by Gabriel's tongue,  
 Negotiate our peace, and cancel Eva's wrong,  
 Loosen the sinners bands, all evil drive away,  
 Bring light into the blind, and for all graces pray."

St. Germain once prayed as follows: "O mother of God, your defence is immortal; your intercession is life; your protection is security; if *you* do not teach us the way, none can become spiritual, nor adore God in spirit. O most Holy Virgin, none can have the knowledge of God but by you: O Mother of God, none can be saved but by you: O Virgin Mother, none can be delivered from dangers but by you: O favoured of God, none can obtain any gift or grace, but by you." St.

Anselm says, "More present relief is sometimes found by commemorating the name of Mary, than by calling upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ her only son. In the "Treasure of the soul," page 72, I find the following prayer:—"O most pious Mary, Virgin, Mother of the most Holy God, my most beloved advocate, succour me in all my necessities both now and ever."

What, I ask, is this, but to hurl the Son of God from his mediatorial throne, and to place upon it Mary in his stead? My dear Roman Catholic friends, I tremble when I contemplate this usurpation. It were the height of impiety, it were to rob divinity of its peculiar glory, to raise her to an equality with Christ. But oh! to exalt her ABOVE Christ, to ascribe to her a clemency which he does not possess, he who came from heaven, and abandoned his glory, and lived a life of suffering, and bled upon the cross,—to ascribe to her a willingness to hear and to save when he withholds mercy,—language fails to designate, as I feel, the fearful character of this anti-scriptural delusion. I will not be harsh, I am in no mood to employ a single unkind word, but I ask you whether, what I have now advanced (and I have ten-fold more of proof beside me) is not sufficient to warrant me in stating that no more accurate view of the practice of the Church of Rome in relation to this whole subject can be found than that which is presented in a picture which was placed some years ago in a Roman Catholic Chapel at Wigan, in which God the Father was painted on one side, and God the Son on the other side, and the Virgin Mary enthroned between the two, with a crown upon her head!

I can imagine some one saying, this relates to other countries; I cannot believe it of this country, or at least of the intelligent Roman Catholics that live around us. Now I think we shall be disposed to admit that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Montreal, is a fair representative of the intelligent portion of the Roman Catholic community. Let me then bring to your recollection the year 1847, when this city was visited with that terrible fever-scurge, which cut down so many of our fellow citizens, and which threatened the destruction of thousands. The various Churches offered special supplication to heaven that Providence would avert the calamity, and our friends of the Roman Catholic community did the same. The Bishop issued a pastoral letter to his flock on the subject, and I shall adduce this letter as another proof that the Church of Rome ascribes divine power to the Virgin Mary. The letter was dated August 13, 1847, and appeared in full, in several of the Roman Catholic Journals in Lower Canada. Though the first extract that I shall transcribe does not bear precisely upon the subject which we have now in hand, yet as it bears upon the general controversy, I may be permitted to read it. The Bishop speaks of eight priests, ten nuns, and several laymen, who had fallen victims to the disease, chiefly by attending to the spiritual and temporal necessities of the dying, and regards them in the light of "propitiatory victims which the justice of God selected in order to satisfy itself, being provoked by our crimes; that it may be able afterwards to show favour to the great number of sinners who amongst us continually abuse his great

mercies." But that part of the letter to which I direct your special attention is this:—"Lastly," says the prelate, "put yourself under the protection of Mary, and ask her that she would preserve this city, and all this diocese, from the dreadful scourge which is threatening us." Here certainly is a transfer to Mary of the power and authority committed to Christ as mediator, to whom ALL power is given in heaven and in earth. But, in this pastoral, the Bishop sets his flock an example also, by renewing his own vow and offering prayer to the Virgin. "O divine Mary, I humbly prostrate myself at thy feet, to protest in the sincerity of my soul that I do not even deserve to bear that glorious name never having done anything that was worthy of thee." "Acknowledging, however, that thou art a mother full of goodness and that thou lovest to do good to those who are most poor and most wretched, I conjure thee with all the confidence which the thought of thy maternal heart inspires, to cause the calamity to cease which prevails among the clergy and the communities of this diocese, and to preserve from this awful contagion all the people confided to my care."

The Bishop then vows to engage all his efforts to "re-establish the pious pilgrimage of our Lady of Bonsecours" and reminds the Virgin that she has at all times loved to be called "the help of Christians." "The miracles which thou hast been pleased to work in that ancient Chapel which our Fathers built, attest that." The Prelate then vows, once more, to repair the negligence, and promises that there she shall receive the homage of pious pilgrims. He then announces to her,

that he has caused to be made in Paris a statue of gilded bronze which has been solemnly blessed at the altar of the Church of "Our Lady of Victories," and promises to have executed and exhibited in the Bouscours Church a picture representing the Typhus seeking to enter Montreal, but stayed at the gate by her powerful protection. This votive prayer contains also the following declaration, "Under an inspiration which evidently came from thee, I have caused to be engraven on the pedestal (of the statue) this devout invocation '*Ora pro nobis, interveni pro clero,*' which at this sad time is like the cry of our pain and the exclamation of our heart for thy help in our urgent need."

"In the face of this whole country," continues the Bishop, "I form this engagement, Thy honor and thy glory are concerned to grant so solemn a vow. It is indeed a very favorable opportunity of proving that one never invokes thee in vain.—O holy Mary, succour thy unfortunate children, help the feeble; warm those who are lukewarm in God's service; pray for the people; employ thyself for the clergy; intercede with thy divine Son for the consecrated communities."

What now becomes of the professions of our Catholic friends that they only seek the assistance of the prayers of the Virgin and of the other saints? Is not the Virgin here approached as though she had in her own power the safety or destruction of the city? Is there not an intimation that no one ever invokes her in vain? Is there not a call upon the inhabitants, to place themselves under the protection of Mary? Is this

seeking merely the assistance of her prayers—to prostrate yourselves at her feet, to speak of the honour and glory of her name, of an inspiration which she breathed into the mind of the Bishop? What, in view of the extracts just now read from Roman Catholic liturgies, becomes of the following assertions of Dr. Milner, in page 228 of his *End of Controversy*, “In short, the saints do nothing for us mortals in heaven but what they did while they were here on earth, and what all good Christians are bound to do for each other, viz: they help us by their prayers. The only difference is, that as the saints in heaven are free from every stain of sin and imperfection and are confirmed in grace and glory, so their prayers are far more efficacious for obtaining what they ask for, than are the prayers of us imperfect and sinful mortals.” I have read no passage even in Protestant authors which more thoroughly proves the weakness of the ground upon which the theory of saint invocation is based, than this passage of Dr. Milner’s which so seeks to dilute the practice of the Church of Rome, which indeed is so different from her practice as to convince me that he felt it impossible to sustain her in it, either by reason or by Scripture. Now mark the doctrine and apply it to the Virgin Mary: she does in heaven, what she was bound to do on earth, she helps people by her prayers? Is this all that Roman Catholics ask her to do in heaven? “No,” is our prompt reply; and we cannot allow the Doctor to say, that her assistance in heaven is more efficacious than it was on earth, because the reasons which he assigns, does not hold good in her

case, at least in his opinion, for she was immaculate, free from every stain of sin and imperfection while on earth, so that by his own theory, he has no right to expect more efficacy in her interference now, than she possessed then. And what, with all her perfection, with all her power and immaculate purity, did she possess then? What did she possess when she sought her son in the crowd without the house in which he was teaching? What power did she possess when she saw her son upon the cross, and when he was obliged to commit her to the care of the loved disciple? Did she ever exert her power in working a miracle? Did she take a prominent part in the establishment of Christianity? The very silence of the Scriptures is like the voice of thunder reiterating its ponderous reproofs against that Church which invests with mediatorial, and therefore divine honours, her who was at most but a favored creature.

An illustration of the confusedness of the theological view which these opinions involve is found in the following prayer which I will now read from "The supplement to the Manual of Catholic Piety," page 30 : "We beseech thee, O Lord Jesus Christ, that the blessed Virgin Mary, who at the hour of thy passion, had her most holy soul run through with the sword of sorrow, may intercede for us with thy clemency, both now and at the hour of death; who livest and reignest with God the Father and the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. *Amen.*

Again: the Roman Catholic Church not content with ascribing these titles, offices and works to the

mother of Christ, transfers them, if not in equal, yet, in considerable amount to other saints, and to angels.

1. In the "Key of Heaven," page 348, St. George takes the place of Christ, in the following prayer:—"O God, who by the merits and intercession of blessed George thy Martyr, rejoicest the hearts of the faithful, mercifully grant that what we ask in his name, we may obtain through the gift of thy grace."

2. In the "Garden of the Soul," pages 435-6, there are the following supplications to St. Joseph, the husband of Mary:—"O GLORIOUS descendant of the Kings of Juda! inheritor of the virtues of all the Patriarchs! just and happy St. Joseph! listen to my prayer. Thou art my glorious protector, and shalt ever be, after Jesus and Mary, the object of my most profound veneration and tender confidence. Thou art the most hidden, though the greatest saint, and art peculiarly the patron of those who serve God with the greatest purity and fervour. In union with all those who have ever been most devoted to thee, I now dedicate myself to thy service; beseeching thee, for the sake of Jesus Christ, who vouchsafed to love and obey thee as a son, to become a father to me; and to obtain for me the filial respect, confidence, and love of a child towards thee. O powerful advocate of all Christians! whose intercession, as St. Theresa assures us, has never been found to fail, deign to intercede for me now, and to implore for me the particular intention of this Novena. (*Specify it.*)"

"Present me, O Great Saint, to the adorable Trinity, with whom thou hadst so glorious and so intimate a correspondence. Obtain that I may never efface by

sin the sacred image according to the likeness of which I was created. Beg for me, that my divine Redeemer would enkindle in my heart, and in all hearts, the fire of his love, and infuse therein the virtue of his adorable infancy, his purity, simplicity, obedience, and humility. Obtain for me likewise a lively devotion to thy Virgin Spouse, and protect me so powerfully in life and death, that I may have the happiness of dying as thou didst, in the friendship of my Creator, and under the immediate protection of the Mother of God."

"Lord, have mercy on us.

Christ, have mercy on us.

Lord, have mercy on us.

Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us.

Holy Mary, Spouse of St. Joseph, *Pray for us.*

St. Joseph, confirmed in grace, *Pray for us.*

St. Joseph, Guardian of the Word Incarnate,

St. Joseph, Favourite of the King of Heaven,

St. Joseph, ruler of the family of Jesus,

St. Joseph, Spouse of the ever-blessed Virgin,

St. Joseph, nursing father to the Son of God,

St. Joseph, example of humility and obedience,

St. Joseph, mirror of silence and resignation,

St. Joseph, patron of innocence and youth,

St. Joseph, exiled with Christ into Egypt,

St. Joseph, intercessor for the afflicted,

St. Joseph, advocate of the humble,

St. Joseph, model of every virtue,

St. Joseph, honoured among men,

St. Joseph, union of all Christian perfections,

Lamb of God, &c.

*Pray for us.*

V. Pray for us, O holy St. Joseph.

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

3. In the Roman Catholic Missal for the use of the laity, page 85, we have the following prayer:—"May this communion, O Lord, cleanse us from sin, and by the intercession of blessed Thomas à Becket, thy martyr, make us effectual partakers of this heavenly remedy." And, in the same service, "Do thou, by the blood of St. Thomas which he spent for us, grant that we may ascend whither he has ascended." Could language more devout, or work more sacred, be applied to our divine mediator? It is a well-known historical fact, that in Becket's Church, at Canterbury, there were three shrines, one for himself, one for Mary, and one for the blessed Saviour. The offerings to these shrines, for one year, were as follows:—the shrine of Jesus Christ £3, that of the Virgin £63, and that of Becket £832. The next year, the offerings to the shrine of Christ were nothing, to the Virgin's £4, and to Thomas à Becket's £954. I mention this to show you the tendency of that system which appropriates to saints, the title and offices of Christ our only mediator; it is to set aside Christ, to rob him of his glory and to give it to another; it is to ascribe to creatures, all of whom were sinful, and many of whom died in sin, the powers and merits and functions of our glorious intercessor.

4. To show the extent to which saint invocation is carried by Roman Catholics, on the continent of Europe at least, if not in this country, I may remark that different saints are applied to on different occasions, and

for different dangers and diseases, e. g., "St. Anthony, the Abbott, preserves from fire—Anthony, of Padua, from drowning—St. Barbara, in times of thunder and war—St. Blass is applied to for diseases of the throat—St. Polonia preserves the teeth—St. Domingo cures fever—St. Roque cures the plague." Thus in all diseases, under every pressure of affliction, some saint is accessible by prayer. Tell me, ye men of reason and of religion, whoever you are, by whatever community you are acknowledged, what must be the effect of this system upon the minds of the illiterate? What but to divert them from the knowledge of the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent? Tell me not that Christ retains his proper position in the economy of grace, because Dr. Milner and other enlightened Roman Catholic expositors speak as they do, so long as the common people, the hundreds and thousands who flock to your churches, are taught to offer more prayers to the Virgin and other saints than to Christ; tell me not that Christ is regarded by Roman Catholics as the true and only Mediator, while the works of Liguori are put into the hands of your devotees, and while the people are taught to pray to Thómas à Becket, and recognize his blood as having been spilt for them. I take up the Missal of the Roman Catholic Church, and I find that in the course of the service of the mass, the Priest offers the following prayer:—

"We beseech thee, O Lord, by the merits of thy saints, whose relics are here, and of all the saints, that thou wouldst vouchsafe to forgive us all our sins. Amen."

Consistently herewith, prayers are offered in this city to saints, whose relics are supposed to be deposited under the altar of the Bishop's Church. I hold in my hand two prayers, printed by a Roman Catholic printer of Montreal, and which must be familiar to most Catholics present. One of these is a prayer to St. Zotique, and the other is a prayer to St. Januarius. Two or three extracts must suffice: "O Holy Zotique, who hast had the good fortune of dying for religion, deign to hear the humble prayers which we address you in the presence of your holy relics. Look with kindness on the pious faithful who invoke you, and bless this city which places its glory on possessing you. And now we pray you to protect us, O glorious martyr, and to obtain for us the favour of imitating your patience, your courage, and your other virtues. Amen." Again: "O holy Januarius, we bless the divine goodness which has willed that your holy body should be exhumed from where it lay for so many ages, and which has inspired our holy father, the Pope, with the thought of giving it to us as a pledge of his paternal affection. We regard this venerable body as a rich treasure, and we esteem it more than the good of the world. Bless all the works which are carried on in this city and in this diocese, bless those who labour for your glory, bless us ourselves who are at your feet full of righteous confidence in your merits and in your goodness. Amen."

Brethren, time fails, or I would adduce equally numerous and convincing proofs, that the glory and functions of Christ as Mediator, are transferred to angels

as well as saints ; but I shall merely quote the *Confiteor*, which every devout Catholic daily employs:—“I confess to Almighty God, to the blessed Mary, ever Virgin, to blessed Michael, the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and to all the Saints, that I have sinned exceedingly, in thought, word, and deed, *through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault.* Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary, ever Virgin, blessed Michael, the Archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and all the Saints, to pray to the Lord our God for me. May Almighty God have mercy on me, forgive me my sins, and bring me to everlasting life. Amen.”

My hearers are now fully informed of the views and the practice of the Church of Rome in relation to this grave subject ; and I feel persuaded that there can scarcely be a person in the congregation possessing ordinary candour of mind, who will not agree with me that the transfer by that Church, of Christ's mediatorial honors to the Virgin and other saints, is triumphantly proved. You will not, therefore, be surprised at our solemnly protesting against this transfer : And we do it

FIRST,—ON THE GROUND THAT IT IS NOT SUSTAINED BY THE WORD OF GOD.

I take up first the New Testament, because, though the Old Testament may assist us in its interpretation, the latter must ever be regarded as the only infallible exponent of the doctrines and principles of Christianity. And what do I find in the New Testament ? If I examine the teaching of Christ on the subject of his

mediatorial power and authority, I find it altogether at variance with the division among others of the smallest portion of his high prerogative. The way to the Father is himself; the door to the fold of his Church is himself; "No man cometh unto the Father but BY ME." "If ye shall ask anything IN MY NAME that will I do." "I will pray the Father, and he shall send you another comforter." "Come unto ME all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." "Him that cometh unto ME I will in no wise cast out." In no one of the Sacred Evangelists can I find an expression which borders even on an intimation that God the Father will be approached through any other than the Son, or that the Son will be, or needeth to be approached by any secondary Mediator. Is it possible, I ask, to conceive that there should be in the teaching of Christ no single reference to a doctrine which the Church of Rome declares to be prominent in the Christian scheme, and necessary to the comfort and protection of the children of God?

But we are told in reply, that the age of Christ was too early for the introduction of this practice, because it was not until after the resurrection of Christ that such a change took place in the condition of the departed saints as enabled them to discharge the duties of protectors and intercessors of his people. Even were we to admit this reasoning, it would certainly have no force in the case of angels, neither could it hold in respect to Enoch and Elijah. But we will refer to the Acts of the Apostles. By this time Simeon, and John

the Baptist, and Ann, and Joseph had died, and Christ had risen ; but in all the specimens of prayer (and there are many) which we have in the Acts of the Apostles, there is not the least semblance of the intercession of saints and angels. Read that simple, beautiful, and powerful apostolic prayer in the fourth chapter : “ Who having heard it, with one accord lifted up their voices to God, and said : Lord, thou art he that didst make heaven and earth, the sea, and all things that are in them. Who by the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of our father David thy servant, hast said, *Why did the gentiles rage, and the people meditate vain things ? The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes assembled together against the Lord, and against his CHRIST.* For of a truth there assembled together in this city against thy holy child JESUS whom thou hast anointed, Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the gentiles and the people of Israel, To do what thy hand and thy counsel decreed to be done. And now, Lord, behold their threatenings, and grant unto thy servants, that with all confidence they may speak thy word, By stretching forth thy hand to cures and signs and wonders, to be done by the name of thy only Son JESUS.” Is there mention here of any other name than that of Christ ? Turn to the seventh chapter, and listen to the dying prayer of Stephen : “ And falling on his knees, he cried with a loud voice, saying : Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep in the Lord. And Saul was consenting to his death.” Here there is no mixture of saints with the Lord Jesus as there is in the supplications prescribed by the Church of Rome for her dying members.

Listen, for example, to the following devotional exercises which are prescribed for the use of dying persons in a work called "The Christian's Guide to Heaven, or a complete Catholic Manual :"—

"O holy Mary, Mother of God, who didst assist at the death of thy beloved Son Jesus, obtain for me the grace of a happy death. Glorious St. Michael, prince of the Heavenly host, intercede for me at the hour of my death, that I may depart this world in the grace and favour of my Creator. O holy Angel Guardian, to whose care God in his mercy has committed me, stand by me at the dreadful hour ; protect me against all the powers of darkness, defend me from all my enemies ; and conduct my soul to the mansions of eternal repose."

I turn to the apostolic epistles and yet there is no variation. Neither Peter, nor Paul, nor John, throws new light on the subject. Christ is the only intercessor. When they needed grace to discharge their duty, their language was, "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." If they prayed for themselves or their people, Christ was the only advocate through whom they approached the Father. There was no recognition of any subordinate mediator. Even St. John, the last of the apostles who lived on earth, makes no reference to this doctrine of saint invocation. He speaks of an advocate, but it is Jesus Christ the righteous ; and when he refers to our seeking blessings at the hand of God, it is in the following language :—  
 "And this is the confidence which we have towards him : That, whatsoever we shall ask according to his

will, he heareth us. And we know that he heareth us whatsoever we ask: we know that we have the petitions which we request of him." How is this? The prince of the apostles, and Paul too, had been dead for many years when this epistle was written, but there is no application for their advocacy. Stephen the proto-martyr had been dead sixty years, and yet there is no reference to his intercession. Gabriel and Michael were as well known as to their nature and office then, as now, but does John exhort Christians to fly to their protection? Can you imagine an apostle, if he believed as the Church of Rome believes, writing a letter to an elect lady without mentioning the Virgin, without urging her to imitate her virtues, without commending her to Mary's protection? Is it conceivable that at that late period there should have been no reference to this practice of the Church, if it then existed—if the primitive Church were guided by the principles of the Roman Catholic Church? Brethren! the more I study my Bible in relation to this matter, the more convinced am I that Christ shares not his mediatorial throne with any creature; he sits there alone; angels and saints are at his feet. They have no power to bless, for all power is with HIM: no power have they to protect, for all power is with HIM: no power have they to save, for all power is with HIM: no authority have they to intercede, for there is ONE mediator between God and men. Fearful is the contemplation, yet is it true, that upon all who trust in any other but the divine arm, there rests God's dire anathema. "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm."

But you will not be surprised to learn that our Roman Catholic friends refer to the Scriptures in support of their doctrine and practice; and you will perhaps be curious to know upon what particular texts they rely.

(1.) The angelic salutation to the Virgin is one of them, "Hail Mary full of grace, &c." whose meaning we fully discussed in the lecture on adoration, showing that it is a weak and uncertain basis upon which to rest the doctrine of either the adoration or the invocation of the Virgin.

(2.) Most Roman Catholic Divines adduce the third verse of the twelfth chapter of Osee. "In the womb he supplanted his brother: and by his strength he had success with an Angel;" And also Genesis xlviii., 15, 16. "And Jacob blessed the sons of Joseph, and said: God, in whose sight my fathers Abraham and Isaac walked, God that feedeth me from my youth until this day; The angel that delivereth me from all evil, bless these boys;" And also Joshua v., 13, &c. "And when Joshua was in the field of the city of Jericho, he lifted up his eyes, and saw a man standing over-against him, holding a drawn sword, and he went to him, and said: Art thou one of ours, or of our adversaries? And he answered: No: but I am prince of the host of the Lord, and now I am come. Joshua fell on his face to the ground. And worshipping, said: What saith my Lord to his servant? Loose, saith he, thy shoes from off thy feet: for the place whereon thou standest is holy. And Joshua did as was commanded him."

An ignorance of the first principles of Biblical interpretation pervades the whole argument that is sought

to be constructed upon these passages. Who does not know that ANGEL is an Old-Testament title of the Lord Jesus Christ? At least it is sufficient for our present purpose, to show that the personage spoken of by Jacob was *Divine*. "I have seen GOD," said the patriarch, "face to face." And as it respects the ANGEL who appeared to Joshua; who can doubt that the same Being is intended who appeared to Moses under the designation JEHOVAH? each of whom addressed the leaders of Israel in the same terms: "the place whereon thou standest is holy;"—"HOLY," because the presence of the Almighty was there.

Now I think you are convinced that there is no foundation whatever in these passages for constituting angels our intercessors, and if even there were, they would not be sufficient to warrant the doctrine of the intercession of *saints*. But let us refer to the New Testament.

Dr. Milner in his "End of Controversy," (page 230), lays great stress on a passage in Luke the evangelist: "We know *That there is joy before the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.*" Luke xv. 10. Now, is it by visual rays, or undulating sounds, that these blessed spirits in heaven know what passes in the hearts of men upon earth? How does his lordship know, that one part of the saint's felicity may not consist in contemplating the wonderful ways of God's providence with all his creatures here on earth? But, without recurring to this supposition, it is sufficient for dissipating the bishop's uncharitable phantom of *blasphemy*, and Calvin's profane jest about the length of

the saint's ears, that God is able to reveal to them the prayers of Christians who address them here on earth."

What, I ask, can be gathered from this passage, but the doctrine that by some method there is conveyed to the heavenly world information respecting the advancement of Christ's redeeming work on earth? Who denies that the angels know much? Who denies that they are powerful beings? Who denies that they are God's ministers, ministering for the benefit of his people on earth? But am I therefore to worship them. to invoke their prayers? Our Catholic friends reason with us as though we almost denied the existence of angels. But I wish you to observe another thing in the remarks of this learned controversialist, viz.: the implication, that God hears the prayers of his people on earth, reveals these prayers to the saints in heaven, and then that these saints in turn present them again to the Father and to Christ! Is there any warrant in Scripture for supposing that the prayers of God's elect take a route thus circuitous?

Another passage which our friends adduce is Matthew xviii. 10. "See that you despise not one of these little ones: for I say to you, that their Angels in heaven always see the face of my Father who is in heaven." But there is no proof here of the *intercession* of angels. The fourth verse of the first chapter of the Apocalypse is also put in as proof: "John to the seven churches which are in Asia. Grace be unto you and peace from him that is, and that was, and that is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne." Modern Roman Catholics have affected to believe that

the seven spirits are angels or saints giving aid or assistance to men. I have not time to say more than that I fully believe this to be a superlative form of expression to signify the Holy Ghost, the Third Person in the ever blessed Trinity. In this opinion I am distinctly supported by three of the most illustrious fathers of the Church, and this being the case, no Roman Catholic has a right to give a contrary opinion, for his creed binds him not to interpret any passage except by the unanimous consent of the fathers. St. Augustine in his exposition of Psalm cl. says, "Which Holy Spirit is chiefly commended to us in Scripture by the seven fold number, as well in Isaiah as in the Apocalypse." Gregory Nazianzen, in his forty-first Oration says, "The precious spirits were called seven, for Isaiah, I think, was accustomed to call the operations of the spirit, spirits." St. Ambrose in his exposition of Luke speaks of "the silver tried by fire, and purified by the *Septiform Spirit*."

There is a class of passages which Roman Catholics advance in favour of the invocation of saints which retort upon themselves with terrible effect. Such as: "Brethren pray for us;—pray one for another." The argument is, that if St. Paul desired the prayers of his infirm and imperfect brethren on earth, believing them to be availing, much more consistently might we desire the prayers of the spirits of the just made perfect in heaven. But if the prayers of saints in heaven are so much more efficacious than ours on earth, surely the apostle knew it, and if he knew it, is it not surprising that we do not find him crying out, "Holy John the

Baptist pray for us?" "Holy martyr, St. Stephen, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified?" "Holy St. Ann intercede with the Saviour on our behalf?" "Holy Simeon have us in thy protection?" But passing from the Scripture, we assert that upon their own principles the members of the Church of Rome have no right to contend for this doctrine, because it is not supported by the unanimous voice of antiquity.

I am aware that our friends adduce what they call apostolic liturgies in support of their views and practice, but these are admitted even by the Roman Catholic historian Dupin to have had their origin, not in the days of the apostles, but in the fifth or sixth centuries.

I am aware also, that in some of the Fathers, expressions may be found which seem to favour the doctrine. But that all the Fathers were not like-minded—listen to the following sentiment from St. Augustine;—you may find it in the Paris edition of his works, vol. iv., p. 683. He is commenting on the sixty-first Psalm, and his words are, "Christ is the High Priest who has entered for us within the vail, and *who alone*, of all who have appeared in the flesh intercedes for us."

Other objections press themselves upon our attention, to which I can only refer:—

*First*,—The departed saints are not endowed with capabilities of interceding for others. Let those who say they are, prove it from the word of God. What knowledge less than omniscience could qualify the Virgin Mary to listen to the invocation of the tens of thousands who every moment of every day pay their

devotions to her thousands of shrines! What power less than omnipotence could enable her to help their necessities! The same may be said of other saints.

*Second*,—In reference to many of the saints, how is it known that they were not hypocrites? Roman Catholic divines and historians universally acknowledge that there have been hypocrites even in the Papal Chair. Who can determine that in the list of Roman Catholic saints there are not to be found many such.

*Third*,—How can it be determined that these saints are yet out of purgatory?

*Fourth*,—How is it known that all these saints have had an existence at all? It is certain that cases have occurred in which imaginary saints have been worshipped. A fact which drew forth from the learned Cassandrus, a Roman Catholic, the following remarks: —“There is also another error not unfrequent, that the common people neglecting in a manner the ancient and known saints, worship more ardently the new and unknown, of whose holiness we have but little assurance, and of whom we know some only by revelation; so that it is justly doubted of several that they never existed at all.”

My dear friends, I fear that you have been already wearied by the length of this exposition and discussion; and yet I may not suffer you to retire, without calling back your thoughts to that glorious doctrine, the oneness of Christ's mediatorship. No other days-man do you need but Christ: No other advocate do you need but Christ: No other High Priest has been appointed to make intercession for you but Jesus, the Son

of God. We rejoice to pray for each other upon earth through Him, but when we come to God, we feel our need of infinite merit to embolden us to approach his throne, and we are convinced that we have this merit only in Christ. When we come to God, we feel our need of an unchangeable intercessor, and we know that it is Christ alone who ever liveth to make intercession for us. When we come to God, we feel our need of a mediator perfect in knowledge and perfect in sympathy, and we feel that these requirements are only found in Christ; we feel that these are necessary to embolden us even to crawl to his footstool, and when, suppliant there, we cast our eyes to the throne of Eternal Majesty, we see nothing to encourage our hope of mercy but the presence of our glorified and exalted advocate. He is there, and we want no other. His humanity is there, and that is the link which binds us to the Divinity that is in him, and to the Divinity that is upon the throne. We want no intermediate link of man's forging: Who is Thomas à Becket, who is St. Anthony, that either of them should be allowed to intervene between us and Christ? Who is Liguori or Bonaventure, that he should be needed to come between us and our blessed, our loving, our Almighty Saviour, who is able to save unto the uttermost all who come unto God by Him. Who are even Peter and Paul and John, but sinners saved and redeemed by the grace of God in Christ? Need we their intercession while we have a divine intercessor? Can they know, as he does, our wants? Are they touched, as is he, with the feeling of our infirmities? Have they power with God, as he

hath, to prevail on our behalf? What is their finitude to his infinity? What is their power to His Almighty-ness? What are their resources to the boundless fountain of grace and love which reside in his glorious mind? And who are Michael and Gabriel, and all the host of Cherubim and Seraphim, that exult in the presence of the throne, compared with Jesus, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords? O, brethren, I feel that if the brightest Archangel that basks in the beams of God's eternal presence, did but pass between my vision and the glory of this divine mediator, my view of that glory would be utterly eclipsed; I feel that I could not bear even a feather of his wing to glide for one moment between my Saviour and myself. I see my Saviour exalted upon his mediatorial throne, I contemplate his power—his merit—his love—his deep compassion; I listen to him praying for me, as once he prayed "Father forgive him," and while I thus behold and hear, I exclaim—

"Thou, O Christ, art ALL I WANT,

"MORE THAN ALL, in thee I find."

And because the purest created intellect is placed infinitely below his feet, I would set aside angels, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, saints,—and say with the venerable Peter: "Lord, to whom should we go but UNTO THEE, THOU hast the words of eternal life."

## LECTURE VI.

### THE ONE METHOD OF JUSTIFICATION.

THERE is one doctrine of the Christian religion, respecting which, happily, there exists no difference of opinion between the Protestant and Roman Catholic communities. It is a doctrine no less true than humiliating; a doctrine which History has penned upon every age of the world, and which experience has confirmed in every investigation of humanity. It is a doctrine which is written in bold black letters upon every page of inspiration, and which the Spirit of God has inscribed in burning characters upon every fold of the human conscience. It is a doctrine, the evidence of whose truth, notwithstanding the sophistries of ancient pagan wisdom and the copious dilutions of modern philosophy, (so called,) gathers strength as the world gathers age. My hearers are not in suspense as to the doctrine of which I speak, for they have doubtless already detected the reference to be to the natural sinfulness and depravity of the human race.

Here then, is common ground: The Protestant can take the hand of the Catholic, and with downcast eyes and smiting upon their breasts they can draw near together to their Heavenly Father's throne, and can say, each without violating the creed of the other, in one language, and in one voice, "God be merciful to

me a sinner!" Ah, my hearers! we are all sinners, and God hates sin. We have broken his laws, and "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them." Who, where is he, among the thousands that now hear my voice, who would be bold enough to stand forth and protest that he has never committed a single sin, that he has never manifested a sinful disposition, or spoken an unholy or unkind word, or indulged an impure thought or affection or motive? I pray God, that this doctrine so personally momentous to us all, may this evening influence each one now before Him to correspondent solemnity of feeling. I desire to remember this evening that God is in this place, that I am addressing a congregation of sinners, and that I am placed here in order, not only to defend the truth, but also to beseech you in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God.

There is another doctrine upon which we are all at one, our need of God's pardoning mercy. Many of the petitions which ascend to heaven from both Roman Catholics and Protestants, demonstrate this. I enter, for example, a Roman Catholic Church, and during the service of the mass I hear the officiating priest cry out, "*Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis,*" and I see the devout Catholic following the Latin of the priest in the English of his prayer book, his lips quietly moving to the words "Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world, Have mercy on us!" Here then is an acknowledgment on the part of the Roman Catholic Church of the need of mercy at the hands of a Saviour. I go into an Episcopal Church, and I hear

the whole congregation pleading with the Holy One in these words, "But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders:" I worship with my Congregational or Presbyterian brethren, and I hear the same confession from the lips of the minister, and the same earnest cry for mercy: and in a congregation of Baptists or Methodists, the "Amen" that occasionally seals the petition for grace and salvation proves that these sections of the common church of the Redeemer acknowledge the same doctrine. Here again is common ground; let us then occupy it this evening, and be we of the Roman Catholic Church, or belong we to some of the various Protestant communities, let us present the unworthy sacrifice of our petitions upon the universal altar of the Christian religion, let us gaze with the eye of our faith upon the one sacrifice for sin, let us come through the one mediator between God and men, and let us humbly but earnestly cry, "Hide thy face, O Lord, from our sins, and blot out all our iniquities."

And now I wish both Protestants and Catholics, to listen while I read as a text the 38th and 39th verses of the xiiiith Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. "BE IT KNOWN THEREFORE TO YOU, MEN BRETHREN, THAT THROUGH HIM FORGIVENESS OF SINS IS PREACHED TO YOU: AND FROM ALL THE THINGS, FROM WHICH YOU COULD NOT BE JUSTIFIED BY THE LAW OF MOSES. IN HIM EVERY ONE THAT BELIEVETH, IS JUSTIFIED."

The Protestant version reads thus:—

"Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: And by him all that believe are justified

from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."

This passage speaks of justification, it speaks also of forgiveness of sins, and it speaks of these two graces and blessings as one and the same. At first sight, this seems rather contradictory, because speaking after the manner of men and of the world, a man who is justified does not need forgiveness; he spurns the very idea of pardon, and claims acquittal as his inviolable right: and a man who is forgiven feels, on the same principle, that he can neither demand nor expect to be justified. How then can we reconcile this evangelical paradox? Only thus: That the Holy Spirit, for the purpose of demonstrating that forgiveness under the gospel is bestowed by God consistently with the claims of law, employs an expression which literally means, i. e. in law, for it is a forensic term, to acquit a man of any charge or charges that may be preferred against him in court, and to pronounce him innocent; not that a justified sinner is positively innocent, this were a contradiction, but that by the scheme of redemption through Christ, having previously complied with certain conditions, he is treated, accepted, and acknowledged, as though he were an innocent person. I shall refer you to two passages from the writings of the Apostle Paul to prove that this is the gospel view of justification: "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in JESUS CHRIST. Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to the shewing of his justice, for the remission of former sins." "But to him that worketh not, yet believeth in

him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reputed to justice according to the purpose of the grace of God. As David also termeth the blessedness of a man, to whom God reputeth justice without works: *Blessed are they, whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin. Blessed are they, whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.* "That is," says a Catholic annotator in the Douay Bible, "blessed are those who, by doing penance, have obtained pardon and remission of their sins, and also are *covered*; that is, newly clothed with the habit of grace, and vested with the stole of charity. *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin.* That is, blessed is the man who hath retained his baptismal innocence, that no grievous sin can be imputed to him. And likewise, blessed is the man, who after falling into sin, hath done penance and leads a virtuous life by frequenting the sacraments necessary for obtaining the grace to prevent a relapse, that sin is no more imputed to him." Without discussing the integrity of the paraphrase, it is clear from the text that when the apostle speaks of evangelical pardon he means the same as justification, that indeed "forgiveness of sins," "remission of sins," imputation of justice, (or righteousness) "non imputation of sin," and "the covering of sin," all mean the same thing and refer to the same blessing.

To me, it appears indisputable, that the apostle here speaks of a blessing which has no reference to any other change than that which is relative, that he speaks of a change which alters merely the position or relation

of a sinner to His God. He was guilty, he is now accounted righteous; he was condemned because he had broken God's law, he is now pardoned; he was an enemy, he is now reconciled unto God by the death of his Son; he was a prodigal, he is now accepted by his offended Father. Were we to take another step, were we, in speaking of this blessing, to refer to a change of nature as well as of relation, we should, I think, go beyond the boundary which the Holy Scriptures usually assign to justification, and find ourselves in the region of regeneration. Roman Catholic divines have often confounded these two blessings, it was especially done by the Council of Trent. We shall keep them perfectly distinct; indeed our present scheme of doctrinal exposition assigns, to the next lecture, the discussion of the important subject of Regeneration.

The plan which I propose to follow this evening is, to lay down a scheme, or chain, of Protestant propositions, proving their truth out of the Douay Bible, and, as occasion may serve, out of the writings of the early fathers of the Church; and showing, as we proceed, whether the deduction which shall be drawn from these sources, are, or are not, correspondent with the teaching and the practices of the Church of Rome.

I. The following proposition will form the first link in this chain:—THERE IS NO MAN, BE HE IN HIS NATURAL STATE, OR IN A JUSTIFIED STATE, WHO IS NOT UTTERLY DESITUTE OF PERSONAL MERIT.

I am not unaware that this is a proposition which strikes at the root of our natural pride; I know how difficult it is to bring man down from those moral

heights to which his dreamy and misguided fancy has elevated him ; but am I, therefore, to conceal the truth ? Am I even to smooth down the hard and rugged doctrine of man's absolute demerit in the sight of God ? I dare not, with this book of divine scripture before me ; for I here read, (Romans iii,) that " there is none just, that all have turned out of the way, that they are become unprofitable together, there is none that doeth good, there is not so much as one." These pregnant sentences are surely sufficient to *annihilate*, at least this opinion—that man, before justification, is, or may be possessed of merit. Where is the merit, if there is none that doeth good ? Where is the merit, if they have all turned out of the way ? Where is the merit, if there is none just ? And experience is parallel with this scripture. Bring me any unregenerated man—I care not how many steps he may have taken towards the kingdom of grace, or how nearly he may have arrived thither, he will confess to an admixture of impurity, or insincerity, or pride, or selfishness, in even those words and works which seemed most meritorious ; he will confess that ever, in his experience, when he would do good, evil is present with him. But the most startling feature of this proposition is that which denudes of all merit, a man who is even justified and regenerate ; that which denies to all the zeal, and all the love, and all the sacrifices, and all the charities, and all the obedience of the people of God, the smallest particle of merit. This is a hard saying, who can hear it ? But let us go to the law and to the testimony, for if we speak not according to this word, there is no light in us.

I turn then to the seventeenth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, and I read in the tenth verse:—"So you also, when you shall have done all these things that are commanded you, say: We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which we ought to do." In the very nature of things it must be so. Whence come these fruits of righteousness, but from Him from whom proceedeth every good and perfect gift? To constitute the works of Christians meritorious, it must be shown that they are wrought independently of extraneous influence, suggestion, or aid; wrought also of perfect free will. But because they are not thus wrought, because we are moved and empowered by the Holy Spirit to do them, because there is in us, naturally, no disposition to good works, where is the merit of them? What of merit is there in the branch of the vine laden with its rich clusters of fruit, the branch that derives all its life and nourishment from the roots and the stock; that is pruned by the husbandman; that is warmed by the sun, and fanned by the breeze? Sever it from the vine, and the question is answered. And so it is with the Christian. Is there life in his soul? it is the life of Christ. Is there strength? It is the power of Christ. Is there warmth? It comes from Christ the Sun of Righteousness—"CHRIST IS ALL AND IN ALL," and if you desire to sum up the amount of merit which the Christian possesses, sever him from Christ, and the problem is solved. Orthodox to the letter are the sentiments on this subject of Pope Gregory the First who said, "that the best of men will find no merit in

their best actions, and that if he should attain to the highest virtue, he should obtain eternal life, not by merits, but by pardon." Again, in commenting on the Penitential Psalms, he says, "I pray to be saved, not trusting to my merits, but presuming to obtain that by mercy alone, which I hope not for by my merit." Would that the Council of Trent had taken this leaf out of the writings of Gregory the Great, and inserted it amongst their canons instead of the following :—"Whoever shall affirm, that the good works of a justified man are in such sense the gifts of God, that they are not also his worthy merits ; or that he, being justified by his good works, which are wrought by him through the grace of God, and the merits of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member, does not really deserve increase of grace, eternal life, the enjoyment of that eternal life if he dies in a state of grace, and even an increase of glory : let him be accursed." Here then is Gregory the Great, a Pope and a Saint, anathematized by the Trentine Fathers !

A striking illustration of the present doctrine of the Church of Rome, as it respects human merit, is found in a grave-yard in Cork, on a tomb stone, upon which the following inscription is engraved :—"I. H. S. Sacred to the memory of the benevolent Edward Molloy, the friend of humanity and father of the poor : he employed the wealth of this world only to secure the riches of the next ; and, *leaving a balance of merit on the book of life, he made heaven debtor to mercy.* He died October 17, 1818.—R. I. P."

II. The second proposition which we advance is this : JUSTIFICATION IS A GRATUITOUS BLESSING, i. e. IT IS BESTOWED UPON MAN IRRESPECTIVE, IN THE LEAST DEGREE, OF HUMAN MERIT.

The very term *forgiveness* which St. Paul uses in the text as synonymous with justification, proves this. If I break the laws of my country, am found guilty by an adequate tribunal, and am sentenced to punishment, and then, in her clemency, the Queen should extend to me her Royal pardon, it would not, methinks, be difficult to show that the act was an act of free and gratuitous mercy on the part of the Sovereign. It is even so as it respects ourselves and the King of Kings : we have broken his laws, all the world is declared guilty before Him, we are condemned to punishment, but God extends to us the offer of a free pardon. This is grace without merit, and hence the Apostle Paul, as I read in his epistle to the Ephesians, Douay version, says, "In whom we have redemption through his blood the remission of sins ACCORDING TO THE RICHES OF HIS GRACE."

And the term *justified*, as it is employed by the Apostle, does not detract from the doctrine of the gratuitousness of the blessing. We have already seen that man, as a sinner, may be both forgiven and justified. This arises from the peculiar nature of the economy of redemption. Evangelical justification indeed means neither more nor less than forgiveness bestowed consistently with the claims of the divine character and laws, and we know that this is the only principle upon which forgiveness could or would be bestowed. As, therefore, forgiveness is bestowed by God, of his grace,

as God could not bestow this grace to the disparagement of his justice, it follows that the scheme which he has devised for the reconciliation of these two perfections in the act of forgiveness must have been devised, and its blessings bestowed without claim or merit also. Hence, I read in the Douay Bible the following text: "BEING JUSTIFIED FREELY BY HIS GRACE through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

The Bible, yes this Douay Bible, is full of passages to this effect. I read in Romans xi. 6: "If by grace it is not now by works; otherwise grace is no more grace." In Ephesians ii. 8, 9: "For by grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves for it is the gift of God. Not of works that no man may glory." In Titus iii. 5: "Not by works of justice which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us; that being justified by his grace, we may be heirs according to the hope of everlasting life." But why should I multiply references to substantiate a doctrine whose fitness and whose glory appeal to the conscience of every sinner, and whose truth was patent to the whole Christian Church for the first thousand years of its existence? Roman Catholics speak of the unity of their church, and of the apostolicity of its teaching and practice; but this we confidently affirm, and you shall have proof before you leave this church, that into whatever other errors the Church of Rome may have fallen before the sitting of the Trentine Council, it was left to that body of ecclesiastics to hurl the first church anathema against every humble preacher who should dare to affirm with Paul, "that man is justified by faith

only." In the beginning of the twelfth century, Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, required that the following exhortation should be given to a dying monk : "Do you believe that you cannot be saved but by the death of Jesus Christ? I do believe so. Do you heartily thank him for it? I do. Be you therefore ever thanking him for it as long as you live, and put your whole trust and confidence in that death alone; and let that be your only safeguard. And if the Lord will enter into judgment with thee, say thus: O Lord, unless I hold the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and thee and thy judgment, I am not able to plead with thee. If he tells you that you have merited damnation, say unto him, I hold the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and my ill-deserts; and instead of those merits which I ought to have, but alas, have not, I offer to thee the merit of his most meritorious passion." This exhortation was judged so orthodox and scriptural in the twelfth century, that it found its way into most of the Roman Catholic devotional works. Cardinal Hosius, indeed, referred to it as Catholic in doctrine, and it was not until the Council of Trent that it was found to contain articles of faith contrary to the belief of the church; so it soon found a place in the *Index Expurgatorius!* What will be said by Roman Catholics when they are informed that in the year 1584, several passages which deny the merit of good works, were commanded by the order of the Council of Trent to be blotted out of several books? What will be said, when I affirm, that from the office for the dying, the following questions and answers were

expunged by the same authority: *Q.* "Dost thou believe that thou shall come to Heaven not by thy own merits, but by the virtue and merit of Christ's passion? *A.* I do believe it. *Q.* Dost thou believe that Christ died for our salvation, and that none can be saved by their own merits, or any other way but by the merits of his passion? *A.* I do believe it." These are the questions which, prior to the Council of Trent, were put by officiating ministers to dying Roman Catholics; but that Council stretched forth its sacrilegious hand and robbed the members of the church of this sole foundation of their hope.

Our Catholic friends sometimes ask: "Where was your religion before Luther?" In the Bible we reply: and, so far as the doctrine of justification by grace is concerned, in St. Bernard, in Anselm, in those sentences which the Council of Trent expunged from the office of the church. To show you how Scripture triumphed over the Tridentine dogmas, I will read to you some of the last expressions of Cardinal Hosius, the very prelate who presided over the Council:—The following sentiments are taken from his last will:—"I approach the throne of thy grace, O Father of mercies, and of all consolation, to the end that I may obtain mercy, and find grace in thy sight. Whensoever it shall please thee to demand back again that which thou hast committed to me, into thy hands I resign my spirit; which if thou shouldst look upon as it is in itself, I confess it is not worthy to appear in the presence of thy Majesty, for it is full of all kind of pollution; but if thou hast respect to the blood of thy Son, wherein it has been washed

and purified, and to those bitter torments which he suffered for our sins, that he might render us acceptable in thy sight ; they are worthy that for their sake thou shouldst give it eternal life, which he purchased at so great a price." He then desires that God would not look upon him as himself, but in the face of Jesus Christ. "I am not worthy," says he, "that thou shouldst behold me with the eyes of thy Majesty ; but as it is most worthy, that for the sake of his death, and passion, thou shouldst not only look upon me, but crown me also ; 'tis therefore that I come unto thee, most dear Father, and that *without any merits, but those inestimable ones of thy Son, Jesus Christ, my Lord and my Redeemer ; I bring thee the merit of that death*, wherein alone I place all my hope and my confidence ; that is my righteousness, my satisfaction, my redemption, and my propitiation. The death of my Lord is my merit." And after that, having recited the words of St. Bernard in the 61st sermon upon the Canticles ; he adds, speaking of the blood of Jesus Christ, "*Regard that price, for that price sake declare me worthy to be placed among the sheep at thy right hand.*"

Blessed, thrice blessed Gospel truth ! It is the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ ; it is the refuge of the distressed sinner ; it is the anchor of the rejoicing soul of the believer. What other doctrine can sustain the mind of the penitent, while in fear and trembling he prays, "God be merciful to me a sinner ?" What other doctrine can encourage the faith of the Christian while he surveys the absolute demerit of his best actions ? What other doctrine but that of salvation by grace can

enable the dying Christian to say "thanks be to God which giveth me the victory?" I rejoice to be permitted to preach to Protestants and to Catholics this evening, salvation by the grace of God; "Be it known unto you men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by Him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."

III. We come now to the third proposition,—WHEN GOD JUSTIFIES A SINNER, HE JUSTIFIES HIM WHOLLY.

This proposition you perceive is educed from the text: "And from all the things from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses, in him every one that believeth is justified."

The Apostle evidently means all things with which man stands charged in the sight of God. The law of Moses, either ceremonial or moral, justified from nothing; if therefore Paul's language means anything, it means that the evangelical justification of the sinner by God through Christ is perfect and complete; that the sinner indeed is delivered from all the guilt of his original sin and all the guilt of his manifold offences; delivered so fully as to be able to exclaim in the triumph of his faith, "There is now, therefore, no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus;" and as long as this text remains in the Douay Bible it will witness with the clearness of the noon-day sun against the counter-teaching of the Church of Rome during the last four centuries. Her view as propounded by the Council of Trent is, that *ALL guilt* is not remitted in justification, that the accepted and reconciled child of God is still liable to temporal punishment on account of his sins.

Hence the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church which divides sin into mortal and venial ; a division which the Reformed Churches declare to be unscriptural, and against which, therefore, they protest.

It is difficult to determine from Roman Catholic writers, which sins are mortal and which venial ; and it is surprising that in a matter of so great moment to man, a matter on which his endless interests are suspended, a holy and infallible Church, possessing such care and anxiety for the faithful as she professes to feel, should not, in some of her authorized formularies, have presented us with a list of those sins which are venial and of those which are mortal. The most consistent statement on the subject which I have been able to find is in the Theology of Peter Dens, the great text book of Maynooth College. It is found in the 1st vol., p. 362, &c. The work is written in Latin, but I shall give you a literal translation into English :

“What is vice (*vitium*)? *Vitium* properly and theologically is defined ‘a habit inclining to sin (*ad peccatum*)’ whence *vitium* is distinguished from *peccatum* as the habit from the act; *vitium* and *peccatum* however are often taken for the same.

“What is mortal sin? It is that which of itself brings spiritual death to the soul, inasmuch as of itself it deprives the soul of sanctifying grace and charity in which the spiritual life of the soul consists.

“What is venial sin? That which doth not bring spiritual death to the soul; or that which does not turn away from its ultimate end, or which is only slightly

repugnant to the order of right reason. It is moreover certain not only from the divine compassion, but from the nature of the thing, that there are venial sins, or so slight ones as in just men may consist with a state of grace and friendship with God." Mark, the following note, and see from it the terrible character of the evil which is involved in this unscriptural distinction:— "Although mortal sin differs much from venial, yet, by the testimony of St. Augustine, it is very difficult to discover, and most dangerous to define, what is mortal sin and what venial." "However," continues Dens, "some rules are every where assigned by theologians, by which it can generally be discovered what sins are in their own nature mortal or venial. When Scripture speaks of any sin in severe terms, that is to be considered mortal, e. g. if it call it *scelus*, *nequitia*, *iniquita*, *abominatio*, or says that it is worthy of death, hated by God, that it excludes from the kingdom of God, that it cries to heaven, if there be prefixed 'Alas,' &c., it is mortal. On the contrary, that sin is considered to be venial when Scripture uses milder expressions, as if it employs the word 'mote,' 'stubble,' 'hay,' &c., or but slightly blames it, as in Prov. x. 19., 'In the multitude of words there wanteth not sin,' and 'Every idle word which man shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment.' "An idle word is of its own nature a venial sin, also a jocose or officious lie, excess in laughter, joy or sorrow, vain curiosity. The early motions of luxury, hatred, &c., are venial.

"What sin is called venial from the smallness of the

matter? That *which of its own nature* IS MORTAL SIN, but in this act, here and now, is venial from the smallness of the matter about which it is concerned; thus THE THEFT OF ONE PENNY IS VENIAL from the smallness of the matter, A TRIFLING EXCESS OF DRINKING, &c."

The time will not permit me to quote more extensively, though I greatly desire to do so. But you have heard enough to show you what is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on the nature of sin; and I shall wonder greatly if this extraordinary revelation does not strike every mind now present with astonishment and terror. I am sure there is not an intelligent Catholic in this Church whose conscience does not at once rebel against the immoral principles contained in these theological expositions. Where, in the word of God, have we ground for such doctrine? The Bible says thou shalt NOT STEAL—the command is absolute; but the Catholic Church says, thou mayest steal a penny, and yet continue in the grace and favor of God; thou mayest exceed a little in drinking, and yet not lose the grace of true religion! How different is this teaching from that of our Divine Jesus, when he explained on the Mount the spirituality of the law? When he showed that an immodest look involves the commission of adultery, and that to be angry with a brother without cause is to commit murder? Is the teaching of Dens, or of his great Master, Thomas Aquinas, accordant with that of the apostle James: "But if you have respect to persons, you commit sin, being reprov'd by the law as transgressors. And whosoever shall keep the whole law, but offend in one *point*, is become guilty of all." "So,"

says the Romish commentator, "the meaning is, that in matters relating to faith, the administering of the sacraments, and other spiritual functions in God's Church, there should be no *respect of persons*; but that the souls of the poor should be as much regarded as those of the rich. See *Deut.* i. 17. That is, he becomes a transgressor of the law in such a manner, that the observing of all other points will not avail him to salvation; for he despises the lawgiver, and breaks through the great and general commandment of charity, even by one mortal sin. For all the precepts of the law are to be considered as one total and entire law, and as it were a chain of precepts where by breaking one link of this chain, the whole chain is broken, or the integrity of the law consisting of a collection of precepts. A sinner, therefore, by a grievous offence against any one precept, incurs eternal punishment: yet the punishment in hell shall be greater for those who have been greater sinners, as a greater reward shall be for those in heaven who have lived with greater sanctity and perfection."

Intimately involved in this distinction, is that other equally unscriptural dogma that the guilt and punishment of sin are two-fold. The following is the canon of the Council of Trent: "Whoever shall affirm, that when the grace of justification is received, the offence of the penitent sinner is so forgiven, and the sentence of eternal punishment reversed, that there remains no temporal punishment to be endured, before his entrance into the kingdom of heaven, either in this world, or in the future state, in purgatory: let him be accursed."

But how is this canon to be reconciled with the statement of Paul in the epistle to Galatia, chap. iii., verse 13, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." The usual argument which our friends adopt is this: that the punishment of spiritual death is removed by justification may not be questioned; but that because man is called to suffer the penalty of temporal death, it is clear that the temporal punishment is not removed. But it is forgotten that this temporal punishment as it is called, is no longer a punishment to the righteous man—that this curse of temporal death is converted by the grace of Christ into a blessing; so much so is this the case that the man of God desires to depart and to be with Christ, and that in his last moments the sting of death is extracted, the victory of the grave annulled, and the dying saint enabled to exclaim, "thanks be unto God which giveth me the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord."

It is upon these distinctions of sin unto mortal and venial, and of punishment into eternal and temporal, that the novel scheme of indulgences rests; a scheme at which we must at least glance in our present discussion.

And here we willingly accord that many Protestants have fallen into error by supposing the authorized teaching of the Church of Rome to be, that indulgences are granted to the faithful for the remission of the guilt of all sins; whereas her most eminent divines are careful to explain that mortal sins and spiritual guilt are not regarded by them at all; that these indeed are taken away in absolution. I wish to be very clear in

presenting the Roman Catholic view of this subject; and turn first to the 6th vol. of Dens' theology, p. 417, where I find the following:—*Q.* “What is an indulgence? *A.* It is the remission of the temporal punishment due to sins (already) remitted as to their guilt, effected by the power of the keys without a sacrament by the application of the satisfactions which are contained in the treasury of the church. *Q.* What is to be understood by the treasury of the church? *A.* It is the accumulation of spiritual virtues (*bonorum*) remaining in the divine acceptance, the disposition of which is intrusted to the church. *Q.* From what things does this treasure grow? Chiefly from the superabundant satisfactions of Christ, then from the overflowing satisfactions of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the rest of the Saints.”

In the “End of Controversy,” by Dr. Milner, we are presented with the following view of the scheme of indulgences:—“To explain, now, in a clear and regular manner, what an indulgence is; I suppose, first, that no one will deny that a sovereign prince, in showing mercy to a capital convict, may either grant him a remission of all punishment, or may leave him subject to some lighter punishment: of course he will allow that the Almighty may act in either of these ways with respect to sinners. I equally suppose that no person, who is versed in the Bible, will deny that many instances occur there of God's remitting the essential guilt of sin and the eternal punishment due to it, and yet leaving a temporary punishment to be endured by the penitent sinner. Thus, for example, the sentence

of spiritual death and everlasting torments was remitted to our first father, upon his repentance, but not that of corporal death."

But what shall we say to this learned controversialist for sustaining by an appeal to Scripture, a scheme which the most celebrated doctors of his church, have declared to have no warrant from Scripture? Durandus says, very little can be affirmed with any certainty concerning indulgences, because neither the Scripture speaks expressly of them, and the Fathers Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, and Jerome, speak not at all of them. He also says, that it is not clear that the power of the keys conferred upon the apostle Peter is to be understood of the power of granting indulgences. Which of these divines are we to follow? Cardinal Cajetan in the first volume of his works, speaking on this subject, says, "If we could have any certainty (*si certitudo habere posset*) concerning the origin of indulgences, it would help us much in the disquisition of the truth of purgatory." Alphonsus De Castro acknowledges that "many things are known to us of which the ancients were altogether ignorant such as indulgences, &c." I might also refer to Gabriel Biel, Navarius, St. Anthony, Archbishop of Florence, Cardinal Fisher, and others to the same purpose. What, again, shall we say to Dr. Milner, who is full of wrath against Bishop Porteus, for stating an indulgence to be a transfer of the over-plus of the saints' goodness joined with the merits of Christ," while Delahogue a great authority, in Maynooth at least, asserts: "Indulgences remit, even in God's forum, the debt of

temporal punishment which would else remain to be satisfied, either in this life or in purgatory, after the remission of the guilt of sin; they derive their efficacy from the treasure of the Church, which treasure consists, primarily, of the merits and satisfactions of Christ; for, as a single drop of his blood was sufficient for the redemption of the sins of the whole world, there remains an infinite hoard of his merits at the disposal of the Church for the service of her children; and, secondarily, of the merits and satisfactions of the Virgin Mary and other saints, who underwent far severer sufferings than their own sins required; which superabundance and almost superfluity of sufferings of theirs form a sort of bank or deposit, out of which the Church may make disbursements for the common benefit of the faithful, in the way of payment (*via solutionis*) for the punishments or satisfactions due from them."

1. We protest against Indulgences because, by the showing of Catholic writers themselves, they have no authority in the word of God.

2. We protest against Indulgences because, by the showing of Catholic writers themselves, they have no authority in the writings of the early Fathers.

3. We protest against Indulgences because, they are so worded as not to maintain even the Roman Catholic distinction between spiritual and temporal guilt. Intelligent Catholics will not dare to deny that, whatever may be the case with the literate portion of the Church, the illiterate and common people are frequently misled. In travelling through Sicily, on one occasion, having to remain, for a few hours, in a town in the interior, my

attention was directed to three monks who were moving through the streets followed by a crowd of the lower orders of the people. I observed that one of these monks had a large number of printed papers in his hand, and that another was ringing a small bell to draw the attention of the townsfolk to the business which they had in hand. Upon inquiry I found that they were dispensing *Indulgences*. Wishful to procure a copy, I desired the keeper of the hotel to purchase one, which he did for a small silver coin. That indulgence, I now hold in my hand; the proceeds of the sale, it is said, were to be devoted to the maintenance of the religious orders of the Church in the Holy Land. I will read one sentence from this document:—"For the benefit of the holy places and the sanctity of the faith, our Lord, Pope Benedict XIV., conceded a plenary indulgence in the article of death, and remission of all sins to officials and benefactors of the Holy Land." What, I ask, would be the probable effect of the possession of such a document upon the mind of an ignorant person? The Pope concedes to him a plenary indulgence in the article of death, and remission of all his sins. What does he know of those nice distinctions in theological philosophy which have been drawn by the doctors of his Church? Peter Dens himself complains of the strong language which is employed in the Bulls of the Popes, as ascribing too much to their indulgences; and no marvel while Pope Boniface IX. granted indulgences from punishment and from guilt, *a Pœna et a Culpa*; and Clement VIII, whom Bellarmine magnifies for his care in reforming indulgences, grants a most

plenary remission of sins; no marvel while Clement VI. in his bull, published out of the Utrecht manuscript, not only gives a plenary absolution to all persons who died in the way to Rome, but also demands the Angels of Paradise to carry the soul immediately to heaven!

4. We protest against indulgences because they lead to superstition. Upon the minds of the common people they produce the same influence which the charms of witchcraft produced in olden times. Confirmatory of this I shall read one line merely appended to the indulgence which I procured in Sicily:—"This indulgence is profitable against lightning, earthquake, thunder, thunderbolts, and other afflictions."

5. Lastly, we protest against indulgences, because they lead to the commission of sin. They encourage sin, and to their influence we ascribe the confessedly low state of morals in Italy, Spain, and other Roman Catholic countries. If a man may, by absolution, obtain remission of spiritual and eternal guilt, and by indulgences be freed from temporal punishment, under what restraint is he placed? What is there to keep him from the commission of the basest crimes? I shall give you the opinion of Antonius, one of the Trentine fathers, as to the state of the church in the sixteenth century, when the scheme of indulgences was in full vigour. It may be found in an address which he delivered before the Council:—"He called upon the Council to "consider the depravation of manners, the turpitude of vice, the contempt of the sacraments, the solicitude of earthly things, and the forgetfulness of celestial good, and of all Christian piety:" Each suc-

ceeding day witnessed a "deterioration in devotion, divine grace, Christian virtue, and other spiritual attainments." No age had ever seen "more tribunals and less justice; more senators and less care of the commonwealth; more indigence and less charity; or greater riches and fewer alms." This neglect of justice and alms was "attended with public adultery, rapine, exaction, taxation, oppression, drunkenness, gluttony, pomp of dress, superfluity of expense, contamination of luxury, and effusion of Christian blood." Women displayed "lasciviousness and effrontery; youth, disorder and insubordination; and age, impiety and folly:" while never had there, in all ranks, "appeared less honour, virtue, modesty, and fear of God, or more licentiousness, abuse, and exorbitance of sensuality." The Pastor was "without vigilance, the Preacher without works, the law without subjection, the people without obedience, the monk without devotion, the rich without humility, the female without compassion, the young without discipline, and every Christian without religion." The wicked were "exalted, and the good depressed." Virtue was despised, and vice, in its stead, reigned in the world. "Usury, fraud, adultery, fornication, enmity, revenge and blasphemy" enjoyed "distinction;" while "worldly and perverse men, being encouraged and congratulated in their wickedness, boasted of their villany."

IV. We shall now adduce a fourth proposition:—  
 THE MERITS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST CONSTITUTE  
 THE ONLY SATISFACTION WHICH GOD EITHER ACCEPTS  
 OR DEMANDS FOR THE JUSTIFICATION OF A SINNER.

Any one who is in the habit of reading the New

Testament does not demand proof of the scripturalness of this proposition. It is emblazoned upon almost every page of the Holy Evangelists; it is the living breath of the sermons of the blessed apostles, as recorded by Luke in the book of their Acts; it is the burden of their epistolary communications to the several churches of whose establishment they were the instruments; and in the heavenly vision of the beloved John, it is recorded as the great subject which inspires the worship of angels, and the songs of the redeemed in the world of glory. Saith Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews, "Christ was once offered to exhaust the sins of many, *i. e.*, according to the Rhemist expositor, in language equally beautiful and forcible—"to empty or draw out to the very bottom, by a plentiful and perfect redemption." How sublime in simplicity is that portion of St. John's narrative of the crucifixion in which the completeness of Christ's sacrifice, and the perfection of his merits are set forth:—"Afterwards JESUS knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, said: I thirst. Now there was a vessel set there full of vinegar. And they putting a sponge full of vinegar about hyssop, put it to his mouth. JESUS therefore when he had taken the vinegar, said: IT IS CONSUMMATED. And bowing his head, he gave up the ghost."

We have found it desirable in former lectures to mark those points of agreement which exist amongst Roman Catholics and Protestants. Let us follow the same course in considering the doctrine of satisfaction for sin. We all believe that God in his infinite wisdom,

did not think fit to pardon the sins of mankind without a vicarious sacrifice, that our Lord Jesus Christ became that sacrifice through the merits of which God is willing to pardon sin ; and that to all true penitents the efficacy of that sacrifice is available for everlasting salvation. Thus far we are agreed ; but here comes the point of difference : Protestants declare that, according to the scripture, whenever the guilt of sin is taken away the punishment is remitted also. Roman Catholics assert that when the eternal punishment of sin is remitted, the penitent must satisfy the justice of God, so far as the temporal punishment is concerned, by doing voluntary or compulsory acts of penance, by obtaining indulgences, or undergoing the penalty in purgatory. That I have not mis-stated this doctrine is clear from the following answers in Bishop Butler's Catechism, (pp. 53, 54) : *Q.* " What do you mean by the penance enjoined by the confessor ? *A.* The prayers and other good works which he enjoins on penitents, in satisfaction for their sins. *Q.* Why does the Church grant indulgences ? *A.* To assist our weakness, and to supply our insufficiency in satisfying the Divine Justice for our transgressions." In the fourteenth canon of the 14th Session of the Council of Trent, I read as follows : " Whoever shall affirm, that the satisfactions by which penitents redeem themselves from sin through Christ Jesus, are no part of the service of God, but, on the contrary, human traditions, which obscure the doctrine of grace, and the true worship of God, and the benefits of the death of Christ: let him be accursed."

The Council teaches also at the same session, " that

such is the abundance of the Divine bounty that we are able to make satisfaction to God the Father through Christ Jesus, not only by punishments voluntarily endured by us as chastisements for sin, or imposed at the pleasure of the priest according to the degree of the offence, but also (and this is an amazing proof of love) by temporal pains inflicted by God himself, and by us patiently borne."

This is the ground of that system of penances which are undergone by Roman Catholics, sometimes by self-infliction, at others by command of the priest. These penances vary in cruelty and duration, and sometimes they are voluntarily assumed by Catholic devotees for the purpose of increasing the capital stock of merit which has been entrusted to the church.

And here I wish to offer a remark on the introduction into Roman Catholic versions of the Bible, of the expressions "*penance*," and "*do penance*," as translations of the Greek words *μεάννοια* repentance *μετανοεῖτε* repent. Roman Catholics consider the Latin word *pœnitentia*, coming from the word *pœna*, punishment, as, under all circumstances conveying the idea of penal or satisfactory punishment. This term, however, is not an exact rendering of the word which the Holy Ghost employed, which is derived from *μετά*, implying *change* and *νοῦς*, the mind; and therefore must mean a change of mind—a spiritual change. This consequently can have little to do with bodily austerities. We see the inconsistency of rendering the word *μετανοήσατε*, "*do penance*," in the address of Peter:—"Now when they had heard these things, they had compunction in their

heart, and said to Peter, and to the rest of the apostles : What shall we do, men *and* brethren ? But Peter *said* to them : Do penance, and be baptized every one of you in the name of JESUS CHRIST, for the remission of your sins : and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here is a proof that Peter employed the word in a very different sense from that in which it is understood by the Church of Rome. Could the apostle mean by this command, "Do penance and be baptized." If he intended this, Roman Catholics do not follow the apostolic order and practice, for they say, "Be baptized and do penance."

The following penance is recommended by Dens for voluntary drunkenness : "That he should read for two days the psalm *miserere* on his knees ; that he should fast twice in the week ; and that he should distribute to the poor twice as much as he has spent in drink. But if he be a poor man and a labourer, he is to recite for three successive days on his knees five *Paters* and *Aves*, for two days, not to drink anything before noon and in the evening to eat only half a meal ; on the two next Sundays not to enter Church, but after mid-day he may go to preachings or to praises." And this is the satisfaction which the drunkard is required by the Church of Rome to add to the infinite satisfaction of Jesus Christ ! Observe, there is no direction for him to abandon his sin, to look to Christ. Again ; his punishment consists, chiefly at least, in some of the high privileges of Christianity, those of prayer, alms giving, and the reading of the word of God.

I will now give you an instance of self-torture from a

document intitled:—*The austerities of Santa Rosa, who was canonized by Pope Clement X., A. D. 1673.—Extracted from the collection of the Constitutions published by the Popes at the solemn canonization of Saints from John XV., to Benedict XIV. ; that is, from the year of our Lord 998, to the year 1729. Superintended by Justus Fontaninus, Archbishop of Ancyra. Printed at Rome, 1729, at the press of the Rev. Apostolic Chamber.—From the Bull of Canonization.*

“She changed the stones and crosses, with which when going to prayer in her childhood, and as yet ignorant of the use of whips, she was loaded by her maid, Marianne, who was almost the only person conscious of her mortifications, into iron chains, which she prepared as scourges, with which, after the examples of St. Dominick, every night she offered herself a bloody victim to God to avert his just anger, even to the copious effusion of streams of blood, either for the sorrows of the holy Church, or for the necessities of the endangered kingdom or the city of Lima, or compensating the wrongs of sinners, or for making any expiation for the souls of the dead, or for obtaining Divine aid for those who were in their last agonies ; the servants be sometimes horror-struck at such dreadful blows of the chains. And when the use of these were forbidden to her, she privately encircled her waist with one of them bound thrice round her, so that it never was apparent that she wore it, except when she was under the tortures of the sciatica ; which chain was afterwards loosened only by a miracle, and its links after the virgin’s death were found to emit a wondrous and indescribably sweet

odour. Lest any part of her innocent body should be free from suffering, she tortured her arms and limbs with penal chains, and stuffed her breast and sides with handfuls of nettles and small briars. She afterwards increased the sharpness of the haircloth, which reached from her neck beneath her knees, by needles mixed up with it, which she used for many years, until she was ordered to put it off on account of the frequent vomiting of blood. When she laid aside this punishment she substituted another garment less injurious to her health, but not less troublesome. For beneath it every movement was painful to her. Her feet only were free from these sufferings, which, either by hitting them with stones or by the burning of an oven, she did not suffer to be free from torture. . . .

“ She fixed upon her head a tin crown, with sharp little nails in it, and for many years never put it on without receiving wounds; when she grew older, this was replaced by one which was armed with ninety points. . . .

“ She desired the hardness of her bed to be such that it should rather drive away than invite sleep, so that when about to sleep, the same should be both a bed to her and an instrument of torture. Her pillow was either an unpolished trunk, or stones concealed for this purpose; which bed she afterwards so filled with sharp pieces of tiles and triangular pieces of broken jugs, that the sharp points of each should be turned to her body; nor did she try to sleep until she had embittered her mouth with a draught of gall.

“ Near the time of her death, Rosa throughout Lent

alternately sang the canticles and praises of God every day for a whole hour with a very melodious bird, in so orderly a manner, that when the bird sang the virgin was silent, and when the virgin sang, the bird, who was most attentive, ceased to sing. She invited, moreover, the inanimate plants, after an unheard-of fashion, to praise and pray to God, pronouncing the verse, 'Bless the Lord, all ye things which bud on the earth;' and she so visibly persuaded them, that the tops of the trees touched the earth, as if adoring their Creator with a solemn veneration."

Xavier, Liguori, and many others have practised equally severe austerities. The doctrine against which we are protesting leads to such practices, but I ask is it according to the Word of God! Is it according to the testimony of the ancient fathers? St. Ambrose says, "Of tears, I read; of satisfaction, I read not;" and our Heavenly Father says, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." My beloved hearers, how does this doctrine detract from the glorious and ample sufficiency of the sacrifice of Jesus, that any supposed merit of ours should be represented as adding to his merit, that these *Pater Nosters* and *Ave Marias*, and fastings and flagellations, these suicidal sufferings should make satisfaction for that for which his blood does not make satisfaction, is methinks to seek to dilute with human frailties, and to pollute with human sins, that precious blood of our Redeemer, which cleanseth from all sin. To what strange inconsistencies are men led by a departure from the Word of the Living God!

V. One other proposition, and only one, have we to advance and sustain this evening :—**FAITH IN THE ATONEMENT OF CHRIST, IS THE GRAND, SOLE, SCRIPTURAL CONDITION OF JUSTIFICATION.**

Passage after passage could I repeat from the Douay Bible in support of this proposition, but I have time to adduce but two or three. And first, let me invite you to consider the case of the jailor at Philippi, who sought direction from the apostle Paul respecting his salvation. “What,” said he, “must I do that I may be saved? Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved?” What saith Paul to the Galatians? “By the works of the law no flesh shall be justified before him.” What saith he again? “We account a man to be justified by faith without the works of the law.”

Ought not these passages to be sufficient to set at rest the entire question? They satisfied the mind of St. Hilary, who in the ninth canon upon Matthew plainly says, “**FAITH ONLY JUSTIFIETH.**” They satisfied St. Basil, another father of the Church, who thus wrote: “This is a perfect and a whole rejoicing in God when a man advanceth not himself for his own righteousness but acknowledgeth himself to lack true justice and righteousness, and to be justified by the only faith in Christ.” “Paul,” he continues, “doth glory in contempt of his own righteousness, and looketh for the righteousness of God by faith.” These passages satisfied Ambrose, another father, who says, “This is the ordinance of God, that they who believe in Christ should be saved without works, by faith only, freely receiving remission of their sins.” And yet we are anathematized

by the Council of Trent for holding these views of the early fathers ! There is one ground of complaint which Protestants rightly, as I think, urge against their Roman Catholic brethren in relation to this subject. Our friends unfairly and untruthfully represent the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith only ; as though we meant, by being justified freely by grace through faith, that this faith is alone in man without true repentance, hope, charity, dread, and the fear of God, at any time and season. Now, when we say that believers are justified freely by faith, we do not mean that nothing is afterwards required from the justified person. " This saying," to employ the exposition of one of the Homilies of the Church of England, " that we be justified by faith only, freely and without works is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works as being unable to deserve our justification at God's hands, and thereby most plainly to express the weakness of man and the goodness of God ; the great infirmity of ourselves, and the might and power of God ; the imperfectness of our own works, and the most abundant grace of our Saviour Christ ; and therefore wholly to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only, and his most precious blood shedding." The eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth Articles of the Church of England seem to exhaust this branch of our subject. " We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings : Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in

the Homily of Justification. Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's Judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit. Works done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin."

Here we have the key to the interpretation of the language of St. James, respecting the justification of Abraham, upon which the Roman Catholic Church so confidently relies for the support of her particular views. St. Paul says of Abraham that he was justified by faith, St. James, that he was justified by works. Now it is to be noted that these apostles refer to different periods in the life of the Patriarch; St. Paul, to the period when God promised that Isaac should be born; and St. James to the period when Abraham obeyed God as to the offering up of Isaac. Surely the Patriarch was justified when he believed God's promise concerning the birth of a son, for it is said that the faith was imputed to him unto justification. James speaking of a period forty-one years afterwards, when Abraham obeyed the voice of God, says that he was justified by works. How? Why he

proved that his faith was not dead; he was justified in the sight of men by his works; he demonstrated to all the world that he had faith, for he brought forth its fruits. Here then we have a spiritual justification by God through faith only, and a declarative justification by ourselves through works; I mean, that we declare ourselves truly justified by God, when we bring forth the fruits of faith.

Protestants do not deny, that there is needed, in every sinner, a preparation of heart before he can savingly believe. No sinner, for example, will even seek, much less obtain justification, unless he is convinced by the Holy Spirit of God of the evil of sin; unless the conviction is so deep as to lead to contrition and sorrow of spirit,—so deep as to lead him to confess his transgressions unto the Lord.

We now wish to show another difference between Protestants and their Roman Catholic neighbours. With us THE PENITENT CONFESSES HIS SINS TO GOD, and asks for pardon through Christ. With them THE PENITENT CONFESSES TO THE PRIEST, and asks absolution from the Church.

There are few tenets of the Church of Rome against which Protestants feel so strong an objection as that of auricular confession, i. e., the confession of sin in the ear of the Priest of the Church. We read in the Bible of confession of sin, but it is in the following language, "I have acknowledged my sin to THEE, and my injustice have I not concealed." I read in 1 John i. 9, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins;" but there is not one word here of

confession to the priest. In the Epistle of James, chapter v, verse 16, I find the following passage :—“ Confess therefore your sins one to another : and pray one for another, that you may be saved. For the continual prayer of a just man availeth much.” “ *Confess your sins to one another.* That is,” says the Catholic annotator, “ to the priest of the church, whom (verse 14,) he had ordered to be called for, and brought to the sick ; moreover, to confess to persons who had no power to forgive sins, would be useless. Hence the precept here means, that we must confess to men whom God hath appointed, and who, by their ordination and jurisdiction, have received the power of remitting sins in his name.” Notwithstanding this note, Cardinal Cajetan, as we find in Catharinus lib. v, p. 444, would not allow “ any one place of Scripture to prove auricular confession.” Maldonat an old canonist of the Church says, “ that all the interpreters of the decrees held that there was no divine precept for confession to a priest ;” and Gregory de Valentia, writing on this very subject acknowledged that some good Catholics did “ not believe in its necessity.”

Protestants must have the *letter of the word of God*, enjoining upon them the absolute necessity of confessing to a priest, before they will be content to pour into the ear of any mortal, of any one indeed but God their Heavenly Father, all the secret thoughts and workings of their hearts ; they must have higher authority than the twelfth century, before they can allow their wives and their daughters to be put upon the rack, which Dr. Chaloner has constructed in his “ Garden of the Soul,”

and which I would read to you this evening did not decency forbid. If every ancient father of the Church prescribed auricular confession, and the word of God remained as it does in even the Douay Bible, Protestants would reject the dogma as unscriptural, as unsafe, as contributing to immorality of life, both in ministers and in people. But the ancient fathers are against the Church of Rome here, and I bid every Roman Catholic to mark this. "What have I to do with men," inquires St. Augustine, "that they should hear my confession, as though they could heal my disease." "I do not force you" says Chrysostom, "to disclose your sins to men; review and lay open your conscience before God. Show your wounds to the Lord, the best of physicians, and seek medicine from him."

Here then is another novelty which the Church of Rome has introduced into her creed and practice, for as we have already shown, auricular confession is supported neither by the letter of Scripture, nor by the voice of antiquity.

While on this subject, having referred to the immoral effects of the confessional, I must quote the following from Dens:—

"What is the seal of sacramental confession? It is the obligation or debt of concealing those things which are known from sacramental confession.

"Can a case be stated in which it is lawful to break the sacramental seal? It cannot be stated, though the life or safety of a man or even the ruin of the state should depend upon it; nor can the supreme Pontiff dispense with it; so that on that account this secret of

the seal is more binding than the obligation of an oath, or vow, or a natural secret; and that by the positive will of God.

“What therefore ought a confessor to answer being interrogated concerning truth, which he has known through sacramental confession alone? He ought to answer that he does not know it; and if necessary confirm the same by an oath.

“It is objected that it is in no case lawful to tell a falsehood, but the confessor would tell a falsehood, because he knows the truth. Answer. I deny the minor *i. e.*, that the confessor would lie, because such confessor is interrogated as a man and replies as a man; but now he does not know that truth as a man though he knows it as God; and that sense is naturally inherent in the reply for when he is interrogated or replies out of confession he is considered as a man.”

Such are the enormities which we have been compelled to lay before you, and to which this doctrine unquestionably leads.

And now, fellow-sinners, suffer me to recall your thoughts to a consideration, for a few minutes only, of the grace and the glory of that doctrine which is revealed to us in the text, the doctrine of justification by faith only. I call you fellow-sinners, for I feel that I myself am a guilty sinner before God, and that you, my brethren in the flesh are guilty too. But oh! the wondrous grace, the boundless wisdom, the almighty power of God have discovered, devised, and executed a scheme of righteous mercy for the removal, the present removal, of your guilt and of my guilt, of all the guilt of our every soul.

What is it to be justified before God? It is to have my sins forgiven; my poor unworthy soul acquitted and accepted; it is to have my offended Father embracing me his prodigal child, clothing me with the best robe, the robe of righteousness, placing the signet of his love upon my finger, and killing for the feast of joy the fatted calf. Can I justify myself? No! It is God that justifieth. Can any priest or prelate bestow on me this grace of pardon? No! "It is God that justifieth." "I, even I am **HE** that blotteth out thy transgressions for my namesake." Can I contribute to my justification? No, for what am I? All my righteousnesses are but as filthy rags; I am a worm; I am a man of unclean lips; I have broken the Divine commands and if I could even now render obedience, this obedience would not atone for past transgression. "Whither oh whither shall I fly?" Whither? to Christ my only Lord, my only righteousness. Whither? to Jesus who saves his people from their sins; to Jesus who bare my sins in his own body on the tree; to Jesus, my suffering, crucified, bleeding, dying Saviour; my risen, exalted, interceding Lord. Shall I then attempt to add to his merit by lacerating this poor sinful body? No! for by **HIS** stripes and not my own am I healed. Shall I pierce myself with spikes and thorns for the purpose of helping to satisfy the claims of divine justice? No! for **HE** was wounded for my transgressions. Shall I chastise my sinful flesh? Shall I macerate this polluted clay? No! for the chastisement of my peace was upon **HIM**, and **HE** was bruised for my iniquities; **HE** is my **ALL**, and it

is only for me to come to God with a broken and contrite spirit, renouncing all trust in my own righteousness, accepting Christ as my Saviour, and trusting in his righteousness and in his only, and then

“ My debt is paid ; my soul is free,  
And I am justified.”

I need no other satisfaction than this ; it is all sufficient, for it is infinite and it is present. And how vast the love and condescension of my heavenly Father ! He permits me to approach him through Christ ; to Him I may confess my sins, whether I am in the closet, or in the busy world ; whether I am in a church, or a conventicle ; whether I am on the mountain top, or on the verdant plain ; whether I am gently gliding down the river stream, or tempest-tossed upon the ocean wave ; whether I am wading through the snows of Greenland, or panting beneath a vertical sun in the deserts of Africa ; whether I am in youth or in years, whether I am in health or in sickness, whether I am just entering into life, or quitting upon the bed of death this mortal vail ; wherever I am, or in whatever circumstances, I have a confessional, I have an ear open to my confessions of sin, an ear into which I can pour without restraint the troubles of my penitent spirit, and that ear is the ear of God,—my FATHER ! into that ear I can utter my penitent complaint ! I have also a Priest who has power upon earth to forgive sins, and that is Jesus Christ the Great High Priest of the Christian Catholic Church. I hear that Father say : “ Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be made as white as snow : and if they be red as crimson

they shall be white as wool;" and I hear my High Priest say: "Son be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee."

No other absolution do I need, this is all sufficient and I go on my way rejoicing; no other satisfaction, for in him are my sins exhausted; No masses, for he was once offered in the end of the world to take away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

My dear hearers, have you thus come to God through Christ? Are you mourning before him this evening on account of your sins? Are you anxious for the communication of pardoning mercy. Are you pouring into the ear of the Lord God of Sabaoth your confessions of sin? Are you coming to God through your only Priest? Are you trusting to him alone making mention of his righteousness, and of his only?

Come, O my guilty brethren, come,  
 Groaning beneath your load of sin,  
 His bleeding heart shall make you room,  
 His open side shall take you in;  
 He calls you now, invites you home,  
 Come, O my guilty brethren, come;

Cast your souls for a present conscious pardon upon the infinite merits of your Divine Redeemer, so being justified by faith you shall have peace with God through our LORD JESUS CHRIST.



## LECTURE VII.

### THE ONE AGENT OF REGENERATION.

There is not, probably, one of my hearers, who would be disposed to deny, that the design of Christianity is to make men holy. More than this, I question whether there is within these walls, an individual, either Protestant or Catholic, who will not agree with the speaker that that form of religion which tends not to individual and ecclesiastical holiness, is unworthy of the designation CHRISTIAN. If it is true that "a tree is known by its fruit," and if it is righteous to apply this principle, as we may call it, to Churches, we might argue, *a priori*, that that system or section of Christianity which most successfully accomplishes this end, approaches nearest to that divine original which has been sketched out in the New Testament. We are quite willing to meet our Roman Catholic friends on this ground, and are glad that an opportunity will be afforded in the course of this evening's lecture.

The subject which we have now to discuss, leads us to consider not only theory of doctrine, but also practice of life; not only what we believe, but also, *yea* chiefly, what we are, and what we do. Members of the Roman Catholic Church often assail their Protestant brethren with the charge of nullifying the sanctity of the Christian religion by the impious doctrine of Justi-

fication by faith only. In a work entitled "Grounds of Catholic Doctrine, now in use for the reception of converts into the Church," printed and published by a Roman Catholic bookseller in this city, I find the following description of Protestants:—"Their church is not Holy, neither in her doctrine, which, especially in the first 'reformers,' was shamefully scandalous in the encouraging lust and breaking of vows; blasphemous in charging God with being the author of sin; and notoriously wicked in their notions of free-will and predestination; nor is she Holy in the lives, either of her first teachers,—none of which were remarkable for sanctity, and the greater part of them infamous for their vices,—or, of their followers, who, as many of their chief Protestant writers have freely owned, instead of growing better than they were before, by embracing the 'reformed religion,' grew daily worse and worse." Again:—"It is visible to any unprejudiced eye, that there is not so much devotion, zeal or religion amongst Protestants, as there is amongst Catholics. We never hear of any instances of extraordinary sanctity amongst them."

In "Catholic Tracts," No. 8, by Rev. T. Baddely, entitled, "A sure way to find out the true religion," I find this comparison of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism:—"The holiness of the Catholic religion is indeed very different from that of other religions: because the religions taught by men teach doctrines invented by Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Whitfield, and other deluded and wicked men; whereas the Catholic Church teaches only that doctrine which Christ taught

his apostles ; consequently, if it was holy then, it is holy now." Again :—"There is nothing in the Protestant religion that can make a man more holy or more virtuous. They have no sacrifice, nor sacraments, except baptism, and that they begin to make light account of. They receive no benefit when they go to the Lord's Supper, because they receive nothing but a sup of wine and a morsel of bread ; they have no houses of devotion, no convents, or monasteries ; scarcely a book of spirituality."

Dr. Milner, one of the most liberal of Roman Catholic controvertists, gives the following opinion of Protestant sanctity :—"In a former letter to your society, I have stated that sincere humility, by which, from a thorough knowledge of our sins and misery, we become little in our own eyes, and try to avoid, rather than to gain the praise and notice of others, is the very groundwork of all other Christian virtues. It has been objected to Protestants, ever since the defection of their arrogant patriarch, Luther, that they have said little, and have appeared to understand less, of this essential virtue. I might say the same with respect to the necessity of an entire subjugation of our other congenial passions, avarice, lust, anger, intemperance, envy, and sloth, as I have said of pride and vain glory"

Without dwelling upon the uncharitableness of many of these remarks, I will just say that these friends of Protestant humanity either knew, or ought to have known that a change of heart and sanctity of life are insisted on by all Evangelical Protestant communities, as essential to Christian character.

These observations have been suggested by the subject which has been appropriated to this evening's discourse:—REGENERATION BY THE HOLY SPIRIT. The words which I have selected for a text are found in the Gospel according to St. John, chapter iii., verse 5:—

“JESUS ANSWERED: AMEN, AMEN, I SAY TO THEE, UNLESS A MAN BE BORN AGAIN OF WATER AND THE HOLY GHOST HE CANNOT ENTER INTO THE KINGDOM OF GOD.”

We are to speak, then, of something without which all other things are vain. If it can not be predicated of us that we are born again, we are unfit for the kingdom of God; yea, we can never see it. We may be intelligent and intellectual, we may be orthodox and moral, we may have the true Bible, and the true Priesthood, and the true visible Church, and the true Sacraments; but, if we are not BORN AGAIN, all these outward circumstances and accidents will avail us nothing. As St. Paul saith, in his letter to the Galatians, “neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but A NEW CREATURE.” What then are Church Unity, and Church Infallibility, and Church Apostolicity, without the New Birth? Here is something which concerns you all, the responsibility of which, you cannot shift upon either priest or church; for the Blessed Saviour comes to you in his Gospel, and, as with the voice of thunder, exclaims, to every one of you, “YOU MUST BE BORN AGAIN.”

\* The word *παλιγγενεσία*, regeneration, taken in its comprehensive sense, denotes any entire alteration of

\* See Knapp.

state by which one is brought into a wholly new and reformed condition. The change indicated by the term is, however, invariably a change *for the better*. Cicero, for example, calls his restoration from exile, a regeneration; and Josephus denominates the restoration of the Jewish land after the captivity, a regeneration of the country. In Roman law, the manumission of a slave was called his regeneration. In Matthew xix., verse 28, the word is employed to denote the change from this to the heavenly world: "Verily, I say unto you, that ye who have followed me; in the *regeneration*, when the son of man shall sit on the seat of his majesty, you also shall sit on twelve seats, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

When the Israelites spoke of a person changing his religion, they used the phrases *birth, and new birth*; When a Gentile became a Jew, he was regarded as new-born, a child, a new man, just beginning to live. This might be called *external* regeneration. The term was afterwards used by the Rabbins in a moral sense; since it became the duty of one who had been admitted into the Jewish Church, to live according to Jewish laws, and to have a better moral disposition. This is *internal, moral* regeneration. The term was used in both these senses in the time of Christ and his apostles.

Now it was not the manner of Christ and his apostles to invent new terms, but to borrow terms from the ancient Jewish phraseology, and transfer them to Christianity. Hence we find the terms regeneration, begotten again, born again, born of God, used in the New Testament in the two following senses:—

(1.) To denote a passing over, externally, from Judaism or Heathenism to the Christian society, and making an external profession of the Christian name. Thus, the apostle Paul, in the epistle to the Ephesians, speaking of the union of Jews and Gentiles into one church, says "that Christ has made in himself of twain one new man," which cannot here denote internal reformation, because it could not be predicated of all Gentiles who adopted the Christian profession.

(2.) But the term regeneration and its cognates is more frequently employed in scripture to denote an *internal* change, a moral renewal of the heart and dispositions of man, which empowers the subject of it to renounce the love of sin, to follow after holiness, to do the will of God, from the higher motives of love to the Father and to Christ. In this sense the creation of a new heart is spoken of even in the Old Testament; circumcision of heart is an expression which is also used. Again; a "new heart," a "new mind," a "new spirit," which has God for its author: expressions which are transferred by the apostles to the New Testament. Paul speaks of "putting on the new man;" he speaks also of the Christian being made "a new creature in Christ Jesus;" St. John also designates Christians "sons of God," because they are "born of God."

There are two passages of scripture, in which these two meanings of regeneration are, as we suppose, combined; one is our text, the other is its parallel in Titus iii, 5:—"According to his mercy he saved us, by the laver of regeneration and renovation

of the Holy Ghost;”—language very similar to that which the Great Teacher addressed to Nicodemus: “Unless a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost,” *i. e.* unless a man consecrate himself by baptism to the profession of my religion, and become, by the renewing of the Holy Spirit, a reformed man, a child of God, a friend of God, like him in moral character, bearing his image, he cannot be considered, a member of the Messiah’s spiritual kingdom either on earth or in heaven. A great deal of the confusion which has arisen respecting baptism and regeneration, has been caused by not considering the first or professional sense in which some of the early fathers, (Ignatius and Justin, for example.) and probably the apostle in the verse in Titus just quoted, used the word regeneration, as altogether different from and by no means necessarily connected with that positive change which is inwrought in the heart of every true Christian by the power of the Holy Ghost.

It is to this latter, more general and more momentous sense of regeneration that we now invite your attention, in a series of propositional truths: and surely it will accord both with the sanctity of this place, and the supreme importance of the subject under consideration, for me to invite my every hearer to offer present prayer to the Father, through the Son, for the enlightening grace of the Holy Spirit.

FIRST,—THE NATURAL DEPRAVITY OF THE HUMAN HEART IS THE DOCTRINAL FACT UPON WHICH RESTS THE NECESSITY OF THAT SPIRITUAL CHANGE WHICH IS DESIGNATED IN THE TEXT, BEING BORN AGAIN.

The truth of this proposition none of us will be disposed to question. The depravity of man is acknowledged, with but little variation, by both Protestant and Roman Catholic authorities. The first and second Canons passed in the fifth Session of the Council of Trent read thus :—“Whoever shall not confess that when Adam, the first man, transgressed the commandment of God given him in paradise, he lost immediately the purity and righteousness in which he was created; and by the sin of his prevarication incurred the wrath and indignation of God, and consequently death, with which God had before threatened him; and with death, captivity to him who thence hath the power of death, that is the devil; so that by this offence of prevarication the whole man was changed for the worse, both in body and soul: let him be accursed. Whoever shall affirm that Adam’s prevarication injured himself only, and not his posterity, and that he lost the purity and righteousness which he had received from God, for himself only, and not also for us; or that when he became polluted by disobedience he transmitted to all mankind corporal death and punishment only, but not sin also, which is the death of the soul: let him be accursed.”

The ninth article of the Church of England is very clear and expressive on the subject :—“Original Sin standeth not in the following of *Adam*, (as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk;) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is ingendered of the offspring of *Adam*; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own

nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek, *phronema sarkos*, which some do expound the wisdom; some, sensuality; some, the affection; some, the desire of the flesh; is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin."

Here then we agree: we are not only guilty, we are depraved also; we are not only under the condemnation of the law, our hearts also are deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; we not only need pardon and justification, we need also spiritual renewal or the new birth. This is clearly set forth by our Lord in his discourse with Nicodemus. The import of his language is: ye are already born, but "ye must be born again;" ye are already born, but it is "of the flesh," of human nature, of corruption, of sin; "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," that which is born of sin is sinful. Ye are all the children of wrath, for behold ye were born in sin and shapen in iniquity. Oh that the solemnity of this truth were now impressed by the Holy Spirit upon our every mind! I am far from God; I am ignorant of God; my heart is at enmity against him; I see him not; I hear him not; I feel him not; He is not in my thoughts; I am a sinner, depraved, corrupt, loathsome, vile; I am lifeless—

DEAD ; I am ready to perish ; to sink into perdition ! This is my state by nature ; this is my present state, unless I am converted and regenerate. My dear hearers, endeavour to realize this your fearful, wretched, deplorable, and dangerous condition, while I press upon your attention the words of the Saviour, " YE MUST BE BORN AGAIN."

The Council of Trent, in her third and fifth Canons on Original Sin, has, in effect, taken away this ground of the necessity of regeneration. These canons expressly state, that the guilt, the pollution, the very in-being of sin are washed away in baptism ; washed away not only in the case of infants, but even in that of adults. There is not the least ambiguity in the language employed, as you will immediately see :—" Whoever shall affirm, that this sin of Adam, which originally was one offence only, but being transmitted to all by propagation, not by imitation, becomes the sin of all, can be taken away by the strength of human nature, or by any other remedy than the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, the one Mediator, who hath reconciled us to God by his blood, and 'is made to us justice, sanctification, and redemption.' (1 Cor. i. 30 ;) or shall deny that the merit of Christ Jesus is applied, both to adults and infants, by the sacrament of baptism, rightly administered according to the form of the church : let him be accursed. Whoever shall deny that the guilt of original sin is remitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, bestowed in baptism ; or shall affirm, that that wherein sin truly and properly consists is not wholly rooted up, but is only cut down, or not imputed : let him be accursed."

The following sentiments also occur in the Catechism of the Council: "Baptism washes away the stains of sin." "The law of Baptism extends to all, inasmuch that, unless they are regenerated by the grace of baptism, be their parents Christians or infidels, they are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction." Again: "If then through the transgression of Adam, children inherit the stain of primeval guilt, is there not still stronger reason to conclude that the efficacious merits of Christ the Lord, must impart to them that justice and those graces which will give them a title to reign in eternal life? This happy consummation BAPTISM ALONE CAN ACCOMPLISH." "Infants unless baptized cannot enter heaven." Once more: "The salutary waters of baptism, not only wash away all the stains of past sins, but also enrich the soul with divine grace, which enables the Christian to avoid sin for the future, and to preserve the invaluable treasures of righteousness and innocence."

These doctrines being so prominently inculcated in the standards of the church, it need not surprise us that there is so utter an absence in Roman Catholic teaching, both public and private, of all reference to the necessity of the New Birth. Baptism, indeed, takes its place; the members of the church are taught, that if they are baptized, (whether as infants or as adults it matters not,) the guilt and the pollution of sin are of necessity entirely washed away. They may contract new guilt, their souls may become again spotted by sin, but there are close at hand confession, and absolution, and penance; these will remove the newly contracted guilt

and pollution; and so the whole system of salvation, essentially spiritual in its nature, is ritualized by that church which assumes to itself the sole distinction of apostolical.

SECONDLY,—REGENERATION IS AN INWARD, SPIRITUAL CHANGE.

Nicodemus, you observe, was giving a natural interpretation to the Saviour's words; but our divine teacher immediately corrected his misapprehension, and showed him that, by the language which he employed, he meant to enforce the necessity of a *spiritual* change. Except a man be born "from above" (*ἀνωθεν*); "except a man be born of water *and of the Spirit*, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Ye must be born FROM ABOVE." There is nothing natural or physical in the whole thing; it is supernatural, it is spiritual, it is heavenly. And because it is a spiritual change, it is holy; purity is its leading characteristic, for it is from heaven, and heaven is holy; it is from God, and God is pure. It is a change from sin to holiness; from sinful motives, to pure motives; from sinful desires, to holy desires; from sinful propensities, to holy propensities: It is a change from death to life,—from the death of sin to the life of righteousness: It is a change from spiritual torpor to spiritual action, from spiritual blindness to spiritual eyesight: It is a translation from the kingdom of Satan to the kingdom of God's dear Son; a transformation from the image of sin and the world, to the image of God's righteousness and true holiness. The change is so great, so real, so marked, so decided, so conspicuous, that it can be neither mis-

taken nor misunderstood. It is real and not relative, it is radical and not superficial; it reaches down to the very depths of the inner man. Listen to two or three passages of the New Testament, which speak of this change: "God," says St. Paul, in his Epistle to Ephesus, "who is rich in mercy, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together in Christ." Here this divine change is spoken of as a resurrection from the dead. In his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, the same apostle compares it with a new creation; for he speaks of the regenerate man as a new creature, old things having passed away, and all things being made new. In another place it is spoken of as an introduction from darkness into light: passages which all show that regeneration is not only a spiritual change, but that it is a change of so positive and decided a character as to be immediately recognized both by the subject and the observer.

For the same reason which we just now advanced, viz.:—that our Roman Catholic friends regard Baptism by the very act itself (*ex opere operato*) as producing regeneration, and as capable of doing this without respect to the quality of the subject,—the spiritual character of the change is completely lost sight of. I know that the Catechism of the Council of Trent declares that *free-will, faith, and penitence*, are dispositions necessary for baptism; that the rite is to be forced upon no one; and that it has been the invariable practice of the Church, to administer baptism to no individual without previously asking him if he were willing to receive it. But the practice of the Church

is not invariable. In the *Bibliotheca Ferraris*, I read, that any voluntary consent is sufficient, although it is mixed with an involuntary one, extorted by force or fear in any manner. Pope Innocent III. quoted by this author, says: "He who is violently attracted by terrors or punishment, and, lest he should receive detriment, receives the sacrament of baptism, such a one receives the character, the impress of Christianity." But then it is not to be concealed that Roman Catholic divines distinguish between a valid and a fruitful reception of baptism.

The doctrine of the Council of Trent, as expressed in the Catechism is as follows: "Another necessary condition is compunction for past sins, and a fixed determination to refrain from their future commission; should any one dare to approach the baptismal font, a slave to vicious habits, he should be instantly repelled; for what so obstructive to the grace and virtue of baptism as the obdurate impenitence of those, who are resolved to persevere in the indulgence of their unhalloved passions." It would have been well for the Church of Rome, and for Christianity in general, if this excellent and scriptural requirement had been universally attended to; but alas, it has been almost entirely disregarded. Cardinal Wiseman himself, and his authority as an expounder of Roman Catholic doctrine, few will be disposed to question, in his lectures on the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, vol. i, p. 131, teaches that strict examination of baptismal candidates is unnecessary. This is his language: "Apply this to the two rules of faith: and suppose a

Missionary arriving in a foreign country, where the name of Christ was not known, and advancing as his fundamental rule, that it was necessary for all men to read the Bible, and for each one to satisfy his own mind on all that he should believe. I ask you, not if you think it possible that thousands could be said to be properly converted by one discourse, under such a principle, but whether, if the Missionary conscientiously believed and taught this principle, he could, in one day, admit those thousands, by the baptismal rite, into the religion of Christ? Would he be satisfied that he had made true converts, who would not go back from the faith once received? I am sure any one conversant with the practice of modern Missions, will be satisfied that no Missionary, except one from the (Roman) Catholic Church, would receive persons so slightly instructed into its bosom, or be satisfied that they would persevere in the religion they had adopted. But *they* can do it at this day, and they have done it in every age; for St. Francis Xavier, like the Apostles, converted and baptized his thousands in one day, who remained steadfast in the faith and law of Christ. And all may be so admitted at once into the (Roman) Catholic religion, who give up their belief in their own individual judgment, and adopt the principle, that whatever the (Roman) Catholic Church shall teach them, must be true."

That the Cardinal speaks here of baptism administered not validly merely, but fruitfully, is clear from his comparing the converts of Xavier, with the converts of the apostles; forgetful that they worked miracles, and

were empowered to read the hearts of men, and are therefore no rule in this respect for ordinary ministers. Besides, the Cardinal's theory is wholly opposed to the teaching of the Fathers, for St. Augustine, Cyril, and Jerome, as it is known to any one acquainted with their writings, insisted upon the minute instruction of candidates for baptism. Now it cannot but be, that a theory which is so contrary to experience will be practically disregarded. True, Roman Catholic divines speak of a spiritual change, so spiritual and so extensive as that the very roots of sin are plucked up and destroyed from the soul, but then, they ascribe this work to baptism; and when the people see that even in baptized adults the same old habits, dispositions, tempers, propensities remain, when they see that in most instances the water of baptism touches only the head, and that there is no special washing of the inner man, they soon begin to suspect that the doctrine is one grand Christian hoax. Granted that baptism is a Christian sacrament, that as a sacrament, when received in faith it is a sign and a seal of inward renewal; granted further, that when the adult penitent receives the sacrament in the faith of Christ, it becomes the instrument of regeneration; but then this is a very different theory from that of the Cardinal, who contends that a Christian missionary, upon the consent of five hundred or one thousand idolaters, or cannibals, or devil worshippers, and a summary and very general profession on their part of faith in Christ, is authorized to baptize them *en masse*. And I confess that for me to believe that the sacramental water thus applied in the name of the blessed Trinity

would, *ex opere operato*, regenerate every one of these idolaters, these devil worshippers, these cannibals, would make them new creatures, would remove the guilt of sin, would uproot the seeds of sin, would secure to them, were they immediately to die, an entrance into the kingdom of heaven, requires a stretch of credulity equal to that which a man evinces when he adopts the profession of atheism. Is it any marvel that in the midst of such views and practices the spiritual character of regeneration should disappear?

THIRDLY, THE AGENT OF OUR REGENERATION IS THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD AND HE ALONE.

From first to last the work is His. From the first ray of convincing light which pierces the dark mind of the sinner, to that regenerating change which introduces him into the light of spiritual day—the day of holiness, the work is wholly His. The sense in which we are said to be born of water has been already intimated: The sense in which we are represented as being born of the incorruptible seed of the word, so far from disallowing the sole agency of the Holy Ghost, rather confirms it; for that word is nothing, imparts no life, without his quickening power. Roman Catholics will say, “this is *our* doctrine;” we grant that several instances may be pointed out in which the theory of regeneration by the Spirit is defined, (not perhaps very clearly,) but, methinks, to give to an external rite that prominence which the Council of Trent imparts to it, and that greater prominence with which the practice of the Catholic Church invests it; to make the new birth so

intimately and invariably dependent on its administration; to say that no man can be regenerated without baptism, and that baptism intentionally ministered, and willingly received, always produces regeneration; to declare, so solemnly as that all who deny it are anathematized, that the absence of the rite, whatever other qualities or graces may exist, leads infallibly to everlasting damnation, and this in the case of helpless infants, is, as I think, to limit the power and the benignity of the Holy Spirit, and to stigmatize with injustice the gracious scheme of redemption; it is to rob the Holy Spirit of his prerogative, and to place that prerogative, virtually at least, in mortal hands. Now I will ask you, whether Paul could have entertained the modern Roman Catholic view of baptism, the Trentine view I mean, and yet have consistently written, as he did, to the Corinthian Church: "I give God thanks, that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius. Lest any should say that you were baptized in my name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other." Could any Roman Catholic Bishop, with his views of Baptism, insert in a pastoral letter, I give God thanks that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius? I trow not. Paul knew how to distinguish between the work of the spirit, and the signification of a sacrament. Now the Roman Catholic theory would require us to believe that Crispus, Gaius, and the house of Stephanas were all in the Corinthian Church, whom Paul had instrumentally introduced into the regenerate state; but his own language in the fourth chapter of this same epistle,

completely sets aside this view: "For if you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet not many fathers. For in Christ JESUS by the gospel I have begotten you." Again: If no one can be regenerated, can receive the Spirit of God, but by baptism, as the whole Roman Catholic Church declares, how came it to pass that when Peter preached to Cornelius and his company, the Holy Ghost descended upon them before baptism, and that Peter viewed this descent as qualifying them to receive the rite or sacrament: "While Peter was yet speaking these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word. And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord JESUS CHRIST. Then they desired him to tarry with them some days." Oh! my brethren, regeneration is the Spirit's work, for the birth is Divine, It is as true now as it was in the days of the apostles, that to AS MANY AS RECEIVE CHRIST BY FAITH, the power is given to become the sons of God; "who are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

#### FOURTHLY. THE FRUIT OF REGENERATION IS SANCTIFICATION.

This is a truth which Catholics in general, might probably be disposed to concede. But what is sanctification? It is living holiness. Regeneration is the birth, sanctification is the life. Regeneration is a change from nature to grace, sanctification is not a change, but a state; a state of holiness. It is holiness of heart and life. It comprises therefore two branches,

though the stock is one ; the one inward, the other outward. Inward holiness, to adopt the language of the Westminster Confession, is “ the destruction of the whole body of sin, it is the mortification of the lusts of the soul, it is the existence of the Spirit’s grace and strength in the inner man, it is the principle of pure love to God and to all mankind.” Outward holiness is obedience to the law and will of God ; it comprehends holiness of dispositions, holiness of temper, holiness of word, holiness of action, it comprehends self-denial, daily cross-bearing, love of prayer, charity to the poor, benevolence and even beneficence to our enemies ; it embraces temperance of living, honesty of purpose and action, humility of deportment, obedience and deference to superiors, chastity of life. Let me read to you from the Douay Bible a few passages illustrative of these views :—“ And what concord hath Christ with Belial ? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever ? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols ? For ye are the temple of the living God : as God saith : *I will dwell in them, and walk among them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.* Wherefore, *Go out from among them, and be ye separate,* saith the Lord, *and touch not the unclean thing.* And *I will receive you ; and I will be a Father to you : and you shall be my sons and daughters,* saith the Lord Almighty. Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of the flesh and of the spirit, perfecting sanctification in the fear of God.” The same apostle in his epistle to the Romans, chapter vi., 6, says : “ Knowing this that

our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin may be destroyed, to the end we may serve sin no longer." In the fifth chapter of his epistle to Galatians we have the following impressive view of Christian sanctification :—" But the fruit of the Spirit is, charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, mildness, faith, modesty, continency, chastity. Against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's, have crucified their flesh, with the vices and concupiscences. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit. Let us not be made desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another." Saint Peter also, in the second chapter of his first epistle says, " You are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people, that you may declare his virtues who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." These are apostolic views of the effects of regeneration, and where these fruits, in more or less maturity, do not appear, there exists not true holiness, there is the absence of regenerating grace. Christianity is a holy thing. True Christianity sanctifies every thing that it touches, and purifies every man whom it rightly influences. That holiness is the prevailing characteristic of all true Christians, may appear from the very term by which the apostles designate them. They call believers "*saints*." This is their usual form of address in their epistles to the Churches; the Romans were " called to be *saints*," and the Corinthians also. " Paul to all the *saints* who are at Ephesus, Paul to the *saints* and faithful brethren in Christ Jesus who are at Colossa," are the superscriptions of two of his epistles.

Our Roman Catholic friends have limited the meaning of the term "saints;" and, without any authority from the word of God, they apply it only to those who have been canonized by the Pope, and placed upon the Holy Calendar. And here, perhaps, it may be well to refer to those characteristics by which the Church of Rome judges of the holiness of her members, and of their worthiness for canonization. Every Roman Catholic knows that his Church grounds the sanctity of individuals on the amount and severity of their austerities, and on the number and magnitude of the supposed miracles which they have wrought. Take up the lives of your saints, and you will find that their holiness was chiefly a *ritual* holiness: Prayers, fasts, penances, lacerations, exposures to cold, bodily fatigues, fightings for the Church, destroying heretics; these things, together with the working of some few miracles, are quite sufficient, in the Church of Rome, to establish the holiness of an individual, and to give him the distinction of a saint.

The saints of the Church of Rome may be divided into several classes. There are some who, by means of immense wealth have been great benefactors to the Church; others who from the high authority which they possessed became the patrons and defenders of the Church. Many have been canonized because of a life of long and affected retirement; and others again because they have returned from a dissolute life to the service of God and of the Church.

I shall now adduce some of the grounds upon which several of the canonized saints of the Church of Rome have been raised to so elevated a distinction:—

Of St. Patrick it is said (Roman Breviary) that he was wont to repeat daily the whole psalter, together with the canticles and two hundred hymns and prayers; three hundred times on each day to worship God upon his knees, and in each canonical hour of the day to sign himself one hundred times with the sign of the cross. Dividing the night into three portions, he spent the first in running through one hundred psalms, and in two genuflexions; the second in running through the other fifty psalms in cold water, with his heart, eyes, and hands raised to heaven; he yielded the third part to a short sleep upon a hard stone. To these devotions, miracles without end may of course be added; such as restoring sight to the blind, and health to the sick, and raising nine dead persons to life. I ask my Roman Catholic hearers if these characteristics of sanctity are apostolic. Did Paul thus? Did he exhort Timothy or Titus to such practices? Are these the methods for obtaining holiness which John prescribed? No! "If we walk in the light, as he also is in the light: we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

From the Golden Legend, and Grey's Lives of the Saints; we have the following instances of the sanctity and power of the saints:—

"St. Clare was in such esteem with God, that without the least difficulty she obtained whatever she asked. From her very infancy there appeared surprising signs of her future sanctity. Even from that early period she prayed, fasted, gave alms, and wore a hair cloth to

mortify the flesh. She was seldom alone in her pious exercises. On one occasion, a very beautiful child, with two radiant wings flew into her lap—at another time she saw the young child Jesus lying in his manger. In her dying moments, Jesus was seen near her accompanied by several virgins crowned with flowers. One of them in particular, who wore a close crown more radiant than the sun, embraced her; the rest spread a carpet of inestimable value over her body.” The nuns of the Convent to which this saint belonged, made a *post mortem* examination of her body, and found engraved upon her heart, as she had often previously affirmed, a figure of Christ upon the cross and all the instruments of his passion. Is there, I ask, anything like this in the Christianity of the New Testament?

St. Theresa had many extraordinary visions; during one of which, it is mentioned that a divine love-wound was made in her heart, by a seraph with a golden arrow, pointed with red-hot steel.

St. Bonaventure not being able to take the Holy Eucharist in the usual way, through violent indisposition in the stomach, had the holy pyx placed upon his breast, and the sacred wafer instantly penetrated that way into his very bowels, in order to become the life of his soul.

St. Francis Xavier, so noted a saint in the Roman Catholic Church, demands some mention. That he was a hero, no one will doubt, who has read his life; that he was diligent in the discharge of his ecclesiastical functions, is no less unquestionable—that he was bent upon

the success of the order to which he belonged and of which he was one of the earliest members, is evidenced by every page of his remarkable history : but, that he was possessed of supernatural sanctity, who will believe, when it is known, that he praised the inquisition after visiting its cruel dungeons ? Yet, there were some noble traits of character in St. Francis. There was e. g. an utter disregard of difficulties in the prosecution of his labours. On one occasion his friends attempted to dissuade him from undertaking a mission on account of its extraordinary dangers. " Ah," said he " who are they that set bounds to the power of God, and have such mean ideas of the grace of our Saviour ? And are there any hearts hard enough to resist the power of the Most High when it pleases Him to soften and to change them ? Can they resist this power, at the same time so gentle and so strong, that makes the dry branch flourish, and raises up children unto Abraham from the stones ? What ! cannot he that subdued the whole world to the empire of the Cross by the ministry of the Apostles bring into subjection that little corner of the earth ? Are the islands of the Moor, alone, to be excluded from the benefits of redemption ? And when Jesus offered all the nations to His Eternal Father as a heritage, were those people to be excepted ? They are very barbarous and very brutal, I know ; but they were once more so ; neither can I do anything of myself, and therefore I have the more hope of them. I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me, and from Him alone Gospel-workmen gather all their power." The miracles which Xavier is said to have wrought might

fill a volume. Here is one: "When sailing, one day, among some islands, a tempest arose, and, in order to quell it, as they say, he touched the waves with his crucifix. The virtue of his crucifix stilled the raging of the wind and sea; but, to his great grief, he let the image fall into the water. Some time afterwards, walking with a Portuguese on the beach, he saw the sacred object appear above the crest of a wave. The wave broke on the sand, and threw up a crab holding the crucifix in one of its claws. Xavier stood still. The crab crawled towards him, carrying the cross erect, laid it at his feet, and returned to its native element." At his death his body saw no corruption; by touching it a sick man was instantly healed, and from it the richest odours were exhaled.

But why should I occupy your time with such strange and wonderful details? If these are qualifications for saintship, then have I read my Bible to no purpose. No such prescriptions for securing holiness do I discover here—no such evidences of sanctity are demanded here. What are gifts to Christian love? Hear the apostle: "If I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." This is the true principle of spiritual Christianity, as Paul understood it, and enforced it; and this is the Protestant principle—would God it were more the Protestant practice!

Dr. Milner finds no saintship amongst the most re-

nowned Protestants. They come far short, in his estimation at least, of the holiness of the worthies of his own church. He professes to be conversant with the works of Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley. Had he read his life with candour, shame would have compelled him to expunge from his book, this self-sufficient, this uncharitable, this derogatory sentiment. I wish every intelligent Catholic would read and compare the life of Xavier, by Bonhours, or even by Alban Butler, and that of Fletcher, by Benson; let him then tell me whether Dr. Milner was just when he charged upon Protestantism an incapability to make its followers holy. Were not the life and labours of the Swiss Pastor, Felix Neff, both saintly and apostolic? Who that has been in the habit of witnessing the dying hours of faithful Protestant Christians, has not often discovered a courage and a victory over death scarcely less remarkable than that which distinguished Paul, when he said, "I am now ready to be offered." "Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. I will read to you the closing scene of one of the most celebrated modern saints in the Roman Calendar—distinguished for his devotion to the church, and to piety, I mean Alphonso Liguori; and then I will read an account of the closing hours of a good Protestant, which I this morning, almost at random, took down from my library shelves; The Rev. Peard Dickinson.

S. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI.

"On the 8th of July, 1787, in addition to his old complaints, he was attacked by a sharp fever, together

with a terrible dysentery. These were symptoms so little to be mistaken, that, although he had been absolved three days before by Father Vincenzo Magaldi of the congregation, he confessed again to Father Lorenzo Negri of the congregation also, and after having received absolution, was released from all his usual anxiety, and broke forth into expressions of the liveliest joy and hope, the Lord being doubtless willing to console his servant by a foretaste of Paradise, for all that he had made him suffer during this life, and especially for the grievous temptations against faith, by which he had been assailed some time after his retirement from his diocese. His sufferings lasted for fourteen days, during which he was constantly engaged in acts of piety, keeping his eyes lovingly fixed upon the crucifix and image of the blessed Mother ; confessing frequently, and communicating every day.

“ The news of his mortal illness having been spread abroad, priests, secular as well as regular, and persons of the highest distinction, came from all parts to kiss his hand, bringing kerchiefs, and other things, to sanctify by contact with him, and preserve as relics. At length it became necessary for him to receive the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which he did with the most fervent acts of faith, hope, charity, resignation, and joy. On the 25th of the same month, he received the Blessed Sacrament as a viaticum ; and when the time for communicating approached, every moment appeared intolerably long, and unable to contain himself, he incessantly exclaimed, give me the body of my Jesus—when will Jesus come to me ?—when shall I

possess him? His longings having been at length satisfied, he sunk into a long and deep meditation upon the love of Jesus in the most Holy Sacrament.

“ Four days before his death he was seized with convulsions so violent as to deprive him of the use of speech. On the thirtieth day of the month, Father Villani not thinking it safe to give him the Viaticum, as he was afraid he should not be able to swallow, one of the fathers desired him to make a spiritual communion, which he did, showing by his eyes and various signs, that he joined in the devout sentiments suggested by that father. On the day before his death Monsignor Tafuri came to visit him, and seeing him so near his dissolution, reverently kissed his hand, and placed it on his head. On the day of his death, just before the commencement of his agony, upon hearing the names of Jesus and Mary, he opened his eyes and appeared somewhat to revive. What is even more surprising, on the night before his death the image of the blessed Mother having been brought near his bed, he not only opened his eyes, but fixing them upon it, smiled sweetly, his countenance all radiant with delight. Whence we may all conclude, that the divine Mother blessed her holy client with one of those visits which it was his daily prayer to have at the hour of death, and which he so often held out to all who should be devout to Mary. Alphonsus straining the crucifix and image of most holy Mary to his breast, the brethren in tears and prayer around him, calmly and without struggle or contortion, breathed forth his blessed soul, on Tuesday, the 1st August, 1787.”

REV. PEARL DICKINSON.

“ On Tuesday, May 11th, in the midst of a violent fit, I heard him whisper, ‘ We have erred and strayed from thy ways like lost sheep.’ I said, ‘ But are now returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls;’ he immediately replied, in broken words, with great energy, ‘ It was all of grace, free mercy in Christ Jesus.’ After the fever abated that evening, and he began a little to revive, his soul was abundantly filled with divine consolation ; he seemed at a loss to express the joy he felt, his love to Christ, or his view of God’s boundless mercy and infinite compassion. He said, ‘ I seem all happiness.’

“ During one of the following nights, he cried out, ‘ O happy, happy spirits, I see you, I see you all, and I am coming to you. They are waiting for me, and I must go;’ and clapping his hands, he shouted, ‘ Victory, victory, my Jesus, and my All!’ To one of his nurses he said, ‘ For Christ’s sake, make sure of an interest in him ; it is neither Paul, nor Apollos, nor Cephas, nor any other creature, but Jesus Christ the corner-stone : build upon him, as the sure foundation.’ While taking a little refreshment, I perceived him deeply engaged in prayer, and distinctly heard the following words : ‘ That an abundant entrance may be administered unto us into the eternal kingdom.’ Soon after he said to me, ‘ The Lord give you the bread of life.’ I answered, ‘ I am sure he will give it you, and I trust I shall partake of it:’ he replied, ‘ I doubt not but you will,’ and spoke with sweet confidence of our being mutual partakers of the blessings of the kingdom.

“To one of the nurses that attended him he said, ‘I have not a shadow of doubt; my evidence is as clear as the noon-day sun!’ At another time, ‘I have nothing but glory and heaven in my view; my heart is full of God, my cup runneth over!’ He told her he should ‘be glad to leave some further dying testimony, that his friends might be satisfied, but that he was so low he could not converse with them.’ She replied, ‘You have given us proof enough.’ ‘Then,’ said he, ‘tell them God is love; I know and feel him so!’ Having had a very severe fit, and being extremely weak after it, he said, ‘What a mercy it is that the Lord careth for the righteous!’ A person present replied, ‘He does, and it shall be well with them.’ ‘Yes,’ said he, ‘well for ever and ever, glory be to God!’ The nurse giving him a little drink, with his hands clasped, and his eyes lifted up to heaven, he entreated her to love the Lord Jesus with her whole heart: ‘O,’ said he, ‘the sinner’s friend! Never forget the sinner’s friend!’

“May 14th, in the evening, he appeared very earnestly engaged in prayer; but I could only hear these words, ‘Lord, make us wise unto salvation!’ On my going to him, he said, (with peculiar tenderness, taking my hand,) ‘My dear love, sweet is thy voice to me: God bless you.’ These are the last words he spoke to me; for a fit presently came on, which was followed by a very painful and restless night. On May 15th, after being in extreme pain, when we thought him past speaking, about two o’clock in the afternoon, he opened his eyes, and, as the nurse was giving him a

little wine with a teaspoon, he suddenly stopped her and pointing with his finger upward, he said, 'Hark! do you not hear? they are come for me. I am ready, quite ready.' A few minutes after, she spoke to him again, he said, 'Stop, say nothing but—Glory, glory!' These were the last words he ever spoke. After a very painful struggle, which lasted more than four hours, his happy spirit took its flight, about twenty-five minutes past seven o'clock in the evening."

Is there then no power in Protestant Christianity, to make men holy, and to sustain the mind in death?

We lay no claim on behalf of Protestant Christians, to self-flagellations, to self-inflicted stripes and bruises and wounds, to daily Aves and Pater Nosters which may be reckoned by the hundred, to midnight vigils on cold altar steps; no claim do we lay to miraculous gifts, to the gift of tongues, of healing, of raising the dead, of quelling the fury of the elements; no claim lay we on behalf of the dead bodies of Protestants to sweet instead of corruptible odours, to incorruption, to the impartation, by mere contact, of health to the dying, and of life to the dead. No! the bodies of the holiest Protestants see corruption. This we are obliged to confess. They crumble into dust. Like most other mortals, Protestants "come forth like a flower and are cut down, they flee also as a shadow and continue not." Protestant dust returns to the earth as it was:—but we do claim for Protestant Christians, not for all, alas! who bear the Protestant name, but for all who worthily bear it, we do claim, I say, deep sorrow and contrition of heart on account of sin, severe con-

flicts with their wicked hearts, the mortification of unholy desires, crucifixion to the world, self-denial, love to the Redeemer, zeal for his cause, devotion to his glory : We claim for them hours spent in communion with the ever blessed Trinity, a knowledge of God's Word, a love to their fellow men, liberality to the poor, integrity of purpose, honesty of life, benevolence and beneficence to their enemies :—We claim this for them, not for their own honor, God forbid ! but for Christ's glory, for it is HE, and not themselves, who hath wrought in them this grace, who hath wrought in them to will and to do of God's good pleasure. They came to Him as guilty sinners, they mourned at his cross, they cried to him for mercy, they pleaded and believed his merits, they waited for the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the answer came : to use the words of Paul, as they are written in the Douay Bible, God sent forth the spirit of his Son into their hearts, crying : Abba, Father, and then they were strengthened with might in the inner man, then they were empowered to walk not after the flesh but after the spirit, then they brought forth those fruits of regeneration which are to the praise and glory of God. Glory be to God alone for all that has been experienced, and all that has been achieved by true Protestant Christians. We pray that such may abound yet more and more in all our communities. We acknowledge the existence of much inconsistency, vices alas prevail, and sin abounds, but our confidence and our hope are this, that Protestant Christianity which has done by the grace of God so much for the world, especially within the last century, will accom-

plish the spiritual regeneration of entire nominal Christendom.

There is, however, this difference between the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches : The Protestant Church lays no claim to infallibility, but acknowledges herself to be erring, and to be afflicted with grievous inconsistencies over which her more spiritual and devoted members mourn and weep. We thank God that there is amongst us a little religion, but we acknowledge with shame that it is very little, and with unaffected sincerity that we lack more, much more. But the Roman Catholic Church lays claim to infallibility, to unity, to sanctity. She once had the true gospel, and because she is infallible she must have it now. This is the style of argument which is employed, and this the opinion that is entertained by many Catholics ; but are they fully acquainted with the history of their Church ? We Protestants say, and we do it with all kindness, that a Church assuming such attributes and powers as the Church of Rome assumes, ought to be a holy and regenerate Church ; but has she been, and is she now thus holy and regenerate ? Let our friends only read their own historians, and they, with us, will answer, "No." And why ? because she has overlooked and thrown aside the doctrine of spiritual regeneration by the Holy Ghost as the one foundation of all holiness. If you would but read the history of your Church from the eighth to the sixteenth centuries, you would soon agree with us that whatever other attributes she possessed, she could lay no claim to those of sanctity and infallibility.

I read to you in the course of the last lecture that

graphic description of the state of the Roman Church which was given to the Council of Trent by one of its Fathers, Antonius.

Let us examine other Roman Catholic authors : Cardinal Baronius describes the Popes of these ages to have been "monstrous and infamous in their lives, dissolute in their manners, and wicked and villainous in all things." Platina, the Roman historian, declares that Pope Boniface VII. obtained the popedom by wicked arts (*malis artibus*) and lost it in a similar manner. The citizens conspired against him on account of his iniquities, so that he was glad to fly the city ; during his absence John XV. was elected in his room, but Boniface returned and avenged himself upon his substitute by starving him to death. He lived but a short time, and after his death the citizens dragged his body tied by the feet through the streets, and left it a prey to dogs. And what shall we say of the boy Pope Benedict the Ninth ? of whom one of his successors says "So base, so foul, so execrable was his life that I shudder to relate it."

Statements equally fearful respecting the clergy and Church generally might be readily produced, but I have only time to ask, are such things consistent with the infallibility and sanctity of the Church ?

Regeneration is the want of the professing Church. I now address myself more especially to Protestants, and I feel sure that there is not in the congregation a spiritually minded Protestant who will not agree with me that we all need more of the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit. Our *principles* are holy and glorious ;

but what are our practices? Our *Gospel* is pure and unadulterated; but what are our lives? Our knowledge of the Bible is extensive; but are we following its precepts? Our *professions* are great; but are our principles of action evangelical? Our *privileges* are abundant; but is there a corresponding progress in Christian knowledge and love? Why, I ask, is it, that the high and holy principles of Protestantism have not made more sure and rapid advancement? Why, but because we ourselves have been unfaithful to those principles? Why is it that Protestantism has, in many instances, been a by-word and a reproach amongst our Roman Catholic brethren? Why? Partly because Protestants have dishonoured that name for which our ancestors shed their blood. Our charity has failed us; our meekness has failed us; our devotion to the ordinances of religion has failed us; our benevolence has failed us; our self-denial has failed us; our integrity has failed us; the fruits of Regeneration have failed in too many a Protestant vineyard. I am addressing Protestants of almost every name; and I would say to myself and to you, let us but be faithful to our privileges, let us but live in purity, in benevolence, in charity, in peace, in devotion to Christ's cause, in zeal for his glory; let us but live and labour for the instruction and salvation of those around us, both Protestant and Catholic, who are in spiritual darkness, and no weapon that is formed against us shall prosper; opposition may come, but, come whence it will, it shall not hinder the word of the Lord from having free course and being glorified. Let us, then, go this evening to the fountain of grace, let us call upon the

Divine Spirit, let us seek his regenerating, transforming, sanctifying power, and may a merciful God vouchsafe to answer !

—Shall we then for ever live  
At this poor dying rate ?  
Our love so faint, so cold to Thee,  
And Thine to us so great !  
Come, Holy Spirit, heavenly Dove,  
With all thy quick'ning powers ;  
Come, shed abroad the Saviour's love,  
And that shall kindle ours."

I believe I am addressing many hundreds, some of you Catholics, but most of you Protestants, who feel that you need that change of heart of which the blessed Saviour spoke to Nicodemus, and without which no man shall see the Lord. Oh, suffer me to plead with you this evening in my Master's stead, and to say in his own language. "Ye must be born again." I ask you not your Church, your age, your rank in society ; I ask you not whether you are educated or illiterate, I ask you not whether you are baptized or unbaptized, but I ask you : "Have you a sinful heart ? Are you living in rebellion against your God ? Are you breaking the Divine Laws ?" Is it so ? Then, on the authority of Christ I say, unless you be born from above you cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Would you be born again ? Repent ye and believe the Gospel, for to as many as receive Him, to them giveth He power to become the sons of God. Would you have your hearts cleansed, would you be justified and sanctified ? Come to that precious blood of your Redeemer which cleanseth from all sin,

for ye are washed, and sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God. "Ye *must* be born again." O ye spiritual prodigals! Your offended Father is waiting to receive you; long have you wandered away from his home; long have you disregarded his government; but lo! he appears, and from the distance where he now stands he cries, "Come now and let us reason together though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow." "Stands," did I say? No! he moves, he walks toward you; walk you towards him, and he will accept you and be a Father unto you, and ye shall be his sons and daughters; and then, with wonder and with joy, you shall exclaim together, "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God."

## LECTURE VIII.

### THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS.

If you survey the two great religious systems which the Divine Being has established amongst men, you will find between them some points of correspondence and many points of contrast. Judaism and Christianity have each their attesting miracles; each has its law, its priesthood, its offering of sacrifice, its way of access to the Divine Presence, its method of pardon, its sacraments and ritual of worship; and not only is there a general correspondence between these several parts of the two systems, but an intimate relation also—that which exists between a type and its anti-type.

Very striking are the points of contrast between these two systems. Whether you contemplate its establishment or its operation, you see that each stands out in bold distinctness from the other. How different the first appearance of Jehovah to Moses, and the appearance of the same glorious Being in the stable of Bethlehem; how different the giving of the law in the midst of the clouds and darkness, the lightnings and thunderings, the earthquake and trumpets and voices of Sinai, to the publication of the Christian law and doctrine in the sermon on the Mount; how different the imposing ritual of the temple worship, with its altars and sacrifices, with its mitred pontiff, and sacrificing

priests, and attendant Levites, with its clouds of incense, and its ceremonial ablutions and sprinklings of water and of blood,—to the simple forms of worship which the apostles and early Christians practised in the upper rooms of Jerusalem, and in the private dwellings of Judean villages, and in the highways and groves of the Holy Land; with no other dome but that of Heaven's canopy, and no other priest but an unseen though spiritually present Jesus, and no other sacrifices but those of a broken and contrite spirit, and no other incense but that of ardent prayer to God. I am sure you have been often struck with the rigid simplicity of the apostolic ritual, as compared with the gorgeousness of the Levitical, which, glorious as it was, may be said to have had no glory by reason of the excelling glory of Christianity. The glory of the Christian system is not derived from its dazzling paraphernalia of gold and gems, or from its imposing ceremonial, but from its essential spirituality and its chaste simplicity. There is less of art in Christianity, and more of nature, less of matter and more of life. Between the Jewish and Christian dispensations there is just the difference which exists between a gorgeous temple with its fluted columns, its rich capitals, its jutting architraves, its elaborated entablature, its bold cornices, its noble portico, its magnificent vestibule, its outer court, its inner sanctuary, its robed priests, its bedecked altars, its imposing ritual, its awe-struck worshippers—and a simple grove, nature's unartificial temple, with its mossy pavement, and its trees rising like columns, their overhanging foliage forming a canopy that admits while it

subdues the light of heaven, and its simple minded worshippers, sometimes prostrate, at other times daring to lift their eyes toward heaven, sometimes offering a prayer for mercy, at others sending up a note of praise, and at others again bending, like the cherubim, over the divine law; exclaiming, "the Lord is in this place and we knew it not. How dreadful is this place, this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of Heaven."

Who that has studied the history of the Christian Church does not know, that from a very early period in her history, there was manifested a proneness to wander away from the simplicity of the apostolic age? As the church became numerous, wealthy, and influential, the upper room, the highway, the grove were abandoned; the rigid plainness of the first Christians was thought unsuitable to this altered position of the circumstances of the church. Large and expensive structures were erected, robes of office introduced, mitres were employed to adorn the heads of the successors of plain fishermen, and sceptres of authority were put into their hands; rivers and brooks were no longer the scenes of Christian baptism, these were replaced by fountains of sculptured marble; the breaking of bread and drinking of wine in commemoration of the blessed Saviour's death and passion, gradually assumed the distinction of a sacrifice, which was offered by bedizened priests in more than the pomp and splendours of the Jewish day of atonement; the ministers of the church no longer content with the designation elder and bishop, became priests and archbishops and pon-

tiffs; no longer were they *servants* but VICARS of Christ; and then political authority was usurped, kings were dethroned, persecution was fostered, and cruelties were practised, which have given to the church, aye the *Christian Church*, the unenviable distinction of creating the gloom of the world's dark ages.

These facts have forced themselves on my attention during this whole investigation, especially in examining the subject which I am to bring before you this evening: "The Christian Sacraments." The words which I have selected for a text you may find in the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, the fifteenth chapter at the ninth verse. It is thus rendered in the Douay Bible:—

"AND IN VAIN DO THEY WORSHIP ME TEACHING DOCTRINES AND COMMANDMENTS OF MEN."

This is the tendency of human nature, to depart from the written law of God by superadding to it. The Scribes and the Pharisees did so; and the Great Teacher reproves them in this chapter. The teachers of the Christian Church have followed in their wake, adding, as we shall now prove, traditional prescriptions to the written Christian law.

I. The first thing which we have this evening to determine is, "WHAT IS A SACRAMENT?"

There is no word in the Greek New Testament which could be rendered *sacrament* in the sense in which it is now almost universally understood in the Christian Church. The Greek word which the Vulgate sometimes renders *sacramentum* is *μυστήριον* which is the same word as the Latin *mysterium*, and the English mystery, and means something secret, covered, hidden,

concealed. This word *μυστήριον* occurs twenty-seven times in the New Testament, and it is worthy of remark that the Vulgate, while in nineteen instances it translates it by *mysterium*, only renders it by *sacramentum* eight times; in the following passages, among others: 1. Timothy iii. 16, "Great is the mystery (*sacramentum*) of godliness." Col. i. 27. "To whom God would make known the riches of the glory of this mystery (*sacramentum*) which is Christ in you the hope of glory." Apoc. xvii. 7. "I will tell thee the mystery (*sacramentum*) of the woman and of the beast which carrieth her which had the seven heads and ten horns." It is still more worthy of remark that the Rhemish Translators in what is usually called the Douay Testament, and which is a translation from the Vulgate, out of the eight instances in which the word *sacramentum* occurs in the Vulgate, render it only once by *sacrament*, preferring in the other seven to retain the Greek word MYSTERY. It is clear, therefore, that the translators of both the Vulgate and Douay versions understood the Latin *sacramentum* to be very generally used in the sense of mystery. Literally the Latin word means that particular form by which a person binds himself to discharge a duty or to fulfil a promise. It thus signifies in classical authors, a bond or oath; and it is employed to signify especially a *military* oath.

The Fathers frequently used the word in the sense of mystery, and also with great latitude. They sometimes called the Christian religion a sacrament; the Trinity was a sacrament; and it is perhaps to be regretted that a word which neither occurs in Scripture in the sense in

which it is now understood, nor has any representative there, should have been adopted by the Christian Church with so restricted a meaning. But, since it has been adopted and defined by the Church generally, we must deal with it accordingly. Let us then examine the Protestant and Roman Catholic definitions of a Sacrament.

In the xxvth Article of the Church of England it is said, " Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him." In the Catechism of the same Church, I read : "*Ques.* What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament*? *Ans.* I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof. *Ques.* How many parts are there in a Sacrament? *Ans.* Two : the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace." In the Westminster Confession of Faith, chapter xxvi., a Sacrament is thus defined : " I. Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits, and to confirm our interest in him ; as also to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the church and the rest of the world ; and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ, according to his word. II. There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation, or

sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified ; whence it comes to pass, that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other. III. The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them ; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution ; which contains, together with a precept authorising the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers." And in the larger Catechism I find the following :—" *Ques.* What is a sacrament ? *Ans.* A sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ in his church, to signify, seal, and exhibit unto those that are within the covenant of grace, the benefits of his mediation ; to strengthen and increase their faith, and all other graces ; to oblige them to obedience ; to testify and cherish their love and communion one with another ; and to distinguish them from those that are without." In the larger Catechism of the Wesleyan Methodist Church I find the following, which as you perceive is extracted from the Catechism of the Church of England :—" *Ques.* What mean you by the word sacrament ? *Ans.* I mean by the word sacrament an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." But, perhaps, the most comprehensive Protestant definition of sacrament is that which we find in the Heidleburg Catechism : " Sacraments are holy visible signs and seals ordained by God for this end, that he may more fully declare and seal

by them the promise of his Gospel unto us ; to wit, that not only unto all believers in general, but unto each of them in particular, he freely giveth remission of sins and life eternal, upon the account of that only sacrifice of Christ which he accomplished upon the cross."

Turn we now to the Roman Catholic definition of a Sacrament. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, part ii., section 10, declares that " a sacrament is a thing subject to the senses, and possessing by the institution of God, at once the power of signifying holiness and righteousness, and of imparting them to him who receives it." In Bishop Butler's Catechism, page 45, we have the following definition :—" Q. What is a sacrament ? A. A visible, that is, an outward sign or action, instituted by Christ, to give grace. Q. Whence have the Sacraments the power of giving grace ? A. From the merits of Christ, which they apply to our souls. *Rom.* vi. 14." The fourth and following Canons of the seventh Session of the Council of Trent give further light on the doctrines of the Church respecting the sacraments :—" Whoever shall affirm, that the sacraments of the new law are not necessary to salvation, but superfluous ; or that men may obtain the grace of justification by faith only, without these sacraments, (although it is granted that they are not all necessary to every individual :) let him be accurséd. Whoever shall affirm, that the sacraments were instituted solely for the purpose of strengthening our faith : let him be accurséd. Whoever shall affirm, that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify ; or that they do

not confer that grace on those who place no obstacle in its way ; as if they were only the external signs of grace or righteousness received by faith, and marks of Christian profession, whereby the faithful are distinguished from unbelievers : let him be accursed. Whoever shall affirm, that grace is not always conferred by these sacraments, and upon all persons, as far as God is concerned, if they be rightly received ; but that it is only bestowed sometimes, and on some persons : let him be accursed. Whoever shall affirm, that grace is not conferred by these sacraments of the new law, by their own power, [*ex opere operato* ;] but that faith in the divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace : let him be accursed."

There are some things, therefore, in which Protestants and Catholics agree,—*Firstly*. They agree as to the institution of the sacraments. It is of God. The Catechism of the Council of Trent says *ex Dei institutione*—by the institution of God. *Secondly*. They acknowledge that the sacraments are outward signs of spiritual graces. *Thirdly*. They concur in this also, that there ought to be an agreement or fitness between the sign and the thing signified.

But there are two particulars chiefly involved in the general doctrines of the Church of Rome respecting the sacraments, against which the Reformed Churches protest. The first relates to the inherent grace and power which are said to reside in the sacraments.

The eighth Canon which we just now read, declares that grace is conferred by the sacraments, of or by their own power. The Catechism of the Council of Trent

affirms that "in the sacraments the power of the Omnipotent exists, effectuating that which the natural elements cannot of themselves accomplish." It is difficult to determine what the Trentine Fathers meant by these expressions, for the seventh Canon declares that "grace is *always* conferred by these sacraments as far as God is concerned, *if they be rightly received,*" which seems to contradict the opinion that sacraments confer grace by their own power. Roman Catholic divines are not themselves agreed as to the meaning of these conflicting Canons. Numerous opinions have been maintained, which have given rise to fierce contentions; indeed such is the obscurity of the phraseology which the infallible council employed, that the wisest sons of the church have failed to make it clear, at least to each other, if not even to themselves. On one question, viz: "*Whether the sacraments confer grace morally or physically,*" the Roman Catholic Church is divided into two great sects, the *Thomists* and the *Scotists*. The Thomists, who derive their designation from Thomas Aquinas, maintain, with their leader, that the sacraments confer grace physically. Peter Dens, and many other names of eminence, are found in this school. The Scotists, so called from Duns, a celebrated Scotch divine, and therefore known as *Duns Scotus*, maintain the doctrine, that the sacraments confer grace morally. Amongst the adherents to this opinion are Vasquez, Bonaventure, Richardus, and others.

The Thomists maintain, that "the sacraments possess a physical causality, as the instruments of the Divine

Omnipotence ; and truly and properly concur toward the production of their effects in the mind, by a supernatural virtue from the principal agent, communicated to, and united with it in the manner of a transient action." The Scotists, on the other hand, teach that "the sacraments do not confer grace physically, but morally ; that is, they do not produce grace as physical causes do, but as moral causes, inasmuch as they efficaciously move God to produce the grace which they signify, and which God Himself promises infallibly to give, as often as they are rightly administered, and worthily received. The Sacraments, as Sacraments, are something moral, depending solely on the institution of Christ, from which, and from the merits of Christ, they possess their entire force and efficacy of consolation, so that their manner of operation is not physical, but moral."—*Ferraris Bib.*

Such are the conflicting views which exist in the Church of Rome herself, respecting sacramental efficacy. Here is a substantial difference on an important doctrine. Can our Roman Catholic friends therefore, be surprised if Protestants ask them where, in this case, is their boasted unity ? If, concerning a doctrine of so much moment, there is serious disagreement between Roman Catholic Cardinals and Doctors, why is not the infallibility of the Church brought into requisition to settle this important difference, and to allay the minds of her obedient children ? We hear that the Church is the great exponent of Christian doctrine ; it is often urged against Protestants that they have no authority to settle points of doctrinal

dispute, because they are destitute of that main attribute of the Church—infallibility! Now, I think, we have good ground for asking, why one of these adverse sects has not been set right? and why the unity of the Roman Catholic Church has not been restored?

But where, *in the Word of God*, is the authority for this doctrine of salvation by the Sacraments? I read that “he who *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved.” I read, “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.” I read “Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.” I find then that FAITH is necessary to salvation, but I do not find that the SACRAMENTS are necessary to salvation. The damning sin of the soul is unbelief; for, said Christ, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT SHALL BE DAMNED.” He does not say he that is not baptized shall be damned. And yet the Council of Trent anathematizes all those who declare that a man may obtain the grace of justification without these sacraments. Then Saints Ambrose, Cyril, and Augustine are anathematized, at least as to their memories and doctrines. We have only time to quote from Cyril, who, so far from believing in the *opus operatum* of the sacraments, expressly declares in his first Catechism, that “REGENERATION IS AN EFFECT OF THE FAITH OF HIM THAT IS BAPTIZED.”

The SECOND branch or section of Roman Catholic sacramental doctrines, against which the Reformed Churches protest, is the doctrine of ministerial intention as necessary to the efficacy of the sacraments.

I might occupy the whole evening in exhibiting to

you the various phases of this doctrine which are presented to the mind of an inquirer in authorized Roman Catholic writers.

The Council of Trent, in the eleventh Canon, Session vii., makes the following declaration:—"Whoever shall affirm, that when ministers perform and confer a sacrament, it is not necessary that they should at least have the intention to do what the church does: let him be accursed."

"Representing, as he does, in the discharge of his sacred functions, not his own, but the person of Christ, the minister of the sacraments, be he good or bad, validly consecrates and confers the sacraments, provided he make use of the matter and form instituted by Christ, and always observed in the Catholic church, and intends to do what the church does in their administration."—Catechism, p. 150.

There was offered in the Council great opposition to the introduction of this canon, especially by Catharinus, Bishop of Minori. This we have on the authority of Father Paul Sarpi, in his history of the Council, who, in his second book, furnishes a minute account of the arguments used by Catharin against the doctrine:—

"Here, *Catharin*, Bishop of *Minori*, proposed a memorable thing, and which was judged by all, worthy of due consideration, and very weighty, viz: he said, that as to the Lutherans, who attribute no other virtue to the sacraments, but that of exciting faith, which may be awakened by other means, the receiving of the true sacrament is of small importance; wherefore, also they say, that it is not necessary, and yet they hold it to be

an absurd thing, that the malice of a wicked Minister, who hath no intention to confer the true sacrament, can be any prejudice, because we are to regard what the believer receives, and not what the Minister gives him. But as for the Catholics who attribute to the sacrament, the virtue of conferring grace, it is of very great moment, that they be assured of their receiving the true and efficacious sacrament, for as much as it very rarely happens that grace is obtained by any other means. And certainly, little children and distracted persons do not receive grace by any other means. And certainly, the common people have ordinarily so small and weak a disposition, that without the sacraments it would never be sufficient for the receiving of grace. Moreover, those few persons that are as rare as Phoenix's, which have a perfect disposition, do, notwithstanding, receive a greater degree of grace by the sacrament. If it should happen, that a Priest that hath the charge of four or five thousand souls, should be an unbeliever, but withal a great hypocrite, and that in the absolution of penitents, at the baptism of little children, and consecration of the Eucharist, he should have a secret intention not to do what the Church doth, we must conclude the little children damned, the penitents unabsolved, and all deprived of the fruits of the holy communion! And, it avails nothing to say here, that faith supplies that defect, because that cannot be true in infants, and in others it cannot, according to the Catholic doctrine, do the effect of the sacrament; and if it can, in case of the Minister's wickedness, forasmuch as the same may be constant and perpetual, why might it not do the same

always. Besides, that the assigning so great a virtue to faith, is to take away that of the sacraments, and to fall into the opinions of the Lutherans.

“ He offered it also to their consideration how great would be the affliction and anguish of a tender father for his child at the point of death, if he should have any doubt concerning the intention of the Priest that baptizeth it ; likewise, in what anxiety would a Catechumen be, who finding in himself only a small and very imperfect disposition, and, notwithstanding presenting himself to receive baptism, should he come to doubt whether the Priest might not be a false Christian, and have no intention at all of baptizing him, but only to dip or wash him in jest or sport ? That the same thing might be considered in confession and receiving the communion. And if it be said, proceeded Catharin, that these cases are very rare ; would to God it were so indeed, and that in this corrupt age there were not reason to suspect them but too frequent : But suppose they be very rare, and that there were but one only, might it not so happen that this wicked Priest might administer the true baptism without intention to an infant, who, when grown to a man, might be made a Bishop over a great City, and live many years in that charge, so that he hath ordained a great part of the Priests ; it must be said, that he, being not baptized, is not ordained, nor they ordained, who are promoted by him. So, that by this means there would be in this great city, neither the sacrament of the Eucharist nor of Confession, which cannot be without the true sacrament of Holy Orders, nor that, without a true Bishop, nor a

Bishop duly ordained without baptism. Behold here, how by the wickedness of a Minister we find in one sole act a million of nullities of sacraments; and who would say, that in so great a number of nullities God supplies all by his Almightyness, and that by extraordinary remedies he provides for things of constant and daily use? We should much rather be persuaded he hath already by his providence provided, that such like accidents cannot happen. And yet, said the Bishop, God hath provided against all inconveniences, having ordained that that should be a true sacrament, which is administered with the ceremonies ordained by him, though it may happen that the Minister may have another intention. He added, moreover, that this was not repugnant to the common doctrine of divines, nor to the determination of the Council of *Florence*, which imports, that the intention of the Minister is required to the sacrament; because that is to be understood not of the internal intention, but of that which manifests itself in the outward work, though inwardly he might have a contrary intention. And that thus all those inconveniences are avoided, which would otherwise be innumerable."

"Intention," says Dens, "is the act of the will referring to an end: whence the necessary intention in the minister, consists in the act of his will, whereby he wills the external act of the sacrament, under the profession of doing what the church does." He then distinguishes intention into *actual*, *virtual*, *habitual*, and *interpretative*; and tells us that an habitual intention is not sufficient to the perfecting of a sacrament, nor an inter-

pretative intention; that an actual intention suffices because it is the best, but that a virtual intention may and does suffice.

Dens gives also the following cases, amongst others, in explanation: "A general implied and confused intention is enough, when it sufficiently determines to do those things externally which belong to the sacramental action. Hence, St. Thomas says, "Although he who does not believe baptism to be a sacrament, or to have any spiritual virtue, does not intend, while he baptizes to confer a sacrament, nevertheless, intending at the same time to do what the church does, though he may consider that to be nothing; and because the church does something so of consequence, he intends to do the same obscurely but not explicitly. In like manner, it is not required that the minister should explicitly do what the Church of Rome does." Again, quoting from St. Thomas, he says: "If a priest intend to baptize a certain female to abuse her, or, if he intend to make the body of Christ that he may use it in order to poison . . . the perversity of such an intention does not destroy the verity of the institution, but the minister sins grievously by such an intention."

The Roman missal has the following deliverance respecting the doctrine of intention: "1. If any priest does not intend or design to complete the sacrament, or to transubstantiate, 2. In like manner, if any hosts from forgetfulness remain upon the altar, 3. If any part of the wine or any hosts lie concealed, where he only intends to consecrate those he sees, 4. Likewise, if the priest has before him eleven hosts, and intends to

consecrate only ten, not determining which ten, in these cases he does not consecrate, that is, no transubstantiation takes place, because his intention is wanting."

It is time to ask our Roman Catholic friends whether they have sufficiently weighed the force, and the possible consequences to themselves, of this marvellous doctrine. Whatever you make of the doctrine of priestly intention, you must suppose it possible that, under certain circumstances the necessary intention may be wanting; and further, that these circumstances may have existed in your own case. How do you know that the last absolution which you received was not without intention? Are you certain that the last time you adored the host it was not a host at all, but a mere wafer, because of defect of intention on the part of the consecrating priest? How know you that the priest who baptized you, intended to do what the church intends? How do you know that the Bishop who confirmed you, had the intention to do so; or if he had, are you sure that he was truly baptized, or ordained, or consecrated? Is it not possible that some flaw of intention might have nullified one of the sacraments which he received, so as that he is no Bishop at all? Is it not possible that some centuries ago, in the line from which the priest who last absolved you has apostolically descended, there may have been some flaw through want of intention? Where is the certainty of your salvation? You are removed from the rock Christ, who always intends to save, and the church places you on the insecure and dangerous quicksands of priestly intention. No one who is not rightly baptized can,

according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome be saved ; and yet you have no certainty of true baptism. He who adores an unconsecrated wafer is guilty of idolatry, (according to the doctrine of the church,) and yet you are not sure but that many of the hosts before which you have prostrated yourselves were unduly consecrated. On your own principles you ought not to bow down before the sacred wafer without being sure of its transubstantiation, and yet you never have, and never can have this assurance ! As it respects also your dying and departed friends, what certainty have you that the sacrament of extreme unction was duly administered, or that the masses which are now said for the removal of their souls from purgatory, supposing true masses to be prevalent, are said with an intention to do what the Church does ? How different this from the simplicity of the Gospel, which suspends not the salvation of a sinner upon the will or intention of a priest, or any other mortal, but which says, " Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." How far St. Chrysostom was from entertaining this notion of priestly intention may be learned from his eighty-fifth Homily upon John, in which he says, " I do not only assert that the priests, but that an angel of God can do nothing in things that are given by God. It is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit that order all things ; for the Priest, he only lends his tongue and hand." Listen also to St. Augustine in his eightieth Homily on St. John's Gospel, (vol. ii, p. 827) : "*Now ye are clean because of the Word which I have spoken unto you. Why saith he not, Are clean because of the baptism*

wherewith ye are washed—but because in the water also it is the word that cleanseth. Whence hath water this so great virtue to touch the body, and wash the heart, but by the Word doing it, not because it is spoken, but BECAUSE IT IS BELIEVED.” This does not say much for the doctrine of priestly intention. What can Roman Catholics say of the antiquity and apostolicity of their doctrines in face of the fact that the doctrine against which we now protest, was first broached before a Council in 1414,—the Council of Constance? It accords not with the genius of Christianity, nor with the universal benevolence of the Gospel, nor with the freedom of individual man, nor with either God’s justice or God’s love to make the salvation of hundreds and of thousands dependent on the intention of a single man.

II. We have now to determine THE NUMBER OF THOSE RITES OF CHRISTIANITY WHICH, IN THE SENSE BEFORE STATED, MAY BE DENOMINATED SACRAMENTS.

The Reformed Churches acknowledge two, and but two: BAPTISM AND THE LORD’S SUPPER.

The Roman Catholic Church also acknowledges these to be Sacraments, but adds FIVE others to them, viz:—CONFIRMATION, PENANCE, EXTREME UNCTION, ORDERS, and MATRIMONY.

1. We have not then to discuss the question, whether Baptism and the Holy Eucharist are Sacraments. To this, both Protestants and Catholics assent. It may be well, however, to give, in brief, the leading views respecting these Sacraments of each community, and then to state the grounds of protest, if any, which exist

in the standards of the Roman Catholic Church, concerning the doctrines involved in them, or the ceremonies practised in their administration.

*First*, then, as to BAPTISM. I know not that I can more fully present the Protestant view of this sacramental rite than by reading the twenty-eighth Chapter of the Westminster Confession :—"Baptism is a sacrament of the new Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life : which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in his church until the end of the world. The outward element to be used in this sacrament is water, wherewith the party is to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a minister of the gospel, lawfully called thereunto. Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person. Not only those who do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized. Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated."

The Roman Catholic view is thus defined and explain-

ed by the Council of Florence :—“Holy baptism possesses the first place among the sacraments, because it is the door of spiritual life: for by it we become members of Christ, and of the body of the Church. And since by the first man death hath entered into the world, we cannot (as saith the truth) enter into the kingdom of heaven, unless we are born again of water and the Holy Spirit. The matter of this sacrament is true natural water; nor is it any difference whether cold or hot. But the form is: ‘I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ Nor do we deny but that also by these words, ‘Let this servant of Christ be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,’ or ‘This person is baptized by my hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,’ true baptism is effected; the principal cause from which baptism hath its virtue being the holy Trinity; and the officiating Minister, if the act is expressed, and exercised by him with the invocation of the holy Trinity, perfects the sacrament. The Minister of this sacrament is a Priest, to whose office it belongs to baptize. But in case of necessity, not only a Priest or Deacon, but also a layman or woman, nay, even a Pagan or heretic, can baptize, while he observes the form of the Church, and intends to do what the Church doeth. The effect of this sacrament is the remission of all original and actual guilt; also of all punishment which is due for any guilt. Besides, to the baptized there is no satisfaction enjoined for past sins; but those who die before they commit any sin arrive immediately in the kingdom of heaven and to the vision of God.”

You observe from these extracts that there are several points of agreement between the two communities. The matter of baptism is the same, the form is the same, "I baptize thee, &c.," there is also an agreement as to the sign, and as to the thing signified. More than this, the Church of Rome acknowledges that Protestants have this sacrament in its integrity: "Whoever shall affirm that baptism when administered by heretics (i. e. by Protestants) in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention to do what the Church does, is not true baptism, let him be accursed."

The chief point of disagreement is that which relates to the effect of Baptism in the justification and regeneration of the recipient. This question has been discussed at so great length already, not only this evening in our remarks on sacramental efficacy generally, but also and chiefly in the lectures on justification and regeneration, that I need not repeat the discussion here. I must, notwithstanding, mention two particulars before I go on to the consideration of the Eucharist:—

*One* relates to the case of unbaptized infants. The Church of Rome, in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, teaches that without baptism children are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction; that baptism alone can impart that righteousness and those graces which will give them a title to reign in eternal life; that infants, unless baptized, can not enter heaven. How opposed this to the principles of that divine government which is carried on through our mediator, Christ Jesus! From this doctrine of the Church of

Rome, it follows, that thousands and millions of infants die eternally, not from their own, but from others' neglect. How opposed to the express declaration of Scripture! for I read in the Douay Bible, Mat. xviii. 3 : "Amen, I say unto you, unless you be converted and become as little children you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." I read again in Mark x. 14, that Jesus said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God."

*The other* particular relates to the ceremonies which the Roman Catholic Church has added to the simple method which the Apostles employed in the ministration of baptism.

These ceremonies are threefold :

(1.) The first are those which precede the approach to the baptismal font. *The blessing of the baptismal waters.* This is done only on the eve of Easter or of Pentecost, unless in cases of necessity. A lighted torch is put into the font to represent the fire of Divine love which is communicated to the soul by baptism ; and the light of good example which all who are baptized ought to give. Holy oil and chrism are mixed with the water to represent the spiritual union of the soul with God by the grace received in baptism. Then comes *the presentation of the candidate at the church door*, who is forbidden to enter, as unworthy to be admitted to the house of God until he has cast off the yoke of Satan. If it be an adult, Catechetical instruction is administered. The next ceremony is denominated *the exorcism*, which consists of sacred words and prayers for the

purpose of expelling the devil from the candidate, and of insufflation, or breathing upon him with the words, "Depart from me thou unclean spirit and give place to the Holy Ghost, the Comforter." The Priest then *puts a little blessed salt into the mouth*, saying, "Receive the salt of wisdom : may it be unto thee a propitiation unto life everlasting." Then the *forehead, eyes, breast, and shoulders, and ears are signed with the sign of the cross* ; and lastly, *another exorcism* is recited, the priest touching with a little spittle the ears and nostrils of the person to be baptized, and saying, "Ephphatha, i. e., be thou opened into an odour of sweetness ; but be thou put to flight, O devil, for the judgment of God will be at hand." This completes the preparatory ceremonial.

(2.) Those rites which are discharged at the font are, first, the renunciation, when affirmative answers are given to the questions. "Hast thou renounced Satan ? and all his works ? and all his pomps ?" Then the individual is anointed with holy oil on the breast, and between the shoulders, during which the Priest says, "I anoint thee with the oil of salvation in Christ Jesus our Lord, that thou mayest have life everlasting." He is then interrogated respecting the several articles of the Creed and is baptized in the name of the blessed Trinity.

(3.) There are also the ceremonies which follow the administration of baptism. The priest anoints with chrism the crown of the head, to show that the recipient of baptism is united to Christ his Head, and ingrafted on his body. Then a white garment is put upon the baptized person, the Priest saying, "Receive this garment

which mayest thou carry unstained before the judgment seat of Christ, that thou mayest have eternallife. Amen." In the case of infants, a white kerchief is substituted for the garment. A burning light is then put into the hand as an emblem of the light of a good example.

I have been thus particular in the description of these rites because they constitute so striking a commentary upon the language of my text, "teaching doctrines and commandments of men." Where is prescribed in the Gospel such a ceremonial as this? What Bishop consecrated the water in which the Eunuch was baptized? Can any man forbid WATER said Peter, that these should not be baptized? but he does not mention salt, or oil, or chrism. Oh! it is a grave departure from the simplicity of the Gospel on the part of our friends of the Church of Rome, that such rites as these should be practised; and who can calculate the amount of injury which they engender, by drawing off the minds of the people from the spiritual character of the sacrament, to the merely outward show and form?

*Second*, THE LORD'S SUPPER, or Eucharist, is the other sacrament which the Protestant Churches acknowledge and celebrate in common with the Church of Rome.

The Protestant view of this sacrament is so clearly expressed in the Larger Catechism of the Church of Scotland, that I shall merely quote from it:—

*Q.* What is the Lord's Supper?

*A.* The Lord's Supper is a sacrament of the New Testament wherein, by giving and receiving bread and

wine according to the appointment of Jesus Christ, his death is shewed forth ; and they that worthily communicate feed upon his body and blood, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace ; have their union and communion with him confirmed ; testify and renew their thankfulness, and engagement to God, and their mutual love and fellowship each with other, as members of the same mystical body.

*Q.* How hath Christ appointed bread and wine to be given and received in the sacrament of the Lord's supper ?

*A.* Christ hath appointed the ministers of his word, in the administration of this sacrament of the Lord's supper, to set apart the bread and wine from common use, by the word of institution, thanksgiving, and prayer ; to take and break the bread, and to give both the bread and the wine to the communicants : who are, by the same appointment, to take and eat the bread, and to drink the wine, in thankful remembrance that the body of Christ was broken and given, and his blood shed, for them.

*Q.* How do they that worthily communicate in the Lord's supper feed upon the body and blood of Christ therein ?

*A.* As the body and blood of Christ are not corporally or carnally present in, with, or under the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, and yet are spiritually present to the faith of the receiver, no less truly and really than the elements themselves are to their outward senses ; so they that worthily communicate in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, do therein feed upon

the body and blood of Christ, not after a corporal and carnal, but in a spiritual manner ; yet truly and really, while by faith they receive and apply unto themselves Christ crucified, and all the benefits of his death.

Q. How are they that receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper to prepare themselves before they come unto it ?

A. They that receive the Sacrament of the Lord's supper are, before they come, to prepare themselves thereunto, by examining themselves of their being in Christ, of their sins and wants ; of the truth and measure of their knowledge, faith, repentance ; love to God and the brethren, charity to all men, forgiving those that have done them wrong ; of their desires after Christ, and of their new obedience ; and by renewing the exercise of these graces, by serious meditation, and fervent prayer.

The Roman Catholic view of this sacrament is found in the Canons of the Council of Trent : " Whoever shall deny, that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and consequently Christ entire ; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign or figure, or by his power : let him be accursed.

" Whoever shall affirm, that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy eucharist with the external signs of that worship which is due to God ; and therefore that the eucharist is not to be honoured with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions, according to the

laudable and universal rites and customs of holy church, nor publicly presented to the people for their adoration; and that those who worship the same are idolaters: let him be accursed.

“Whoever shall affirm, that all and every one of Christ’s faithful are bound by divine command to receive the most holy sacrament of the eucharist in both kinds, as necessary to salvation: let him be accursed.

“Whoever shall affirm, that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the mass; or that the offering is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat: let him be accursed.”

There are in the doctrines and practices thus set forth by the Council of Trent, four things against which the Reformed churches most solemnly protest; *Transubstantiation, The Sacrifice of the Mass, The adoration of the Host, and Communion in one kind.*

The two first of these, Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass, were discussed at great length in the Lecture on “the one Sacrifice for sin,” and the Reformed Protest incontestably maintained, on the authority of both Scripture and the early Fathers. But, against the present doctrines of the Church of Rome as to transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass, I wish to present one additional proof from antiquity. It is from the liturgy of St. Basil. I beg your particular attention to it because it demonstrates that the Roman Catholic Church has departed from both, the doctrines and the practices of antiquity. After the words of consecration by the priest, St. Basil calls the elements “τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ

Χριστοῦ.”—the antitypes of the holy body and blood of Christ. How could he have called them *antitypes* after consecration, if he believed the Roman Catholic theory, which indeed obliges all its followers to call them the veritable body, soul and divinity of the blessed Saviour? It is impossible to conceive that this was his belief. But let us follow him in his prayer: “May the spirit come upon us and upon the gifts proposed, to bless and sanctify them, and to make this blood the veritable body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and this cup his blood, the Spirit working the change.”—A prayer which, after consecration of the bread and wine, would be utterly inconsistent in the mouth of a Catholic priest in the present day.

The elevation and adoration of the host is another thing against which Protestants remonstrate; a practice which stands or falls with the doctrine of transubstantiation. We remark, (1.) because there is no ground for this doctrine of transubstantiation, either in the scriptures or in the early fathers of the church, as was proved in the former lecture, we are therefore bound to protest against it as both unscriptural and idolatrous. But independently of this we protest against it, (2.) Because it was not the practice of the Apostles as recorded in the Word of God. If our Catholic friends say that they have warrant for it in scripture, the *onus probandi* is upon them, they must prove that it is so, and not we that it is not. We protest against it, (3.) Because it is opposed to the practice of the ancient church after the apostolic age. The first command which the church received for the elevation and adoration of the

host, was in the year 1216, the year following that in which the Lateran Council was held, when Pope Honorius ordered that the priests, at a certain part of the service of the mass, should elevate the host and cause the people to prostrate themselves in worshipping it. We challenge our Roman Catholic friends to produce higher or more ancient authority for this practice, in the Church generally, than the early part of the thirteenth century. And yet the Church of Rome, as to both doctrines and practices, lays claim to apostolicity and antiquity!

With equal earnestness we protest against the practice of half-communion, i. e., withholding the cup from the laity.

That there is no scriptural warrant for such a practice is evident from the words of Christ, "Drink ye ALL of this." But it has been argued that the Apostles were clergymen, and that therefore these words of Christ are not to be taken in proof that the laity are entitled to drink of the cup. But those who reason thus forget that the same argument would deprive the laity of the bread also. Besides, in the Roman Catholic church, no one receives the cup but THE OFFICIATING PRIEST, the Bishops, if they are present, receive but in one kind :— the Pope, if he is dying, receives but in one kind ; if then this be the scriptural practice, the Saviour ought to have withheld the cup from the disciples. But both the Council of Constance and the Council of Trent, acknowledge that communion in both kinds was the ancient practice of the church, and give as the reason for the change, the avoidance of certain dangers and scandals.

I ask, was there not the same exposure to dangers and scandals in the age of the Apostles as in the year 1214? How is it that the blessed Saviour and the inspired Apostles did not foresee those dangers and scandals which arise from giving the cup to the laity? How? Because they did not believe the doctrine of transubstantiation. Well had it been for these Councils had they remembered the words of St. Ambrose, who in his commentary upon 1 Corinthians, xi., says: "*It is an insult to the Lord to celebrate the sacrament otherwise than he did. For he cannot be devout who presumes to give it in any other way than as it was given by its author.*"

It is worthy of remark here, that Pope Leo, in the year 443, excommunicated the Manicheans, who, on the plea of their abhorring wine, refused the sacramental cup; he also termed their practice, "sacrilegious dissimulation." And in 495, Pope Gelasius used still stronger language respecting these same Manicheans, enjoining the entire observance or the entire relinquishment of the institution, and adding these words, "the division of one and the same mystery cannot be effected without great sacrilege." On the authority, therefore, of Pope Gelasius, the two Councils of Lateran and Trent are guilty of great sacrilege.

2. We have now to speak of those five rites which the Church of Rome has exalted to the dignity of sacraments, viz: Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony. The following is the Canon of the Council of Trent on this subject. "Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Christ, or that they were more

or fewer than seven, namely : Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony ; or that any of these is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be accursed."

Cardinal Bellarmine, in his Treatise on the sacraments, book ii. sec. 25, says :—" All our divines and the whole church, for five hundred years, viz. : from the time of the Master of the sentences, have agreed in the number of the seven sacraments." See how completely this celebrated defender of the Church of Rome manifests the weakness of his cause, by acknowledging that he could not trace the antiquity of this belief in seven sacraments higher than one thousand years after the age of the Apostles ? What matters it, that the Church for five centuries, avowed this belief, if it should not avow it for the other ten ? And what becomes of the infallibility of the Church, if for ten centuries she allowed her children to be ignorant of the fact that Jesus Christ (as says the Trentine Council) instituted seven instruments of grace, whereas they only recognized two or three of them ? The Church, therefore, has not even the evidence of Catholic tradition in support of her present belief on this subject. St. Isidore, Bishop of Seville, who lived in the beginning of the seventh century, writing a work on the Offices of the Church, in which he necessarily treats of the sacraments, names only Baptism, Chrism or Confirmation, and the Eucharist ; and he tells us " they are therefore called sacraments, because, under the covering of corporal things, a secret and invisible virtue is conveyed to the partakers of them."

It is not, be it remembered, pleaded by Protestants that these rites did not exist in the Christian Church before the tenth century, but it is contended that they were not all regarded as sacraments, even in the sense in which the Church of Rome defines a sacrament. Yet the Catechism of the Council of Trent ventures the assertion, that these seven sacraments can be proved from Scripture, though it does not vouchsafe the passages or texts. Peter Dens, however, in his Theology, has the following: "The number seven is also insinuated in various places of scripture. Thus, in Prov. ix., it is said, "Wisdom, which is Christ, hath built her house, i. e. the Church, and hath cut out her seven pillars, to wit, the seven sacraments, which as so many pillars, sustain the Church." Thus, in like manner, in Exod. xxv. by the seven lights, which were in one candlestick, this is insinuated: for the seven sacraments are, as it were, so many lights which illuminate the church. In the Council of Trent, for example, it was agreed that seven is a perfect number, that since there are seven days in the week, seven planets, seven excellent virtues, seven deadly sins, &c., SO THERE ARE SEVEN SACRAMENTS." Well may we exclaim in the language of the text, "IN VAIN DO THEY WORSHIP ME TEACHING DOCTRINES AND COMMANDMENTS OF MEN."

But let us briefly and singly examine the claims of these five additional rites to the dignity of sacraments.

(1st.) *As to Penance.* The DOCTRINES involved in Penance, were discussed in a former lecture. As to its being a sacrament, it seems difficult to impart to it such a character or position. Two things says St. Augustine

are necessary to the matter of a sacrament; 1st. that it be an external and sensible sign; 2d. that there must be a resemblance between the sign and the thing signified." E. g. In baptism water is the sign, spiritual washing is the thing signified;—in the Eucharist bread and wine are the signs—the body and blood of Christ the things signified. What sign, then, is there in penance? What "corporeal thing," to use the language of St. Isidore, "covers the secret grace?" How can contrition make up any part of the matter of a sacrament, when it is not external? How can confession when it is no visible sign? How can satisfaction which may be done when the effect of the sacrament is over in absolution? It is said that the grace of the sacrament is conveyed by the words "*Absolvo te, &c.*" I ABSOLVE THEE; and yet the acknowledged doctrine of the Church is, that before the penitent goes into the confessional, if he have contrition, God has already absolved him, and that in this case the priest does not absolve but makes a declarative announcement of what has taken place before. How then does this accord with the doctrine of the Church, that a sacrament always confers grace, and that the sacrament of penance always confers absolution? There is also another difficulty, the more serious because scriptural, which I have never seen explained. On the day of Pentecost, Peter the Apostle commanded the people, so says the Douay Testament, to "do penance and be baptized;" did the people therefore receive the sacrament of penance first, and did the apostles then confer the *initiatory* sacrament of baptism?

(2d.) *As to Orders*, or the ordination of ministers.

The question is not whether ordination of ministers by imposition of hands is a Christian institution, to this perhaps we shall mostly agree, but whether it is a sacrament ordained by Christ, possessing a visible sign, a promise of grace, and a correspondence between the sign and the thing signified. The Council of Florence declares that the visible sign is the delivery of a chalice with wine it, and a paten with bread upon it into the hands of the person to be ordained, and that the form is "Receive thou power of offering sacrifice in the Church of God for the living and the dead." Did Christ institute this matter and form? Bellarmine is obliged to acknowledge, that there is no proof of his ever having ordained his apostles by imposition of hands; and who ever heard of the cup and the paten for the first thousand years of the Christian era? Who ever heard, for this entire period, of the form which we have just quoted? There is no such form in the Apostolic canons as they are called. The most ancient account that we have of ordaining is in the fourth council of Carthage, but there is no such form of words to be found there; no mention of the cup and paten there; and yet Christ instituted this sacrament, and these forms too, according to the Trentine Council! Is not this TEACHING DOCTRINES AND COMMANDMENTS OF MEN?

(3rd.) *As to Matrimony*, which is exalted by the Church of Rome to the dignity of a sacrament. The arguments which are brought to support this view are so puerile that I shall not occupy your time with their investigation. It is enough that we acknowledge "marriage to be honorable in all, and the bed unde-

fled, and that whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." But when Bellarmine confesses that he does not ground this doctrine upon the use of the word *sacramentum* in Eph. v. 32: "*Sacramentum hoc magnum est,*"—This is a great sacrament,—because, as he says, the word is joined to some things which are not sacraments, I think we may forego the labour of a lengthened investigation and merely read the passage from the Douay Bible:—"Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it. That he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life. That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever hated his own flesh: but nourisheth and cherisheth it, as also Christ doth the church. Because we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. *For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother: and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh.* THIS IS A GREAT SACRAMENT: BUT I SPEAK IN CHRIST AND IN THE CHURCH."

(4th.) *As to Confirmation.* The language of the Church of Rome is: "Confirmation is a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord by which the Holy Spirit is given to the baptized, constantly and intrepidly to profess the faith of Christ." It differs from baptism, according to the following manner which I extract from the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "As by the

grace of baptism we are begotten to newness of life, so, by confirmation, we grow to full maturity having put away the things of a child." The scripture texts alleged in support of this view of confirmation, are those in the Acts of the Apostles which speak of the laying on of the apostles' hands for the descent of the Holy Ghost; but it will be easily seen that these passages do not prove the sacramental character of confirmation. We quarrel not with the Church of Rome or with any other Church for instituting an arrangement with a view to the public acknowledgment by persons baptized in infancy, of those vows, which baptism imposed and still imposes upon them; we think rather, that it would be advantageous to any Church to establish some suitable and evangelical form for the accomplishment of such an object. But when Christ's authority is produced for the ceremony of confirmation as celebrated by the Church of Rome, and when by virtue of such authority it is dignified as a sacrament; we must protest against such human additions to the commandments of the Gospel. The Church of Rome teaches us that here are all the requisites of a true sacrament. 1st. We have the visible sign or matter *chrism*, which is a compound of oil of olives and balsam. 2dly. We have the grace conferred, viz:—strengthening and perfecting grace. 3dly. We have the form of administration, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation in the name of the Father, &c." It is sufficient to demand the New Testament authority for all this. Granted that in their apostolic tours, the first ministers of the Gospel *confirmed* the Churches;

granted that the Holy Spirit is the comforter and strengthener of the members of Christ, but will you tell me where in the Holy Scriptures I may find a proof of the sacramental authority of confirmation as celebrated by the Church of Rome?

(5th.) *As to Extreme Unction.* Our Roman Catholic friends rest this rite or sacrament upon two passages of the New Testament. But before we refer to them it will be well to state the Roman Catholic view of this ceremony from their own authorities: "This sacred unction of the sick was instituted as a true and proper sacrament of the New Testament by Christ Jesus our Lord; being first intimated by Mark, (ch. vi. 13,) and afterwards recommended and published to the faithful by James the apostle, brother of our Lord. 'Is any man,' saith he, 'sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.' (James v. 14, 15.) In which words, as the church has learned by apostolical tradition, handed down from age to age, he teaches the matter, form, proper minister, and effect of this salutary sacrament. For the church understands the matter of the sacrament to be the oil, blessed by the bishop; the unction most fitly representing the grace of the Holy Spirit, wherewith the soul of the sick man is invisibly anointed. The form is contained in the words of administration."—*Council of Trent.*

It is clear, therefore, that the Roman Catholic

Church relies on two passages as their authority for practising this rite, that in Mark vi. 13, in which the sacrament is said to be insinuated, and that in James v. 14, &c., in which it is said to be promulgated:—“And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.” “Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.”

Now concerning the passage in Mark, it is clear that whatever unction the disciples administered, it was not extreme, for the sick persons were anointed with a view to their being healed, and it is expressly stated that they were healed. Who can doubt that it was miraculous healing which the apostles here effected, and of which they spoke? But where is even the insinuation of its sacramental character? Where is the prescription as to the kind of oil? Where is it said that the oil must be blessed—or if it must be blessed, where is it written that the blessing must be episcopal? Maldonat, the Jesuit writer, contends that the text teaches the institution of the sacrament. Dens, however, seems to have doubted that this passage is favorable to the Church, for he says in answer to the question: “When did Christ institute this sacrament?” “The time is uncertain, yet it is very likely that he instituted it after his resurrection, during the forty days in which he conversed with his disciples concerning the kingdom of God and the affairs of the Church.” But the chief foundation upon which Roman Catholics build their opinions of Extreme Unction is the passage in James. Let us

then see whether the foundation is secure? Observe then—*First*. That the object of Extreme Unction in the Catholic Church is the purging away the remains of sin. That the object of St. James' anointing was to restore to health. *Second*. That the doctrine of the Church of Rome is, that the sacrament saves. That the doctrine of St. James is, that faith and prayer save. *Third*. That the doctrine of the Church of Rome is, that one Priest should minister. That the doctrine of St. James is, that several were to be engaged in the rite. *Fourth*. That the doctrine of the Church of Rome is, that the anointing is for sins. That St. James says, "if he be in sins," this then was not the primary cause of the anointing—sickness was the primary cause, but if the sickness had been produced by sin, or had followed sin as a judgment, it is intimated that not only should the sickness be removed, but the sins should be forgiven him.

Now let any Roman Catholic of candour and intelligence ask himself whether there is in this passage ground for the doctrine, that Extreme Unction is a sacrament appointed by Christ to be administered to the dying for the removal of the remains of sin? And here let me merely add the interpretation of this passage by Cardinal Cajetan. "It neither appears by the words nor by the effect, that he speaks of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, but rather of that Unction which our Lord appointed in the Gospel, to be used upon sick persons by his disciples. For the text does not say *is any man sick unto death*, but absolutely *is any man sick*. And it makes the effect to be the recovery of the

sick, and speaks but conditionally of the forgiveness of sins. Whereas, Extreme Unction is not given, but when a man is almost at the point of death, and, as the form of words sufficiently shows, it tends directly to the forgiveness of sins."

This has been a lengthened investigation, and it is more than time to bring it to a close, and to dismiss you to your homes. Yet I dare not allow you to retire without a brief appeal to you respecting the beautiful simplicity of the Gospel of Christ, and the absolute necessity of adhering closely to its precepts and instructions, and of following as closely its ecclesiastical practices. I am no bigot, I believe no ecclesiastical form to be essential to salvation; but I say to every one of you who are seeking that gospel blessing, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." I have seen no cause to alter an opinion which I advanced from this pulpit more than five years ago, and which I reiterate this evening. I say then to the Episcopalian, "Your Episcopalianism cannot save you; I say to the Presbyterian, your Presbyterianism cannot save you; I say to the Congregationalist, your Congregationalism cannot save you; I say to the Methodist, your Methodism cannot save you; and I will add, I say to my Roman Catholic friends, your Catholicism cannot save you; And if you are trusting in any one of these forms of Christianity, if you suppose that either the one or the other will make you more acceptable to the Divine Being, you are labouring under a grievous delusion, and will find yourselves fearfully disappointed at the last. What, if you have been

baptized in the name of the ever blessed Trinity, and have not a change of heart! What, if you have been confirmed, by episcopal hands, and are destitute of the grace of the Holy Ghost! What, if the Priest has absolved you, if you are not freely justified by faith having peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ! What, if you are in the habit of approaching the Eucharistic feast, and do not spiritually feed upon Christ Jesus the Lord! What, if the Minister or the Priest should come to you in your last moments, and pray over you and give you the tokens of your Saviour's death, and after all you should die without the spiritual anointing, the unction of the Holy One! What are Church forms, and Church orders, and Church claims, without Christ and his salvation wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit! When? O, when will all sectarianism and bigotry cease to exist in the Christian Church? When will the Churches of Christ begin to lose themselves in Him? From every other object would I now lead you, and point you wholly to the Cross—from every other refuge but Him—from every other mode or place of cleansing but his adorable, his pierced side, which was opened as the fountain for sin and for uncleanness!

“Thy side an open fountain is,  
Where all may freely go,  
And drink the living stream of bliss,  
And wash them white as snow.”



## LECTURE IX.

### PURGATORY.

If there are any doctrines of religion for a knowledge of which we are entirely dependent upon revelation, they are those which relate to man's future existence. We can gain much information of the nature and attributes of the Divine Being, from the glorious works of creation ; we can reason upon the evil of sin, from observation and experience of its effects ; sound philosophy may suggest principles of ethics, and remedies for immorality ; but gross absurdities have ever been the offspring of *human* conceptions and deductions, as to that unseen world to which every immortal spirit is journeying. How signally the ancient philosophers failed in their endeavours to pry into futurity, is patent to all who are but slightly acquainted with their writings or opinions. Indeed, whether there were in man any soul at all, whether death were not a state of eternal sleep, whether there were a Paradise and a hell, or whether these were the chimeras of a superstitious fancy, were doctrines concerning whose truth the Gentile world at least, and even the Jewish in some measure, wandered in uncertain and gloomy perplexity. All, all was dark until Christ came, shedding the brilliant light of truth over the darkness of the future—“ bringing life and immortality to light by the Gospel.”

Hitherto in these lectures we have discussed those doctrines of Christianity which concern us in this life. We have spoken of God's Word, and of our obligation to read it; of the Church, and its glorious and universal Head; of man as a sinner, of Christ as a Saviour; of repentance and faith, of forgiveness and holiness; of the institutions of Christianity. This evening we are to pass from these present scenes, we are to lift the vail which hides futurity from our vision, we are to leave this world for an hour or two, and are to enter the world that is unseen, the dark, dreary undefined regions of the departed dead; we shall need a guide to direct us in our wanderings—let us not take man who is as ignorant as ourselves of the way, but THE SPIRIT OF GOD in His Word; we shall need light to illumine our path, let us not follow the meteoric light of human speculation, but let us seize the torch of TRUTH; and so far as our guide will take us, and our torch will serve us, let us solemnly contemplate those future scenes whose reality, ere long, every one of us must experience.

In the year 1813, several devout and charitable members of the Church of Rome in Dublin, formed themselves into a Society for the purpose of raising money to relieve themselves and their friends from Purgatory when they should go thither. The Society was designated by those who composed it, "The Purgatorian Society," and its rules were printed and published in a circular, by J. Coyne, Printer, 74 Cook Street, Dublin. The heading of the Circular is as follows: "Purgatorian Society, Instituted July 1st,

1813, and held in St. James' Chapel. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Ghost. 'It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins.' Maccabees, chap. xii, ver. 46."

The *Second* Rule reads thus: "Every well disposed Catholic wishing to contribute to the relief of the suffering souls in Purgatory shall pay one penny per week, which shall be appropriated to the procuring of masses to be offered up for the repose of the souls of the deceased parents, relations, and friends of all the subscribers to the Institution in particular, and the faithful departed in general."

The *Sixth* Rule is as follows: "The spiritual benefits of this Institution shall be conferred in the following manner, viz: Each subscriber shall be entitled to an office at the time of their death, another at the expiration of a month, and one at the end of twelve months after their decease."

The *Seventh* Rule makes the following provision: "Every subscriber without distinction shall be entitled to the benefit of one mass each, provided that such member or subscriber shall die a natural death, be six months a subscriber to the Institution, and be clear of all dues at the time of their departure."

In London a similar Society was formed as early as 1810. From its rules the following are transcribed;

"All monies acquired by this charity shall be destined to provide that the Holy Sacrifice of the mass be offered for the intentions of the Society, and for the support of the schools. At the death of any member, mass shall

be said three times for the repose of his soul. A member may enter the names of his departed friends in the books of the Society, and such deceased persons shall be deemed members of the same, and partake of its spiritual advantages so long as their subscriptions continue to be paid."

In the Catholic Directory for 1851, at page 28, there is an appeal for the Gravesend Mission, in which is asked "five shillings from two to three thousand good Catholics." It is added, "that for the pious intentions of those who thus either contribute or collect, the holy mass will be offered every Monday, at 8 o'clock, which may be applied to their deceased friends." At page 132 of the same Directory, we find an appeal on behalf of "the Asylum of the good Samaritan, Hammer-smith," to which the following announcement is appended: "Subscriptions will be thankfully received by His Eminence, Cardinal Wiseman, 35 Golden Square." It is added: "Benefactors living and deceased, participate in the stated masses, communions, and other prayers of the community and penitents, offered up in behalf of all those who assist them with the means of carrying out their holy undertaking. Cast off clothes, bonnets, &c., are earnestly requested to fit the penitents out for service."

The grave subject involved in these extracts is that which we have proposed for this evening's consideration: PURGATORY;—and the words which I have selected as a text you will find in the seventh chapter of the Apocalypse, at the fourteenth and fifteenth verses :

“AND I SAID TO HIM: MY LORD, THOU KNOWEST. AND HE SAID TO ME: THESE ARE THEY WHO ARE COME OUT OF GREAT TRIBULATION, AND HAVE WASHED THEIR ROBES AND HAVE MADE THEM WHITE IN THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB.

“THEREFORE THEY ARE BEFORE THE THRONE OF GOD, AND THEY SERVE HIM DAY AND NIGHT IN HIS TEMPLE: AND HE, THAT SITTETH ON THE THRONE, SHALL DWELL OVER THEM.”

I. I SHALL FIRST DESCRIBE TO YOU THE PROTESTANT PURGATORY:—

Protestants have a purgatory. The word, as many of you know, is derived from a Latin word, which signifies to purge, to cleanse. The Protestant doctrine is, that “THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, CLEANSETH US FROM ALL SIN.” This is the Protestant purgatory—and though we cannot say, because we do not believe it, that a FIRE has been kindled for sin and for uncleanness; yet we do say, with adoring gratitude, that a FOUNTAIN has been opened for sin and for uncleanness. Yes, many a Protestant has rejoiced to sing—

“There is a fountain filled with blood,  
 “Drawn from Immanuel’s veins;  
 “And sinners plunged beneath that flood,  
 “Lose all their guilty stains.”

The Protestant doctrine is, that all the guilt and all the pollution of the sin of believers are cancelled and removed in this world, and that when once the redeemed have passed into the invisible state, there remaineth no

more sacrifice and satisfaction for sin ;—that all the purgation, or cleansing, or purifying is effected here, and that upon the departure of the sanctified and saved spirit from the realms of time, there is an immediate introduction into the presence of Christ, that though it may not be doubted that after the resurrection, and consequent reunion of the sanctified spirits and glorified bodies of the saints, their happiness will be greatly augmented, yet that even now they are in a state of perfect bliss in the presence of the Lord. As to the wicked, those namely who die in sins, the Protestant belief is, that though after their bodies shall have been raised, their misery will be increased, their souls immediately after death depart to a state of conscious punishment, of which there can be no alleviation throughout the ages of eternity.

II. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY having been greatly misconceived and misunderstood by the generality of Protestants, it is most desirable that its several parts or articles should be clearly enunciated. The fathers of the Council of Trent asserted the doctrine of Purgatory in the following decree: “Since the Catholic church, instructed by the Holy Spirit, through the sacred writings and the ancient tradition of the fathers, hath taught in holy councils, and lastly in this œcumenical council, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the mass; this holy council commands all bishops diligently to endeavour that the wholesome doctrine of purgatory, delivered to us by venerable fathers and holy

councils, be believed and held by Christ's faithful, and everywhere taught and preached. Let difficult and subtle questions, which tend not to edification, and from which commonly religion derives no advantage, be banished from popular discourses, particularly when addressed to the ignorant multitude. Let such as are of doubtful character, or seem to border upon error, be prevented from being published and discussed. Let those which promote mere curiosity, or superstition, or savour of filthy lucre, be prohibited, as scandalous and offensive to Christians. Let the bishops take care that the suffrages of the living faithful—viz., masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which the faithful have been accustomed to perform for departed believers—be piously and religiously rendered, according to the institutes of the church; and whatever services are due to the dead, through the endowments of deceased persons, or in any other way, let them not be performed slightly, but diligently and carefully, by the priests and ministers of the church, and all others to whom the duty belongs." In the sixth Session of the Council, at the thirtieth canon, it is said: "Whoever shall affirm, that when the grace of justification is received, the offence of the penitent sinner is so forgiven, and the sentence of eternal punishment reversed, that there remains no temporal punishment to be endured, before his entrance into the kingdom of heaven, either in this world, or in the future state, in purgatory: let him be accused." The second chapter of the twenty-second Session, declares: "Wherefore it (the mass) is properly offered, according to apostolic tradition, not only for the sins, punishments,

satisfactions, and other necessities of living believers; but also for the dead in Christ, who are not yet thoroughly purified." And the third canon of the same Session issues its anathema upon all who "shall affirm, that the sacrifice of the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities."

In the Douay Catechism we find the following exposition of the doctrine: "Whither go such as die in mortal sin? To hell, to all eternity. Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins? To purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven." The Catechism of the Council of Trent, maintaining the same caution which is so evident in the articles and canons, gives the following view: "In the *fire* of purgatory the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country into which nothing defiled entereth."

In the "grounds of Catholic doctrine" there is a full exposition of the tenet, and a defence of it set forth on the ground of Scripture, tradition, and reason. "Q. What do you mean by Purgatory? A. A middle state of souls, who depart this life in God's grace, yet not without some lesser stains of guilt or punishment, which retard them from entering heaven. But as to

the particular place where these souls suffer, or the quality of the torments which they suffer, the church has decided nothing. *Q.* What sort of christians then go to Purgatory? *A.* 1st, Such as die guilty of lesser sins, which we commonly call venial; as many christians do, who either by sudden death or otherwise, are taken out of this life before they have repented for these ordinary failings. 2ndly, Such as have been formerly guilty of greater sins, and have not made full satisfaction for them to divine justice. *Q.* Why do you say that those who die guilty of lesser sins go to Purgatory? *A.* Because such as depart this life before they have repented for these venial frailties and imperfections, cannot be supposed to be condemned to the eternal torments of hell, since the sins of which they are guilty are but small, which even God's best servants are more or less liable to.—Nor can they go straight to heaven in this state, because the scripture assures us, Apocalypse, 21. v. 27; "There shall not enter into it any thing defiled." Now every sin, be it ever so small, certainly defileth the soul: hence our Saviour assures us, that we are to render an account for every idle word, Matt. 12. v. 6.

From these various authoritative sources we deduce the following articles of Roman Catholic belief:

*First*,—That all persons who die in mortal sin, are immediately consigned to the everlasting punishment of hell, from which there can be neither deliverance nor relief.—It is necessary, however, to note that in all cases in which priestly absolution is secured immediately before death, there is an entire deliverance from the

guilt and punishment of mortal sin. Every one, therefore, who dies receiving the rites of the Church is positively delivered from hell, and is consigned, for a season merely, to the regions of purgatory.

*Second*,—That eternal punishment for sin is to be distinguished from the temporal punishment due to our offences, and that the children of God are not delivered from this temporal punishment but by rendering personal satisfaction both in this world and in the next.

*Third*,—That this satisfaction is in the present state rendered by penances, masses, self-inflictions, prayers, fastings, charities, and the like, and in the future, by personal punishment in the fires of purgatory.

*Fourth*,—That the offering of masses is accepted by the Divine Being, in lieu of this purgatorial punishment, which is shortened in proportion to the number of masses which may be said or offered.

*Fifth*,—That these masses must be purchased by all classes, so that it is much easier for the rich to escape from purgatorial punishment than the poor.

It is not, however, to be supposed that the doctrines of our Roman Catholic friends respecting purgatory are confined to the views which we have now announced. It will be well, therefore, that we ascertain the opinions of her most eminent champions and divines on this mysterious subject.

Milner, in his "End of Controversy," gives it as his opinion that "Abraham's bosom," to which Lazarus was carried by angels, is purgatory.

Cardinal Bellarmine defines its position, and tells us (works, vol. ii., book ii., chapter ii., page 406.) that the

situation of purgatory in which souls are cleansed, is adjacent to that in which the damned are punished, and that it is a subterranean place. Dens, following the Cardinal's view, states that "purgatory is situated under the earth contiguous to hell." Bellarmine says again : "almost all theologians teach that the damned and the souls in purgatory are in the same place, and tortured in the same fire."

But the Cardinal goes farther ; he lifts the vail, and presents a series of illustrations, which, considering that he was a man of acknowledged talents and erudition, it will be well for us to contemplate, the more so, since they represent the popular Roman Catholic view of this mysterious state.

1. The *first* illustration is taken by Bellarmine from the venerable Bede : "A pious father of a family in Northumberland, died after a long illness, in the early part of one night ; but to the great terror of those who watched by the body, came to life again at the dawn of the following day. All, but his faithful and affectionate wife, fled at the sight of him, and to her he communicated in the most soothing terms, the peculiar circumstances of his case ; that he had indeed been dead, but was permitted to live again upon earth, though by no means in the same manner as before. In short, he sold all his property, divided the produce equally between his wife, his children, and the poor ; and then retired to the Abbey of Melrose ; he there lived in such a state of unexampled mortification, as made it quite evident, even if he had not said a word on the subject, that he had seen things, whatever was the nature of them, which no

one else had been permitted to behold. He subsequently revealed some things that he saw : 'One,' said the old man, 'whose aspect was as of light, and his garment glistening, conducted me to a valley of great depth and width, but of immeasurable length ; one side of which was dreadful beyond expression for its burning heat, and the other as horrible for its no less intolerable cold. Both were filled with souls of men, which seemed to be tossed as by the fury of a tempest, from one side to the other, for being quite unable to endure the heat on the right hand, the miserable wretches kept throwing themselves to the opposite side into the equal torment of cold, thence back again into the raging flames. This, thought I to myself, must be hell ; but my guide answered to my thought that it was not so. 'This valley,' says he, 'is the place of torment for the souls of those who, after delaying to confess and expiate their sins, have at length, *in articulo mortis*, had recourse to penance, and so have died ; these at the day of judgment will be admitted into the kingdom of heaven by reason of their confession and penance, late as it was ; but meanwhile many of them may be assisted and liberated before that day, by the prayers, alms and fastings of the living, particularly by the sacrifice of the mass.' " It is to be observed that this is not regarded by Bellarmine as a fabulous invention ; he tells us that he gives full credit to the story, which he further says, is calculated to edify the faithful.

2. This, however, does not equal the *second* illustration which the Cardinal supplies from the life of Saint Christina, by Cantepatensis, an author, he informs us,

of high repute. The Saint died, and afterward returned to life; and in the presence of many witnesses spoke the following words: "Immediately as I departed from the body, my soul was received by ministers of light and angels of God, and conducted to a dark and horrid place, filled with the souls of men. The torments which I there witnessed, are so dreadful, that to attempt to describe them would be utterly vain; and there I beheld not a few who had been known to me while alive. Greatly concerned for their hopeless state, I asked what place it was, thinking it was hell; but I was told that it was purgatory, where are kept those, who in their life had repented indeed of their sins, but had not paid the punishment due for them. I was next taken to see the torments of hell, where also I recognized some of my former acquaintance upon earth. Afterwards, I was translated to Paradise, even to the throne of the Divine Majesty; and when I saw the Lord congratulating me, I was beyond measure rejoiced, concluding of course, that I should henceforward dwell with him for evermore. But he presently said to me—'In very deed, my sweetest daughter, here you shall be with me; but for the present; I offer you your choice: Will you stay for ever with me now? or will you return to the earth, and there in your mortal body, but without any detriment to it, endure punishment, by which you may deliver out of purgatory, all those whose souls you so much pitied, and may also, by the sight of your penance, and the example of your life, be a means of converting to me some who are yet alive in the body, and so come again to me at last, with a great increase of

your merits? I accepted without hesitation the return to life on the conditions proposed, and the Lord, congratulating me on the promptitude of my obedience, ordered that my body should be restored to me. And here, I had an opportunity of admiring the incredible celerity of the blessed spirits; for in that very hour, having been placed before the throne of God at the first recital of the *Agnus Dei* in the mass which was said for me, at the third (recital) my body was restored." Cantepreatensis then relates, that during her second life, "she walked into burning ovens, and though she was so tortured by the flames, that her anguish extorted from her the most horrible cries, yet when she came out, there was not a trace of any burning to be detected on her body. Again, during a hard frost, she would go and place herself under the frozen surface of a river for six days and more at a time. Sometimes she would be carried round by a water wheel and having been whirled round in an horrible manner, she was as whole in body as if nothing had happened to her; not a limb was hurt. At other times she would make all the dogs in the town fall upon her, and would run before them like a hunted beast; and yet, in spite of being torn by thorns and brambles, and worried and lacerated by dogs to such a degree that no part of her body escaped without wounds, there was not a weal nor scar to be seen." "Such," says this illustrious defender of the Church, "is the narrative of Cantepreatensis, and that he said nothing but truth is evident, not only from the confirmation given to his testimony by the Bishop and Cardinal of Viterbo; but because THE THING SPOKE FOR ITSELF.

It was quite plain that the body must have been endued with a divine virtue which could endure all that hers endured without being damaged ; and this not for a few days, but for forty-two years, during which she continued alive after her resurrection. But still more manifest does this become from the many sinners whom she brought to penitence, and from the miracles after her death, by which she was distinguished, for God determined to stop the mouth of unbelievers."

3. I cannot withhold from you a *third* illustration from this eminent writer. He is speaking of the possible duration of the pains of purgatory, and gives in proof a quotation from a life, by the same author, of a distinguished Roman Catholic female, Ludgardis : "About this time, Pope Innocent III., after having held the Lateran council, departed out of this life, and shortly afterwards appeared to Ludgardis. She, as soon as she beheld him encircled with a vast flame, demanded who he was ; and on his answering that he was Pope Innocent, exclaimed with a groan, 'What can this be ? how is it that the common father of us all is thus tormented ?' 'The reasons of my suffering thus,' he answered, 'are three in number ; and they would have consigned me to eternal punishments, had I not, through the intercession of the most pious mother of God, to whom I founded a monastery, repented, when *in extremis*. As it is, though I am spared eternal suffering, yet I shall be tortured in the most horrible manner to the day of judgment ; and that I am now permitted to come and pray for your suffrages, is a boon, which the mother of mercy has obtained for me from her Son.' With these

words he disappeared. Ludgardis not only communicated to her holy sisters the sad necessity to which the Pope was reduced in order to obtain their succour, but she also, herself, submitted to astonishing torments on his account." And the author adds, "The reader must understand, that Ludgardis, herself, revealed to me the three causes of the Pope's sufferings; but I forbear to disclose them, out of reverence to so great a Pontiff." "This instance," says Cardinal Bellarmine, "always affects me with the greatest terror. For if a Pontiff, entitled to so much praise, one, who to all human observation was not merely a man of integrity and prudence, but of eminent, nay, most exemplary sanctity—if even he so narrowly escaped hell, and, as it is, must suffer the most excruciating torments till the day of judgment, what prelate is there, who does not tremble? Who does not scrutinise the secrets of his own conscience, with the most unsparing rigour? For I cannot easily persuade myself, that so great a pontiff could have been capable of committing deadly sins, unless he was deceived, under some semblance of good, by flatterers and relatives, of whom the gospel says, 'a man's foes shall be of his own household.'"

4. I shall close these illustrations with an extract from O'Sullivan's Compendium of the Catholic history of Ireland, a work printed *cum facultate sanctae inquisitionis et regis*, and authorised by Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops. The extract contains a picture of the purgatory of St. Patrick: "There were numbers of men which no arithmetic could number, all lying on the ground, pierced through the body. They uttered

hoarse cries of agony, their tongues cleaving to their jaws. They were buffeted by violent tempests, and shattered by repeated blows of devils. The devils drove them into another plain, horrible with exquisite tortures. Some with iron chains about their necks and limbs, were suspended over the fires ; others were burned with red hot cinders. Not a few were transfixed with spits and roasted, melting metal being poured into them." Alas for those," it is added, "who do not penance in this world !"

These illustrations have been given thus minutely and at length, for the purpose of conveying to your minds the popular Roman Catholic idea respecting purgatory. It would be possible to add other illustrations equally appalling and equally authentic, but I forbear. What you have now heard will suffice to inform you what purgatory is, and without a single argument from me, they have, I am sure, already convinced you of the unscripturalness of the doctrine. Since, however, Scripture proof, in its support, is advanced by our Roman Catholic friends, we must not shrink from a scriptural investigation of the whole subject. With this view we shall adopt the course which has been pursued in former lectures.

First, then, we protest against the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory, on the authority of the Word of God, and in support of the protest shall advance three classes of texts :

*First*, and briefly, those which speak of the perfect satisfaction which Christ, our divine Redeemer, has presented to the Father for our sins. In the gospel by

St. John, xix. 30, the blessed Saviour is represented as exclaiming with his dying breath: "IT IS CONSUMMATED." What means this last utterance of the Son of God upon the cross, but that he was then paying, by his expiring act, our full debt and penalty? but that he was then presenting upon this holy altar of the cross, a sufficient oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world? In the ninth chapter of St. Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, at the twenty-sixth verse, the apostle declares: that "now once at the end of the ages, Christ hath appeared for the DESTRUCTION of sin by the sacrifice of himself." What need then of further destruction, or further sacrifice? He says again in a following verse: "Christ was once offered to EXHAUST the sins of many." If, therefore, the sins of the world are *exhausted* by Christ's sacrifice, what additional process is necessary? Can our sins be more than exhausted? And if exhausted, are not their demerit and punishment exhausted too? I know not what impression these passages may have had upon the minds of my hearers, but to me, they appear sufficient to overthrow the doctrine that human satisfactions, and self-tortures, and masses, and purgatorial punishments, are required by God to be added to the infinite satisfaction of Christ Jesus, our Lord.

The *second* class of passages which I adduce, are those which assert the entire removal, in this life, from the soul of the believer in Christ, of all the guilt and all the pollution of sin.

How clear on this subject is the language of Paul in his epistle to the Romans, (viii. 1.): "There is now

therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus;" but the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church is, that there *is* condemnation to the Christian, for does not purgatorial fire, which, in some cases, is endured for years, imply condemnation? Let us hear the apostle further: In his first epistle to the Thessalonians, chapter v. verse 23, he prays: "May the God of peace himself sanctify you in all things; that your whole spirit, and soul and body be preserved blameless in the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Is it conceivable that the sanctified *IN ALL THINGS*, *i. e.* in spirit, in soul, and in body, should be lashed in purgatory for ages? And now, listen to the language of St. John, in his first epistle: "But if we walk in the light, as he also is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. If we say that we have no sin; we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins; he is faithful and just, to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity." Where then is the necessity for fire? What other purgatorial process does the believer need? What after-process, when the precious blood of the Redeemer has cleansed him from all sin? Look also at the text: What had purged the saints in white raiment, whom John saw in vision before the throne? Was it fire? No, no! but, **THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB**. Are not these passages of themselves sufficient to sustain the Reformed Protest? I put it to every intelligent Roman Catholic, whether, if the doctrine of purgatory is a scriptural doctrine, these passages could have found a place on the page of inspiration.

There is yet a *third* class of passages by which this protest is maintained, and to which I especially call your attention, those, namely, which speak of the present blessedness of the righteous dead.

The first Scripture of this class which I quote in support of the Protestant view, notwithstanding that it is one of Dr. Milner's proof of the existence of purgatory, is that which describes the state of Lazarus—the same Lazarus who sat at the rich man's gate, and who at death was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom. Of him Abraham is represented as declaring, "Now he is *comforted*." Could this be said of a purgatorial state, such as that which St. Patrick or St. Christina describes, or such even as the Council of Florence, or the Catechism of the Council of Trent sets forth for the belief of "the faithful?" Again: How could Paul desire to be dissolved and to be with Christ? How could he speak of the gain of dying with such a purgatory before him as Pope Innocent the Third is said to have suffered? With how little truth, if the doctrine of purgatory is an article of Christian faith, could the angel say, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord?" Where, what is the blessedness of purgatory? "From henceforth now saith the Spirit that they may rest from their labours."—What rest does purgatory afford to the righteous departed? I cannot here withhold from you an incident which occurred in London a few years ago, and which bespeaks the simple power of this beautiful text: An eminent Protestant minister delivered in Poplar, near London, a lecture on the errors of the Roman Catholic Church. Some hundreds of Roman

Catholics were present, some of them listening with evident anxiety, and others interrupting with contemptuous sneers. The minister spoke to the people upon the uncomfortableness (to say the least of it) of the doctrine of purgatory, and shewed them the contradiction between this peculiar principle of Roman Catholicism, and the express and declared mind of the Spirit of God. A lady present noted down the texts which were adduced, and some of the arguments which were urged. Sometimes a smile played upon her face, at other times a sneer was observed, and occasionally the pencil dropped and her eyes were fixed upon the floor. The clergyman gave a second lecture, which the lady also attended. After he had spoken a little, the pencil was laid down, her eye was fixed on him, and her ear seemed to drink in every word. At the close of the lecture she handed to the speaker a slip of paper, requesting an interview, which was immediately granted. As soon as they met, she said to the clergyman: "I have been a devoted member of the Roman Catholic Chapel at Poplar; the priest is my intimate friend, and the god-father of my boy; I was to play the new organ when it was put up; I have gone regularly to mass and to confession, and have been regarded as one of the *élite*, of the communion; but after considering carefully and prayerfully what I have heard in your two lectures, I dare no longer to remain a Roman Catholic." She told the clergyman at the same time, that when she saw the placard announcing the meeting, she informed the priest that a notorious firebrand was coming to Poplar. The priest did not wish to take any notice of the matter,

but on her urging the expediency of his being made acquainted with what should be said, he agreed that she had better go and take notes of the lecture. She did so, as we have seen, and wrote him a letter immediately; telling him there was to be another lecture, and that he must come and answer it, or the Roman Catholics in Poplar would all turn Protestants. The priest returned no answer to this suggestion, and she then wrote to another priest in the neighbourhood, Dr. Butler, but he also took no notice of her communication. The second lecture confirmed the impression of the first, and she resolved to renounce for ever the Roman Catholic communion. The clergyman who had lectured asked her what points in his statements struck her most forcibly, and so rapidly alienated her affections from her Church. She said, it was not so much the argument as the TEXTS. One of these texts, she said, fell like a sunbeam from heaven, and unveiled to her hopes and prospects to which, previously, she had been an utter stranger; and that text was "BLESSED ARE THE DEAD THAT DIE IN THE LORD; YEA SAITH THE SPIRIT THAT THEY MAY"—not suffer in purgatory, but—"REST FROM THEIR LABOURS." She told him that she felt this most acutely, because she had been formerly laid upon a sick bed, and her medical attendant had given up all hope, and told her there was no chance of recovery; she sent for an aged priest from a neighbouring place to administer the sacrament of Extreme Unction. On receiving it, she asked him, "Am I now safe,?" to which he replied, "I can pledge my own safety that you are." "But," added she, "have I not to pass through purga-

tory." "Unquestionably," said the priest. "Then tell me, as a dying woman, what is the nature of the purgatory that I have to experience?" The priest, with great solemnity, and, if his creed were right, with great truth replied, "Purgatory, my dear child, is a place where you will have to suffer the torments of the damned, only of shorter duration." She said every nerve tingled with agony at the announcement. But when the text which the Protestant minister illustrated in his lecture, came upon her ear and reached her heart, declaring that the dead in Christ REST; and again that to be "*absent from the body,*" is to be "PRESENT WITH THE LORD," she felt that either the priest must be wrong and the Bible true, or the Bible must be false if purgatory be true.

The passages which I have adduced are but few; there are others in this blessed Bible were it needful to multiply evidence, but I ask my Roman Catholic friends whether those which I have quoted concerning the infinite satisfaction of Christ's atonement, concerning the efficacy of the precious blood of Christ to cleanse from all sin, concerning the immediate bliss of the departed faithful, do not constitute a mass of proof against the purgatorial system of their Church, sufficient to overthrow its claims, to allay their fears, and to save that oftentimes ruinous expenditure of money which it involves.—"BLESSED ARE THE DEAD WHO DIE IN THE LORD."

But I must not, neither would I, overlook those passages of Scripture by which this favorite doctrine of the Roman Catholic Clergy is sought to be defended.

As formerly, I shall take these passages from the Douay Bible, and shall adopt the selection of Dr. Milner in his "End of Controversy.":

"To come now to the New Testament: what place, I ask, must that be, which our Saviour calls *Abraham's bosom*, where the soul of Lazarus reposed, *Luke* xvi. 22, among the other just souls, till he by his sacred passion paid their ransom? Not heaven, otherwise Dives would have addressed himself to God instead of Abraham; but evidently a middle state, as St. Austin teaches. Again, of what place is it that St. Peter speaks, where he says, *Christ died for our sins; being put to death in the flesh, but enlivened in the spirit; in which also coming, he preached to those spirits that were in prison.* 1 Pet. iii. 19. It is evidently the same which is mentioned in the apostle's creed: *He descended into hell*: not the hell of the damned, to suffer their torments, as the blasphemer, Calvin, asserts, but the *prison* above-mentioned, or *Abraham's bosom*, in short, a middle state. It is of this prison, according to the holy fathers, our blessed Master speaks, where he says, *I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last mite.* *Luke* xii. 59. Lastly, what other sense can that passage of St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians bear, than that which the holy fathers affix to it, where the apostle says, *The day of the Lord shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work be burnt, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.* 1 Cor. iii. 13, 15. The

prelate's diversified attempts to explain away these Scriptural proofs of purgatory, are really too feeble and inconsistent to merit being even mentioned. I might here add, as a further proof, the denunciation of Christ, concerning *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost* : namely, that this sin *shall not be forgiven either in this world or in the world to come*, Mat. xii. 32 : which words clearly imply, that *some sins* are forgiven in the world to come, as the ancient fathers show."

(1.) The first passage is from Luke sixteenth chapter, and twenty-second verse, which speaks of the angelic conveyance of Lazarus, the beggar, to the bosom of Abraham. This, says Dr. Milner, is purgatory, an assertion which obliges us to believe that the "Father of the Faithful" existed in purgatory two thousand years, and that Abraham did not speak the truth to the suffering rich man when he said "now he is *comforted*, and thou art tormented."

(2.) The second text which Dr. Milner quotes in this paragraph is that in the first epistle of Peter, ch. iii. v. 19., where that apostle says, "Christ died for our sins, being put to death in the flesh, but enlivened in the spirit; in which also coming, He preached to those spirits that were in prison." This is a most unfortunate passage for the learned controvertist, for the antediluvian sinners died in mortal sin, they were disobedient to God and repented not—purgatory is for venial sins. How did Christ preach to those antediluvians? through Noah the preacher of righteousness. How the Doctor could have violated his solemn vow, that he would interpret no passage of Scripture but by the

unanimous consent of the Fathers, is to me surprising; and we can hardly suppose him ignorant of their views of the passage. Augustine who strongly leaned to this doctrine of purgatory is against Milner here. "It may be," says this illustrious father and saint, "that the whole of St. Peter's statement concerning the spirits in prison, who believed not in the days of Noah, has no reference whatever to hell, (*ad inferos*,) but rather to those times of which he has transferred the example to our own." He had no idea whatever that *Purgatory* was taught by the passage. St. Jerome in his commentary on Isaiah (chapter liv.) observes that "Christ preached to the spirits in prison, when the patience of God waited in the days of Noah, bringing the flood upon the wicked." Thomas Aquinas, and the venerable Bede, give the same interpretation.

(3) The third scripture which Dr. Milner adduces in confirmation of his views is Luke xii. 59: "I tell thee thou shalt not depart thence till thou hast paid the very last mite." Bellarmine says, the mites or farthings are venial sins, the payment is human satisfaction, and the prison is purgatory. From the very face of the passage, it is clear that our great Teacher speaks of reconciliation with an offended brother, and of present and immediate reconciliation. "Be at agreement with thine adversary betimes." But even if we allow the passage to refer to a future life what doctrine could be gathered from it, but that the uttermost or very last farthing would never be paid? The stress of the argument is upon the word "*until*," and it is contended that it conveys the intimation that the last mite will be

paid ; but this comes with an ill grace from our Roman Catholic friends when we remember their interpretation of the words in the first chapter of the Gospel by St. Matthew, "*Till she brought forth her first born son.*" I will read the note from the Douay Bible : "*Till she brought forth her first born son.*—From these words Helvidius and other heretics most impiously inferred that the blessed Virgin Mary had other children besides Christ : But St. Jerome shews, by divers examples, that this expression of the Evangelist was a manner of speaking usual among the *Hebrews*, to denote by the word *until*, only what is done, without any regard to the future : Thus it is said, *Gen.* chap. viii. ver. 6 and 7. That *Noe sent forth a raven, which went forth and did not return till the waters were dried up on the earth.* That is, did not return any more. Also *Isaias*, chap. xlvi. ver. 4. God says : *I am till you grow old.* Who dare infer that God should then *cease to be* ? Also in the first book of *Maccabees*, chap. v. ver. 54. *And they went up to Mount Sion with joy, and gladness, and offered holocausts, because not one of them was slain till they had returned in peace.* That is, not one was slain, before or after they had returned.—God saith to his divine Son : *Sit on my right hand till I make thy enemies thy footstool.* Shall he sit no longer after his enemies are subdued ? Yea and for all eternity." Then again it is said, till *thou* hast paid, which greatly interferes with the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, that a man's friends, by a succession of masses, can pay these last farthings for him. Dr. Milner is not more fortunate in securing the consent of the fathers

to his interpretation of this passage than to his interpretation of the former. St. Jerome says, "He is never released from prison who does not pay the last farthing *before the end of life.*" St. Chrysostom thus paraphrases the text: "Agree with thine adversary while thou art in the way with him, that is in this life, ( $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\delta\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \beta\iota\omega$ ) for when the way is finished there is no longer time for repentance. Beware lest the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge to the avenging powers, and thou be cast into prison, *i. e.* into outer darkness." Bede says, "*until thou payest*" is put for infinity." The clear sense of the passage, as well as its patristic interpretation, are against Dr. Milner.

(4.) Another passage is advanced by the learned Doctor in proof of Purgatory, (1 Cor. iii. 13, 15,) I will read it: "Every man's work shall be manifest: for the day of the Lord shall declare *it*, because it shall be revealed in fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon: he shall receive a reward. If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Those who were present at the first lecture of this course, have not yet forgotten the manifold views of the fathers on this very passage. Before we speak particularly of these views, it will perhaps be well to look at the passage itself. You observe then, (1st,) that the fire of which the Apostle speaks, is not purgatorial, but probatory. "The fire shall *try*, not purge or purify man's work. (2nd,) That the passage proves too much, for it says *every* man's work shall be tried. Now the doctrine

of the Catholic Church, is that the wicked will not go to purgatory, and that baptized infants do not go to purgatory; but EVERY MAN'S work will be tried by that fire of which Paul speaks. Therefore it is not, it *cannot* be purgatory. "Chrysostom and Theophylact," says Bellarmine, "understand the apostle to speak of eternal fire." "Others," says the Cardinal, "understand the fire of the conflagration of the world."

(5.) The last passage which Dr. Milner brings forward is Matthew xii. 32, it is that which contains the denunciation of Christ concerning blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, viz: that it "shall not be forgiven either in this world or in the world to come;" which words he says, clearly imply that some sins are forgiven in the world to come. But, I ask, what has purgatory to do with forgiveness? Nothing whatever according to the Church of Rome. Forgiveness is granted *in this life*; such at least is the Catholic doctrine. But look for a moment at the illogical character of the Doctor's reasoning. On the same principle you may argue that because it may be said the crime of murder will not be approved either in this world or in the world that is to come, some other crimes will be approved in the world to come. Cardinal Bellarmine was candid enough to allow that the inference does not follow from the premises, and therefore that any reasoning upon the passage for this purpose is altogether illogical. ("*Non sequi secundum regulas dialecticorum.*")

Although in my first lecture I clearly proved the non-canonical character of the Apocryphal books, and that they are therefore without authority in the establishment

of any doctrine, I do not feel disposed to avoid the consideration of that favorite text which our Roman Catholic friends adduce from 2 Maccabees, xii., 43. "And making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection." But I must first remind you of the authority which I then advanced for the rejection of the Apocrypha. I showed you that Eusebius, the most ancient historian of the Church, rejected the Apocrypha; that Origen rejected it; that the Council of Laodicea rejected all the books but Baruch; and that St. Cyril and St. Athanasius followed the same course. I might have added then, but I do it now, that Pope Gregory the Great, the most illustrious of all Roman Catholic Pontiffs, rejected these two books of the Maccabees. And yet the Roman Catholic is the old religion! Yet is it the unchangeable religion! Yet is it the infallible religion! Yet is it the apostolic religion! Notwithstanding that St. Gregory, in the year 590, rejects the authority of that book upon which the doctrine of purgatory chiefly rests!

Having said thus much, we will take our Roman Catholic friends upon their own ground, and will simply remind them, that those on whose behalf prayers are here said to be offered, died in idolatry, which is a mortal sin, and that therefore neither purgatory nor prayers could afford them relief, even on Roman Catholic principles.

We have thus examined the scriptural ground upon which purgatory rests. You have been conducted into a patient investigation of at least the strongest

scriptural evidences which Roman Catholics themselves alledge, and I now ask with confidence, "What are they all?" Where is this doctrine of purgatory? It is not here; the Word of God disavows it; there is not left upon another one stone of the whole foundation upon which this mysterious and fiery fabric is constructed; they lie scattered at our feet; they are gone! The glaring bubble is so attenuated and brittle that it cannot survive a scriptural handling; the first touch of the word of God causes it to explode! Where, I repeat, do you find the doctrine of purgatory? Wherever else you find it, it is not in this BIBLE.

SECONDLY.—Roman Catholics, in contending for the existence of purgatory, build much upon the practices and opinions of antiquity; but notwithstanding this boast, we protest against the doctrine on the authority of the early fathers of the Church.

Not that we deny the *antiquity* of the doctrine. Plato taught it in his day, and Virgil, the Latin poet, in the sixth book of the *Æneid*, furnishes a description of purgatory which so nearly resembles the relations furnished by Bellarmine, as to make it difficult to conceive that the moderns did not borrow from the ancient pagan poet.—

“ For this are various penances enjoined,  
 And some are hung to bleach upon the wind—  
 Some plunged in waters, others purged in fires,  
 Till all the dregs are drained, and all the rust expires.  
 All have their manes and those manes bear,  
 'The few so cleansed to those abodes repair,  
 And breathe in ample fields the soft Elysian air,

Then are they happy, when by length of time  
The scurf is worn away of each committed crime ;  
No speck is left of their habitual stains,  
But the pure ether of the soul remains."

Dr. Milner refers to this extract, and says that it only shows how conformable the doctrine is to the dictates of natural religion? He forgets that he might plead for the practices of idolatry, or indeed any other Heathenish custom, on the same ground.

Our Roman Catholic friends, however, when they refer to antiquity, mean by this expression, the ancient Church of Christ. Now while we contend that there existed in the Church at a very early period, especially after the second century, many errors, and that many a theological vagary was entertained, we are yet prepared to maintain that the doctrine of purgatory was not known to the Christian Church for the first six centuries of its existence, nor even at the end of this period, in the sense in which it is now held by Roman Catholics. We readily admit, however, that some of the early practices and opinions of the Church prepared the way for the doctrine as it appeared in its full growth in the Councils of Florence and of Trent.

We mention three :—

*First.*—*The practice of praying for the dead ;* a practice which commenced in the second century and which probably was introduced by converts from Paganism, who, before their conversion to Christianity, were not strangers to the rite. The notions which these ancient Christians entertained were, however, widely different from those purgatorial doctrines which obtain in the

modern Roman Catholic Church. Their belief was as ours is, that the felicity of the saints is capable of augmentation even now, and that, at the day of resurrection this augmentation will infallibly take place; so they were wont to pray for all the departed saints without exception. Now though we do not believe that the scriptures furnish any warrant for such a practice, we can yet conceive of its being followed without the remotest idea of purgatorial punishment and satisfaction. Our Roman Catholic friends believe that the Virgin Mary never entered purgatory, that the apostles too escaped this fiery ordeal, and that martyrs also go immediately to heaven; if then this is their belief, I have at hand an incontrovertible proof that praying for the dead did not involve the modern Roman Catholic notion of purgatory. What will our friends say to the following prayer taken out of the liturgy of St. Gregory: "Vouchsafe O Lord to be mindful of all the Saints who have pleased thee from the beginning; of our Holy Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, and those who have published the Gospel to thy Church, and of all the spirits of the just, who having finished their course have departed in the faith. But especially of the Holy and Glorious ever Virgin Mother of God, and of Holy John, the forerunner, Baptist and Martyr, and Stephen, the first deacon and Protomartyr, &c." Every one will immediately perceive the difference between praying thus for ALL the righteous dead, and praying that some of the righteous dead may speedily be delivered from the pains and flames of purgatory. To the same effect are the liturgies of St. Basil

and St. Chrysostom, in both of which the name of the Virgin Mary is introduced.

*Second.*—An opinion of the early fathers which prepared the way for the doctrine of purgatory, and which many orthodox Christians still maintain, is that *there is a separate state (HADES) for the spirits of the departed*, where they exist in conscious happiness or misery until the resurrection, when their happiness or misery will be completed, according as they died in faith or impenitency. Tertullian in his treatise on the resurrection says, “No one when he departs out of the body dwells immediately with the Lord, except it be from the prerogative of martyrdom, but his abode will be in paradise, not in hell.” St. Augustine says, “The time which intervenes between a man’s death and the last resurrection, keeps souls in hidden receptacles, according as each is deserving of repose or sorrow, in consideration of that which it has obtained while living in the flesh.” It will scarcely be affirmed that in this notion the doctrine of purgatory is involved, for it is held in the present day by thousands who reject this Roman Catholic dogma.

*Third.*—The opinion which prevailed, that at the day of judgment all believers, as well as sinners, including the Virgin Mary and Apostles, will have to undergo a *probatorial* fire, prepared the way for the reception of the doctrine of an immediate purgatorial fire, but neither of these doctrines is involved in the other.

It is not for us, at this time at least, either to defend or to refute these opinions and practices of the Church in former ages; it is enough if we have shown that

they have no necessary connection with the doctrine of purgatory.

And now I ask, could Ambrose have believed this doctrine while writing the following words :—"Death is a haven of rest, and makes not our condition worse ; but, according as it finds every man, so it reserves him to the judgment to come." Could Jerome be a believer in the doctrine while he penned the following consolatory words to Marcella, on the death of Lea : "Instead of her short trouble, she is already in the enjoyment of eternal blessedness." And even as to Augustine, whose works are esteemed by Roman Catholics, the stronghold of this doctrine, how loosely must he have held it, to have said "such a matter as a middle state for purgatory *might be inquired into*:" but he afterwards affirms: "We read of heaven and of hell; but the third place we are utterly ignorant of; yea, we find it is not in Scripture." Listen to St. Cyprian, speaking of departed brethren: "They should," says he, "be regretted, not mourned, nor should black garments be assumed here, since they have put on white robes there." But why should I multiply quotations, since Roman Catholic divines of the greatest eminence have acknowledged that there is no ground on which to plead the antiquity of the doctrine? The celebrated Fisher informs us, "That in the ancient fathers there is either none at all, or very rare mention of purgatory: that, by the Grecians it is not believed to this day; that the Latins, not all at once, but step by step received it; that purgatory being so lately known, it is not to be wondered that in the first times of the Church, there

was no use of indulgences." Alphonsus de Castro is candid enough to say: "Many things are known to us of which the ancients were altogether ignorant, as purgatory, indulgences, &c." And Cardinal Cajetan is equally explicit: "We have not, by writing, any authority either of the Holy Scriptures or ancient doctors, Greek or Latin, which affords us any knowledge of purgatory."

On how insecure a basis then does this doctrine of purgatory rest! The Scriptures are against it; the earlier fathers, with all their crude notions respecting a future state, are not in favour of it; the more modern Confessors, Martyrs, Cardinals, Bishops, and Doctors rescind its claim to antiquity; and yet it is held and maintained, by the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, as a doctrine, the denial of which will bring down upon our heads the curse of God! Because, Protestants deny, with Cardinal Cajetan, the authority of Scripture for this doctrine—the Council of Trent anathematizes us! Because Protestants follow the opinion of Cardinal Fisher, that purgatory is a doctrine lately known, the Council of Trent excludes us from salvation! Is this charitable? Is it consistent? Is it Christian?

There is one view of the doctrine of purgatory which has always impressed me with its unsoundness; and that is its utter inconsistency with the purposes of Divine grace. The gospel offers its blessings—ALL its blessings, without money and without price. Salvation is here declared to be by the free grace of God. In the Roman Catholic Church it is not without money and

without price. Indulgences and masses are, if not ostensibly, yet really sold and purchased, and so salvation, at least in part, is made to depend, not upon the boundless love of God, but upon the wealth of its members. Reason as you will, if relief from purgatory is to be obtained by charities and masses, the rich in the Roman Catholic Church have an advantage which is denied to the poor. How this doctrine is made to accord with the words of the Saviour, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God," I have not discovered. In what a position are the Catholic poor placed by this doctrine of the Church? Under what bondage must they groan, when they contemplate their prospects in the painful abodes of purgatory? How deeply must they feel the disadvantage of their poverty. Their rich brethren can pay for *thousands* of masses; they can hardly pay for *five* or perhaps *one*. Can you then wonder that when a poor and feeble Roman Catholic trudges our cities and towns begging for bread, that even from the scanty pittance which he obtains, he should lay aside a portion for the purpose of securing as many masses as possible for the welfare of his soul? My Roman Catholic friends know that this is no uncommon occurrence. I met a few weeks ago with an instance of a poor infirm Roman Catholic who sought and procured alms from a member of my congregation, and who confessed that he had already in store several dollars, which he intended to devote to the saying of masses for the speedier deliverance of his soul from purgatory. I dare to say that I am speaking to many who have long felt this

bondage, the bondage induced by the conviction that poverty will be the occasion of their remaining in purgatory and suffering its dreaded pains longer than some of their richer brethren! We solemnly protest against this doctrine, it is opposed to the genius of the Gospel—evangelical inconsistency is stamped upon its very face. Where do you find it in the New Testament? Tell me in what cities the apostles and early ministers of the gospel established purgatorian societies? Tell me in what apostolic epistle the members of the primitive Church are asked to contribute their money to save the souls of departed believers out of purgatory? Give me one instance out of the New Testament in which Christians said masses to help the souls of Christ's people suffering in purgatory—and with this intention we will at once institute a daily mass in this Church. If I am addressing this evening one Roman Catholic who is so poor as not to be able to accomplish his wish in respect to the number of masses to be hereafter said for his soul, I would direct that misguided individual to the infinite satisfaction of Christ's sacrifice, to the infinite fountain of God's love, to the gracious promise of the gospel, "Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely," and to that blessed declaration which delivered from the bondage and fear of purgatory the Roman Catholic lady of Poplar, "Happy are the dead who die in the Lord."

My dear hearers, Protestant and Catholic, let me exhibit to you this evening that gospel purgatory in which, without money and without price, you may be cleansed from all your sin: from its guilt, from its

pollution ; that purgatory in which you may be delivered from its temporal and spiritual and eternal condemnation. You know to what I allude—not to FIRE—but to the purgatorial fountain of CHRIST'S BLOOD. To this fountain would I lead you all. It has been opened for sin and for uncleanness ; it is still open—open for you—for ALL—it flows from Calvary to every spot of our earth—

“ Its streams the whole creation reach,  
So plenteous is the store,  
Enough for all, enough for each,  
Enough for evermore.”

I would take you by the hand this evening, I would lead you to the Cross of Christ, to his open bleeding side, to the very edge of this fountain, and I would implore you with all the guilt you have contracted and with all the stains of pollution, which defile your souls, to plunge by faith into its streams, and then, though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow, though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. Oh cover yourselves with the cleansing blood of your Redeemer, and rise in life and purity. Thousands and myriads have already proved its efficacy. David, the backslider, washed in this fountain, and came out with a clean heart;—Peter who denied his Lord washed in it;—Paul the chief of sinners bathed his guilty soul in its flowing streams;—The four-and-twenty Elders who are before the throne plunged themselves here, and now the burden of their song is, “Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us unto God by thy blood;”—The great multitude referred to in the text, whom no man could number, whom John

saw standing before the throne and singing, "Salvation to our God and to the Lamb," passed through the same fountain, "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Follow them! There is no other way; there is no other purgation. The satisfaction that you need is *HERE*, the cleansing that you need is *HERE*, the purity that you need is *HERE*. God help you to wash your robes and to make them white in this precious blood!

But though there is no purgatory after death there is a fearful, an eternal Hell, in which the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched. Listen to the following passage from the Douay Bible:—"The fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, they shall have their portion in the pool burning with fire and brimstone, which is the second death."

And there is a Heaven where now the souls of believers dwell with Jesus. They are absent from the body, but are present with the Lord—happy, peaceful, at rest.

"Far from a world of grief and sin,  
With God eternally shut in."

Perhaps they were poor, but now they hunger no more, they thirst no more;—perhaps they were afflicted sufferers, but there is no more sickness, no more pain;—perhaps they watered their couch with their tears, but God has wiped them all away. Into this heaven "There shall not enter anything defiled, or that worketh abomination or maketh a lie, but they that are written in the Lamb's book of life."

Whither then are you tending? In which way are you walking? In the way of holiness, or in the way of sin? In the broad road that leadeth to destruction, or in the narrow way that leadeth unto life? To hell with all its terrors, or to heaven with its endless joys? Do you ask how you are to solve this problem? Let me again demand, Have you forsaken your sins? Have you repented? Have you mourned in penitence before your God? Have you gone to the Cross for salvation? Have your hearts been changed by the Spirit of God? Are you living in holiness and righteousness? If not, be you Protestant or Catholic, you have no right to hope for heaven. You are hastening to destruction. Oh! will you live and die in your sins? Remember, as the tree falls so it lies. "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest." Are you trembling before God on account of your sins and in prospect of hell, are you saying:

" Shall I amidst a ghastly band,  
 Dragged to the judgment seat,  
 Far on the left with horror stand,  
 My fearful doom to meet?"

Is this your language? I reply:

" Ah! no, you still may turn and live,  
 For still his wrath delays;  
 He now vouchsafes a kind reprieve,  
 And offers you his grace."



## LECTURE X.

### PROTESTANTISM.

As this is to be the last Lecture of the course, I shall, perhaps, be excused if I offer two or three general observations before entering upon the discussion of our prescribed subject :

*First*, then, I would remark, that these lectures did not originate in any combination, on the part of the Protestant Churches of this city, against the doctrines which are held by our Roman Catholic Brethren. They were not even undertaken by desire of that portion of Christ's Church with which the speaker is associated. No one belonging either to another Church or to his own suggested their delivery. Without suggestion, and almost without consultation, they were determined upon by him, just as in the retirement of his own closet, and with earnest prayer for the Holy Spirit's guidance, he is accustomed to select those subjects upon which he discourses in his ordinary ministrations. He had long felt that an exposition of the grounds upon which the system of Protestantism rests might be given with great advantage to the members of his own congregation, and that although discourses of a strictly and entirely controversial nature are not usually favorable to the advancement of spiritual religion, yet that there would be a possibility of so illustrating and enforcing the

great principles of Protestant Christianity as that they should become spiritually and practically beneficial. He also thought, and not without foundation, that if an announcement of such a design were made, some candid and intelligent Roman Catholics, of whom there are many in the city, might be disposed to come and examine for themselves the principles of that great and growing system which they are taught to regard as the world's greatest curse.

The *Second* observation relates to the spirit in which this exposition has been conducted. The speaker appeals with confidence to the thousands of all classes who have listened to these lectures, that the professions with which he commenced the course have been faithfully maintained. It is a great comfort to his mind, in the review of the labours and anxieties which have attended this investigation, that he has not been betrayed into even a slight departure from the principle on which he thus set out. He may also be allowed to say, that during these ten weeks of thought and research there has been a rapid growth of the conviction which he often expressed before, that all religious controversies should be conducted in the spirit of Christian Charity, that the apostle's words, "*Speaking the truth in love,*" should be the motto of every theological controversialist, and that until he is prepared to inscribe these words upon his banner, he ought not to enter the field of polemical warfare. He is free to confess that, on both sides, the controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants has often been carried on in a spirit of virulence and abuse, which cannot be defended on simply philosophical

much less on Christian principles, and which can never be productive of spiritual benefit.

*Thirdly*,—As to the spirit in which these lectures have been received. The speaker is thankful to that gracious Being, from whom proceedeth every good and perfect gift, for the spirit of inquiry and attentiveness which has been manifested throughout the whole course. It has rejoiced him to observe that Protestants take so deep an interest in the maintenance of their principles, and he has been especially gratified to know that many of his Roman Catholic friends have so far thrown aside their prejudices as to consent to enter a Protestant Church, and to hear for themselves the Protestant side of the question. It augurs well for future discussions, so at least the speaker thinks, that so orderly and decorous a behaviour has characterized the very mixed and crowded audiences which it has been his privilege to address, the more so, that there have come under his own observation facts which prove that in many instances, Roman Catholics have listened to the arguments and appeals that have been advanced with an earnest and candid desire to inquire into the truth as it is in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

*Fourthly*,—As to the results of this effort; the preacher leaves these to the influence of that Divine Spirit in whose strength the work was undertaken; it may, however, be permitted him to hope that these results will be beneficial. One effect, probably, will be the cultivation of a better state of feeling between our Protestant and Roman Catholic fellow citizens. They will, perhaps, understand each other better. Roman

Catholics will be convinced that they have Protestant brethren around them who can defend their own principles without descending to abuse; and Protestants will learn that there are in the community candid Catholics who are disposed to hear with attention what may be said on both sides of the great questions on which they differ. Another effect will be the establishment of Protestants in the principles of their own faith. It is gratifying to know that this effect has been already produced to a very large extent. It is a result much to be desired in the present day because of the insidious and unworthy attempts which are now made to destroy the foundations of Protestantism, by THE JESUITS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME, whose principles are as thoroughly detested by liberal and enlightened Catholics, as they are by Protestants. It is not too much to expect that another effect of these lectures will be an acknowledgment on the part of our Roman Catholic friends, grounded upon sincere conviction, that, without reference to sectional peculiarities, the great principles of Protestantism are sustained by the Bible, and by the most ancient authorities of the Church. The speaker has already heard of conviction of the truth of Protestantism in some minds, and of wavering in others respecting the scriptural verity of Roman Catholicism, and he prays that the light which has thus pierced the darkness may become by the power of the Holy Spirit, so intense as that its last remaining gloom may be dispelled! May we not also hope that one other result will follow? Why should we not expect and believe that the gospel seed which has been thus sown in so

many Protestant and Catholic hearts shall bring forth fruit? Why should we refrain from casting ourselves upon the divine announcement, "My word shall not return unto me void?" We will not refrain from thus trusting the word of the living God; we will believe that many Roman Catholics and Protestants shall become, not Methodists, not Episcopalians, not Presbyterians, but humble and penitent believers in the merits of Jesus, and faithful followers of the Lamb. God grant that it may be even so!

The words which I have selected for a text you may find in the third verse of the epistle of Jude.

"I WAS UNDER A NECESSITY TO WRITE UNTO YOU : TO BESEECH YOU TO CONTEND EARNESTLY FOR THE FAITH ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS."

The terms in which the subject of this lecture has been announced, oblige me to define Protestantism. What is it? Roman Catholics say it is a system of negations. They also perpetuate that stale objection, which, by the way, is assertion only and not argument, that Protestantism is a new religion. Now, if Roman Catholics desire to know from those who employ the term what is meant by Protestantism, our reply is, not Lutheranism, not Calvinism, not Arminianism, but "THE FAITH ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS." Listen to the first few verses of this epistle and you will find that St. Jude exhorts the Christians to whom he wrote, to *protest* against certain novelties which had been already introduced into the Christian Church. "Dearly beloved, taking all care to write unto you concerning your common salvation, I was under a necessity to write

unto you : to beseech you to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. For certain men are secretly entered in (who were written of long ago unto this judgment) ungodly men, turning the grace of our Lord God into riotousness, and denying the holy sovereign Ruler, and our Lord JESUS CHRIST."

I suppose it will not be denied by either Protestants or Catholics, that it is both the duty and the privilege of Christians earnestly to contend for the apostolic faith. Now it appears to me that in the nine lectures to which you have already listened, the leading principles of Protestantism have been undeniably proved to be in accordance both with the Holy Scriptures, and with the ancient authorities of the Church. I would remind you that no argument advanced during this discussion has been founded upon Protestant authorities. If I have quoted from the Bible in support of any Protestant doctrine, I have adopted either the Vulgate or the Douay Version. If I have had occasion to refer to history, Roman Catholic historians have been uniformly selected. If I have described the doctrines of the Church of Rome, I have employed the language of its most eminent members, and usually the very words of its canons and formularies. And yet, notwithstanding that I have thus left Protestant ground, and have fought the battle within the Roman Catholic territory, I repeat that the truth of the leading principles of Protestantism has been thoroughly demonstrated.

I shall adopt the following order in the investigation of the subject: first, I shall prove that Protestantism is the old religion; secondly, that the state of the

Roman Catholic Church in the sixteenth century educed that development of pre-existent principles which resulted in the Reformation ; and thirdly, I shall reply to some objections that may not have been fully met in the consideration of the previous investigations.

FIRST, then, I am to prove that PROTESTANTISM IS THE OLD RELIGION.

I need not occupy much of your time in exhibiting to you the doctrines of Protestantism, for this is what we have been doing for the last nine Sabbath evenings. Perhaps the *leading* principle of the Protestant religion is the absolute sufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith ; this is the foundation of the whole superstructure. Our appeal for the truth of any doctrine, or the authority of any practice is not to creeds, and canons, and articles, and confessions, and catechisms, and liturgies, but to this glorious fountain of immutable truth, THE BIBLE. And because we believe that the doctrines which I shall now announce are taught in, and may be proved by this divine Book, we acknowledge them to be the articles of our creed. These doctrines are, *The existence and trinity of God.* Is this a negation ? *The totally fallen and corrupt condition of man.* Is this a negation ? *The redemption of the whole world by Christ.* Is this a negation ? *The incarnation of Christ by the Virgin Mary.* Is this a negation ? *The crucifixion of Christ, and his one sacrifice for sin.* Is this a negation ? *The resurrection of Christ and his ascension into heaven.* Is this a negation ? *The intercession of Christ and his sole Mediatorship.* Is this a negation ? *The possibility of a*

*sinner's justification and holiness.* Is this a negation? *The necessity of repentance and faith in order to salvation.* Is this a negation? *The personality, office and work of the Holy Spirit.* Is this a negation? *The last and general judgment.* Is this a negation? *The eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal misery of the unbelieving.* Are these negations? These are the truths or doctrines upon which we have been dilating, and I am much mistaken if it has not been proved to the satisfaction of most of my hearers, that novelty is not the characteristic of Protestantism, but rather of Roman Catholicism. Need I remind you that the most ancient Creeds of the Church are freely subscribed by Protestants? The Apostles' Creed, as it is usually called, and the Nicene Creed, are the Creeds of Protestantism; and why we are anathematized when we are prepared to adopt that only profession of faith which was used in the first few centuries of the Christian Church, is a question which I pretend not to solve. If Protestantism is a novelty, then is the Apostles' Creed a novelty. If Protestantism is a novelty, a thing of yesterday, then may the same be predicated of the formulary of the Nicene Fathers. If Protestantism is a novelty, then is much that the fathers of the church wrote a novelty; for inconsistent with themselves and with each other, as they frequently are, they favour more the doctrines of Protestantism than those of the Trentine Council. Roman Catholic controversialists have expended their curses upon Luther for preaching the doctrine of justification by faith only, while St. Hilary in his ninth canon upon Matthew, says, "Faith only justifieth;" and

St. Basil in his Homily on Humility : " This is a perfect and whole rejoicing in God when a man acknowledgeth himself to be justified by the only faith in Christ ;" and St. Ambrose : " This is the ordinance of God that they which believe in Christ should be saved, without works, by faith only, receiving remission of their sins." Is there any novelty, therefore, in the Protestant doctrine of salvation by faith only ? The defenders of the Roman Catholic faith have showered their sneers upon Protestants for asserting the Bible to be the only rule of faith. Now listen to St. Augustine : " For whereas the Lord had done many things, all were not written ; for the same Evangelist John testifies that he both said and did many things which are not written, *but those things were selected to be written which were thought sufficient for the salvation of believers.*"—*On Gospel of John*, xx. v. 30. Jerome also may be quoted ; " The Church of Christ which has Churches in the whole world, is united by the unity of the spirit, and has the cities of the law, the prophets, the gospel, and the apostles ; she has not gone forth from her BOUNDARIES, that is," he continues, " from the Holy Scriptures." Origen says, " As all gold, whatsoever it be, that is without the temple is not holy ; so every sense which is without the Divine Scripture, however admirable it may appear to some, is not holy, because it is foreign to the Scripture." (25th Homily on Matthew). Hear also the following triumphant defence of this great bulwark of Protestantism from St. Cyril of Jerusalem : " NOT EVEN THE LEAST OF THE DIVINE AND HOLY MYSTERIES OF THE FAITH OUGHT TO BE HANDED DOWN WITHOUT THE DIVINE

SCRIPTURES." Will Roman Catholics in the face of these extracts from their own revered fathers ever again taunt Protestants with the novelty of *this* doctrine?

This charge of novelty comes with an ill grace from those who have invested the novelties of the Council of Trent with the authority of inspiration, and have anathematized all those who dare to dissent from them. Novelty belongs to the Church of Rome. What will our friends say to this passage from Justin Martyr, and how will they make it agree with the doctrines of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass? "I also affirm," says he, in his dialogue with Trypho, "that the prayers and praises of the saints are the *only* perfect sacrifices acceptable to God. For these only have the Christians undertaken to perform, and by the commemoration of *the wet and dry food*, in which we call to mind the sufferings which the God of gods suffered through Him, whose name the High Priest and Scribes have caused to be profaned and blasphemed throughout the earth." Listen to Eusebius, of Cesarea: "He gave again to his disciples the *symbols* of the Divine economy, and he commanded them to make the *image* of his own body." Again: "He appointed them to use bread as a *symbol* of his own body." To this agree the words of Tertullian: "The bread which he had taken and distributed to his disciples he made his body, by saying, 'This is my body,' that is, the *figure* of my body." And yet the Church of Rome pleads antiquity in support of her doctrines, and attempts to affix upon Protestantism the stigma of novelty. Novelty

belongs to the Church of Rome. You heard enough last Sabbath to prove to you that purgatory is a novelty; I ask you, however, to listen again to ancient testimony on this doctrine. Chrysostom, in his second homily on Lazarus, says: "When we shall be departed out of this life, there is then no room for repentance; nor will it be in our power to wash out any spots we have contracted, or to purge away any one of the evils we have committed." To whom then justly attaches this stigma of novelty? To the Council of Trent, which anathematizes those who deny the doctrine of purgatory, or to the Protestant community, which declares it to be contrary to both Scripture and antiquity? St. Cyprian in his sermon on mortality, says: "The just, when they die, are called to a place of shelter and rest;" and Gregory Nazianzen affirms, that "the souls of good people when they are freed from the body, do forthwith enjoy an incredible pleasure, and joyfully fly unto the Lord." Novelty belongs to the Church of Rome. Auricular confession is a favourite doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. Is it however sustained by antiquity? Listen to Chrysostom in his fifth sermon on the incomprehensible nature of God: "For this reason I entreat, and beseech, and pray you to confess continually to God. For I do not bring thee into the theatre of thy fellow-servants, nor do I compel thee to discover thy sins to men. Uncover your conscience to God, and seek a cure from him." Again, he says in his sermon on Repentance and Confession, fifth volume of his works: "But now it is not necessary to confess your sins to witnesses who are present; let the inquiry

of thy offences be made in thy thought, let this judgment be without a witness, LET GOD ONLY SEE THEE CONFESSING." Novelty belongs to the Church of Rome. The necessity of subordinate mediators to facilitate our access to the Father and the Son, is a universally acknowledged doctrine of the Roman Church: What then will be said to the following declaration of Chrysostom: "When we want any thing from men, we have need of cost and money, and servile adulation, and much going up and down, and great ado. For it falleth out oftentimes that we cannot go straight unto the lords themselves and present our gifts unto them and speak with them, but it is necessary for us first to procure the favour of their ministers, and stewards, and officers, both by payments and words, and all other means; and then by their mediation to obtain our request. But with God it is not thus, for there is no need of intercessors for the petitioners; *neither is he so ready to give a gracious answer when entreated by others as by ourselves praying unto Him.*" Can you wonder at our reiterating the assertion that NOVELTY BELONGS TO THE CHURCH OF ROME? I might advance other and equally convincing extracts from the Fathers in proof of my position, but these will suffice. I know what our Roman Catholic friends will reply—they will say that they can produce passages from the Fathers equally corroborative of the truth of *their* doctrines; now suppose we were to grant this; how would the concession serve the interests of Roman Catholicism? It would at once convict the Fathers of the Church of inconsistency with each other and with themselves, and there-

fore of being unworthy witnesses in support of Roman Catholic pretensions. We are not careful whether the defenders of the Church of Rome select this or the other horn of the dilemma.

But if such sentiments as these pervaded the writings of the Fathers, and if novelty is the characteristic of many of the peculiar dogmas of the Church of Rome, might we not expect to find, before the days of Luther, some indications of the existence of the old Apostolic faith, as Protestants call it? Is it probable, is it even possible, that intelligent ecclesiastics, should tamely submit to the introduction of novelties? That with the Bible and the Fathers in their libraries, there should not have been some protests against doctrinal innovations? We reply that such a thing is not probable, and scarcely possible. We reply, further, that such a thing did not exist. This old religion, the religion of the Bible and of Protestantism was in existence before the Reformation of the sixteenth century; and nothing but ignorance of his own authors, or unwarrantable effrontery, could lead a Roman Catholic to propound to a Protestant the oft repeated and oft answered question—"Where was your religion before Luther?" The Protestant answer to this demand is "IN THE BIBLE!" But we shall give another answer to the question, and one which will convict the enemies of Protestantism of unscrupulous misrepresentation. Why then, I ask, but that resistance was made to the dogmas and practices of the Church, were laws enacted against heretics? Why was Wickliffe denounced 150 years before the Reformation, but that he protested against

the novelties of the Roman Catholic Church, and appealed to the Bible as the only source of truth? Why were Huss and Jerome of Prague martyred at the stake, but that the truths which Wickliffe taught were influencing them against the encroachments of Rome?

But let us go back to the thirteenth century, and let us ask why were the Waldenses persecuted and slaughtered? Let Rainerius, the persecutor of these noble people, himself declare: "They are the most formidable enemies of the Church of Rome, because they have a great appearance of godliness, because they live righteously before men, believe rightly of God in all things, and hold all the articles of the creed; yet they hate and revile the Church of Rome, and in their accusations are easily believed by the people." Mark this; the chief ground of the treatment which they received at the hands of the Church of Rome was not immorality, not a renunciation of the articles of the Christian faith, but an inveterate hatred to the practices of the Roman Church. And whence did these Alpine Christians and martyrs derive their faith? Was it a late importation into the valleys and fastnesses which they peopled? This same Rainerius, the inquisitor, says again: "That sect is the most dangerous of all heretics, because it is of the longest duration, for some say that it has continued to flourish since the time of Sylvester, others from the times of the apostles." Cassini, an Italian priest, testifies that he "found it handed down that the Vaudois were as ancient as the Christian Church." Campian, the Jesuit, collected that they were said to be "more ancient than the Roman Church;" and the monk,

Belvidere, in his inquisitorial reports, laments that "these heretics have been found at all periods of history in the valley of Angrogna." And what were the doctrines of the church against which these confessedly ancient Christians protested? Purgatory, images, the invocation of saints, the sacrifice of the mass, transubstantiation, the authority and decrees of the Bishop of Rome.

"Where was your religion before Luther?" is the demand. Where? In the writings and experience of those nonconformists of whom, in the year 1153, Bernard of Clairvaux spoke, who he says were then disturbing the Latin Church. Where was our religion before Luther? We point our inquirers to the valleys of Piedmont, and ask them to contemplate it in the purity of life, and in the patient endurance of suffering for Christ, which were manifested by their noble inhabitants. Listen, and our religion will become vocal in the groans of the hundreds and the thousands of that noble race who were slaughtered for the testimony of Jesus. Where was our religion before Luther? Go to Oxford and follow the pen of Wickliffe in his remonstrances against the encroachments of Rome, in his scriptural expositions of truth, and in his translating the Scriptures into the Vulgar tongue. Here, in the writings of the "Gospel Doctor," as he was derisively called, you see something of the Protestant religion, and yet he lived one hundred and sixty-two years before Luther! Where was our religion? In the writings and opinions of St. Anselm who taught his people to die "trusting only in the merit of Jesus Christ." Where was our religion before

Luther? Go to Bâle in Germany, and you will see it engraved on a painted window by an ancient Bishop of that city, Christopher of Utenheim, in these words:—“My hope is the cross of Christ; I seek grace and not works.” Where was our religion before Luther? Read its evangelical and simple principles in the following confession of a poor Carthusian monk:—“O God most charitable! I know that I cannot be saved and satisfy thy justice, otherwise than through the merit, the innocent passion, and the death of thy well beloved Son. Pious Jesus, all my salvation is in thy hands. Thou canst not turn from me the hands of thy love, for they have created, formed and redeemed me.” Where was our religion before Luther? The dungeons of the inquisition and its instruments of torture, the cries of its penitents and the groans of its martyrs, the stakes and the faggots and the gridirons and the cauldrons which were in use ere Luther was born, declare with resistless testimony that long before his day the blessed light of Protestantism dawned upon the world’s dark ages.

Where then, I demand, is the justice or even the consistency of declaring the doctrines of Protestantism to be the invention of Luther? Any man who has read history but slightly must know, that, by such an assertion, he convicts himself of insincerity and falsehood. And what becomes of the taunt of novelty against Protestantism in the face of the fact which has been more than once established in these lectures, that Roman Catholic writers themselves acknowledge the existence of doctrines and practices in their Church which were unknown to antiquity? But we will take our friends

on their own ground ; we will suppose that the system of religion which we have adopted and which we advocate was constituted by Luther, we will suppose that novelty is the characteristic of Protestantism and that Roman Catholicism can justly boast her antiquity, yet will the following words of Tertullian, even on this ground, overthrow the pretensions of the Church of Rome, and with them we shall close this branch of the lecture :—"As the doctrine of a Church, when it is diverse from, or contrary to that of the apostles, shows it not to be an apostolic Church, though it pretend to be founded by an apostle : So those churches that cannot produce any of the apostles, or apostolical men for their founders, (being much later and newly constituted) yet conspiring in the same faith, are nevertheless to be accounted apostolical Churches, because of the CON-SANGUINITY OF DOCTRINE." I am now to show

## II. THAT THE CORRUPT STATE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME EDUCED THAT DEVELOPMENT OF PRE-EXISTENT PRINCIPLES WHICH RESULTED IN THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

This is a subject which must be painful to Roman Catholics, and yet, in justice to both the Reformers and ourselves, it must be fully considered. Whether the members of the Roman community in the present day, are, or are not prepared to admit the almost universal corruption of the church at the period to which we now refer, is not material to our purpose. It is enough for us that the testimony of eminent Roman Catholic writers of that day, is more than abundant as to the

absolute and immediate need of a general Reformation of the Church.

The corruption of the Church of Rome may be said to have commenced in the time of Gregory the Great ; and there is testimony at hand that Christendom was subsequently deluged with pollution from the papal court. Make the fountain impure and the streams will be impure. Gibbon, who will not be suspected of any leaning towards Protestantism, states on the authority of Luitprand, that for the first half of the tenth century the Popedom was in the hands of Theodora and Marozia, two abandoned women, who, rivalling each other in lewd licentiousness, deposed and installed the vicars of Christ at their pleasure. "The influence," says Gibbon "of these sisters was founded on their great wealth and beauty, their political and amorous intrigues. The most strenuous of their lovers were rewarded with the Roman mitre, and their reign may have suggested to the darker ages, the fable of a female Pope. The illegitimate son, the grand son, and the great-grand son of Marozia, a rare genealogy, were seated in the chair of Peter ; and it was at the age of nineteen years that the second of these became the head of the Latin Church. His youth and manhood were of a suitable complexion, and the nations of pilgrims could bear testimony to the charges that were urged against him in a Roman Synod, and before Otho the Great. His open simony might be the consequence of distress—his blasphemous invocations of Jupiter and Venus, if true, could not possibly be serious ; but we read with some surprise that the grandson of Marozia lived in public adultery, that the

Lateran palace was turned into a school for prostitution, and that his open seductions had deterred the female pilgrims from visiting the tomb of St. Peter, lest in the devout act, they should be violated by his successor." Gibbon, as we have already seen gives his authority for this picture, and that it is not overdrawn, appears probable from the following representation made by nine Cardinals to Pope Paul III., at a subsequent period : "In this city (Rome) prostitutes walk about as if they were goodly matrons, or they ride upon mules, and are at noon-day followed up and down by men of the best account in the families of the Cardinals, and by clergymen. We see no such degeneracy in any other city but in this which should be an example to others."

Platina, the Roman Catholic historian, acknowledges that "Boniface VII., obtained the popedom by wicked arts, and lost it by the same means ; many of the honest citizens of Rome, having conspired against him, he was glad to escape from the city, after having first robbed the church of St. Peter of all the precious jewels, rich utensils and ornaments, which he carried to Constantinople, and there sold. Subsequently, he returned to Rome, seized upon John XV. who had been chosen Pope in his absence, put out his eyes, and at length starved him to death in prison." He lived but a short time after his return, and the citizens of Rome, says Peneda, "dragged his dead body, tied by the feet, through the streets of St. John Lateran, and there left it a prey to dogs." And what shall we say of the boy Pope, Benedict IX. of whom one of his successors says,

“So base and so execrable was his life that I shudder to relate it?”

In a sermon preached by Jean Gerson, Chancellor of Paris, before the Council of Constance, he applies to the Church of Rome in his day, these words of the prophet Ezekiel, “Thou didst trust in thine own beauty and playedst the harlot because of thy renown, and pouredst out thy fornications on every one that passed by. And in all thy abominations thou hast not remembered the days of thy youth. Thou hast built thy brothel house at every head of the way, and hast made thy beauty to be abhorred. Behold therefore, I will deliver thee into the hands of those who hate thee.” He then exhorts the Council “either to reform all states of the church in a general Council, or command them to be reformed in Provincial Synods; that, by their authority, the church might be repaired, and the house of God purged from all uncleanness, vices and errors.” The desperate state of the church may be gathered also from the fact, that the College of Cardinals, at the death of Alexander VI., before they entered the conclave for the election of a new Pope, took an oath that if any of them should be chosen, he should immediately, before the publication of his election, bind himself under pain of perjury and a curse, to call a Council within two years, for the reformation of the Church. It may be well to mention that Julius III. who had taken the oath, was elected; but he violated his vow, and nine Cardinals who had suffered from his insolence, withdrew themselves from Rome and called the second Pisan Council for the purpose if possible of securing the much needed reformation. Who

will say, in the face of these testimonies that a protest against these crimes of the church was not demanded from some quarter? Who will say that by every means that would not involve sin, this pollution should have been washed away?

Listen to another representation of this polluted condition of the church from St. Bridget, a saint of high reputation in the Catholic Church, who in her celestial revelations calls the pope "the destroyer of souls, who scatters and tears the sheep of Christ." She says, "The pope is more abominable than the Jews, more cruel than Judas, more unjust than Pilate, more wicked and evil than Jupiter himself;—that his throne shall be hurled into the abyss as a great millstone, that his Cardinals shall be cast into everlasting fire and sulphur." "Of the pope," she again says, "Christ demands, 'what means that excessive pride, insatiable cupidity, and luxury which I abhor, and even a horrid whirlpool of the basest simony.'" The Pope who ought to cry, 'Come ye shall find rest for your souls,' exclaims, 'Come and see me in pomp and grandeur above Solomon's. Come to my court and empty your purses and ye shall find damnation for your souls!' for thus he doth speak by his example and conduct. Behold Rome is now a vortex of infernal mammon, where the demon of all avarice dwells, selling the patrimony of Christ which he purchased with his passion, who has told us that we should freely give because we have freely received." Speaking afterwards of the Pope, she says. "This is true justice, that the Pope who sits in the chair of Peter and does the works of the devil, should resign the seat which he

has dared to usurp, and be a partaker of the punishment of the devil."

This picture is sufficiently sickening, and I would immediately pass on to another and more grateful subject, did I not feel it to be necessary, for the sake of both Protestants and Catholics, to convey the fullest possible information respecting the condition of the Church at and before the period of the Reformation. The course usually pursued by Roman Catholics is to heap all the iniquity and all the guilt that belonged to that period, upon the Protestant Reformers. *They* were the chief sinners of that age; *they* disturbed the church in her holy quiet; *they* were worthy of condign punishment. The general opinion of Roman Catholics in the present day is that Wickliffe, and Huss, and Luther, and Calvin, and Cranmer were monsters of iniquity. What says the mild, the polite, the plausible Dr. Milner? "I have shown that patriarch Luther was the sport of his unbridled passions, pride, resentment and lust; that he was turbulent, abusive, sacrilegious, in the highest degree; that he was the trumpeter of sedition, civil war, rebellion and desolation; and finally, that by his own account, he was the scholar of Satan in the most important article of his pretended Reformation. I have made out nearly as heavy a charge against his chief followers, Zuinglius, Ochin, Calvin, Beza and Cranmer." And now let us see the measure of severity with which the kind Doctor visits the corrupt Popes and Cardinals, whose vices have been depicted by St. Bridget and other Roman Catholics. "I, as well as Baronius, Bellarmine, and other Catholic writers, have unequivocally admitted

that some few of our pontiffs have disgraced themselves by their crimes, and given just cause of scandal to Christendom; but I have remarked that the credit of our cause is not affected by the personal conduct of particular pastors who succeed one another in a regular way, in the manner that the credit of yours is by the behaviour of your founders, who professed to have received an extraordinary revelation from God to reform religion." . . . "Lastly, I grant that a few of the Popes, perhaps a tenth part of the whole number, swerving from the example of the rest, have, by their *personal vices*, disgraced their holy station: but even these Popes always fulfilled their *public duties* to the church by maintaining the *apostolical doctrine*, moral as well as speculative, the *apostolical orders*, and the *apostolical mission*; so that their misconduct chiefly injured their own souls, and did not essentially affect the church." Such is the gentleness of hand with which this Reverend Doctor touches the monstrous profligacies of the Roman Court! Why does he not imitate the candour of St. Bridget, whom he so much admires? Why—but I dare not trust myself to dilate upon this flagrant partiality on the part of this defender of "the Holy Faith."

But I must refer you to other testimonies, as to the corruption of the Popes. The celebrated Petrarch, of whom Butler, in his lives of the saints says, "His works render his name immortal," in his twentieth epistle, designates the Papal Court, "Babylon," and "the Babylonish Whore, seated upon the waters, the Mother of all idolatries and fornications, with

whom the princes and kings of the earth have committed fornication." "The asylum of heresies and errors, &c., of whom the Holy Spirit prophesied in the Apocalypse:" and amply proves the truth of that proverb, "No greater evil can ever befall a man than being elected Pope." In another place he thus writes of Rome, the Holy City: "Whatever any where you have read or heard of perfidy and fraud, whatever of cruelty and pride, whatever of uncleanness and unbridled lust; lastly, whatever of impiety and abandoned manners exists, or has existed in the whole world, from pole to pole, ALL THIS *you may see here, collected into one mass and heaped up together!*" . . . . . "I speak not," says he, "of Simony and selling the gifts of the Holy Spirit for money; I speak not of covetousness, the mother of that crime, and which is styled by the Apostle—Idolatry. I speak not of the contrivers of every lust, nor of the procurers who haunt the Papal chambers,"—But I dare not proceed.

Once more, in his tenth Epistle, being then at the Pope's court at Avignon; he says, "Whoever would truly behold it, let him come hither *and view that hell*, which poets of old did but fancy. For here is wanting no horror of imprisonment, no error of palpable darkness, no fatal urns shuffling together the lots and destinies of men: and to conclude, no imperious Minos, no tearing Minotaurus, nor lascivious portraits of damned Venus, are here rare and scarce. All hope of safety lies in gold, the cruel king of the Imperial regions is appeased with gold. The prodigious monsters that attend him are subdued with gold. For gold, the web

of human salvation is woven, only for gold are the hard thresholds of this gate, shewn; for gold the bars are broken; with gold the grizzly Porter's mouth is stopt, for gold Heaven is opened; and, what needs many words, Christ himself is sold for gold." . . . . .  
 "There the hope of a future state is some empty fable, and all that is revealed of hell, mere fabulous reports. The resurrection of the body, and the end of the world, and Christ coming to judgment, all old women's tales. Truth is there madness, and abstinence clownishness, chastity, a disgrace . . . . . *and the more foul one's life is, the more illustrious is it considered—the more wicked,—the more glorious!*"

Can we then wonder at Cardinal Baronius, when he describes the Popes of these ages as "Monstrous and infamous in their lives, dissolute in their manners, and wicked and villainous in all things?" But what has been affirmed of the Papal Court, in particular, may be said of the Clergy in general. Ecbert, a monk, says of the twelfth century, "I have inspected the Churches of the Clergy, and have found in them great and endless enormities. I have seen the cloisters of nuns which I can call by no fitter name than a snare of the devil, and lo, an alien has laid waste all, the lilies of chastity are burnt up, and a woeful destruction is every where conspicuous throughout the whole world of souls." Honorius Augustodinus, says "Look also at the nunneries, and you will see in them a chamber made ready for the beast. These, from a tender age, learn lewdness, and associate very many companions with themselves to heap up greater damnation. Like an in-

satiable whirlpool, they can never be satisfied with the filth of their uncleanness. In the fourteenth century, Alvarus Pelagius, a Roman Catholic author, wrote a work entitled "The Lament of the Church," in which he says of the Clergy :—"Many of them enter taverns without cause ; they are addicted to magical arts, augury, and divination. They carry weapons of offence ; many carry on wars. They have to do with unlawful gains ; they often practise usury. They manage the affairs of the Church badly. They bring up their children, and relatives, with the property of the church, &c. . . . . They are addicted to feasting, and drunkenness, and whoredom, *which is a common vice with them* ; and MOST OF THEM ALSO—THE SIN WHICH IS AGAINST NATURE. They give money to players, &c. ; they play at dice . . . . . They mix themselves up with secular affairs. They are not an example of good to the laity, as they ought to be, but rather the contrary ; for in the present day, commonly, the clergy ARE MORE WICKED THAN THE LAITY . . . . . Against that holy chastity which they have vowed to God, *they offend constantly, EVEN IN PUBLIC ; besides those most horrid crimes which they practise IN SECRET*, which neither my paper will receive nor my pen write . . . . . The bishops ordain priests for money . . . . . I scarcely think, especially in Spain, that out of a hundred bishops, there is one who is not a Simonist."

But I must with-hold.—I could occupy hour after hour in reading to you from Roman Catholic writers and historians, descriptions and representations of the state of the Church, that would make you blush and weep

at the degradation and pollution of our fallen humanity—pollution concealed beneath sacerdotal robes, and within the walls of sacristies and convents. Can you wonder that for years and almost centuries, the members of the Church of Rome called aloud for a Reformation of the Clergy, that the Vatican was literally assailed with remonstrances against the impurities of the Church? Is it not rather surprising that the Reformation did not assume shape and substance before the sixteenth century? Who will deny that a Reformation was needed? Who will deny that the authorities of the Church, failed to do that, which by her best members, lay and ecclesiastic, they were urged to do? Cardinals, Bishops, Saints of both sexes, Doctors, Monks and Pastors, Emperors, Kings, and Senators, called aloud for REFORMATION.

What answer did they get? The Council of Constance, which it was thought would strike the first note of Reform in the Church, imported into that city, I speak on the authority of Labbeus, a larger amount of lasciviousness and impurity than had previously existed within its walls. Seven hundred harlots followed the Constantian fathers into the City! This was the infallible Council that burned John Huss! Cardinal Hugo, in a speech which he made to the citizens of Lyons, immediately after the dissolution of the sacred Synod which was held there, boasted that at the time of the meeting, the city contained two or three brothels; but that at its departure it comprehended only one which however extended without interruption from the eastern to the western gate. And as to the

Council of Trent, its members spent more time in heaping anathemas upon the heads of Protestants than in seeking to reform the crimes of Catholics.

Will my Roman Catholic friends look at these things with candour? Will they ask themselves whether their Church, in the ages of which I have spoken, manifested the spirit and the purity of the true Church of Christ? Where was her sanctity? Where was her unity? Unless indeed we speak of unity of crime! Where was her apostolicity? Not surely in the chair of St. Peter! Where was the infallibility of the Church? Was it in the Popes? No; for we have seen that they were corrupt and debased men. Was it in the College of Cardinals? No; for they were no less depraved. Was it in the Clergy generally? History assures us that they had departed from the purity of the Gospel. Did it reside in the convents and monasteries of the Church? No; for they were the acknowledged scenes of the foulest crimes. Do you find it in the Councils of Basil or of Constance? Alas for infallibility! It is a meteor! You follow it to Rome, it is still distant from you; you imagine that it lights upon the Church of the Pontiff, but as you approach, it disappears;—you see it resting over the conclave of Cardinals, but as you draw near to admire its light and beauty, lo, it is gone! You follow it to the cities of Florence, of Constance, of Trent, surely you will reach it here, but it still shuns investigation. To return however: Do I rejoice over these crimes? God forbid that I should triumph at the abounding of iniquity. Would, I say, that the Church of Rome had

remained in her original Apostolic purity and simplicity ! Then had there been no call for a Reformation ; then had Christendom remained ONE ; but she did not ! And when she had sunk into viciousness, her authorities did not even then interfere ; but God interfered and raised up instruments of his own. The imperfect light which dawned upon Wickcliffe and Huss, increased in brightness in the days of Luther ; it was not perfect day but morning, early morning. It is not yet perfect day ; but the light is increasing, the truth is unfettered, the word of God is multiplied, the blessings of the Reformation are diffusing themselves over our dark world, and by and by, the perfect day of millennial glory will burst forth upon the Church from the Sun of Righteousness, unintercepted by any cloud of error or of darkness or of bigotry ; the Church of Christ shall be purified and perfected, made ONE and CATHOLIC, and shall acknowledge one Sovereign Pontiff, ONE SHEPHERD AND BISHOP OF SOULS, EVEN JESUS CHRIST ; so will the prophetic word be verified, "There shall be ONE FOLD AND ONE SHEPHERD." It was proposed to consider

### III. SOME OBJECTIONS WHICH MIGHT NOT PROBABLY HAVE BEEN MET IN THE DISCUSSION OF THE FORMER BRANCHES OF THE SUBJECT.

1. A common objection urged by Roman Catholics against Protestantism, is, that it is destitute of unity. If it is meant that we have no real unity, doctrinal or spiritual, I deny the allegation, and appeal to the course which I have adopted during these lectures. You all know that the speaker is a Wesleyan Methodist

Minister, and yet in defining the principles of Protestantism, he has not, excepting in one single instance, and then only to show that it coincides with Protestant standards generally, referred to a Methodist standard. I have taken up the standards of the Churches of England and Scotland, and have quoted from the Homilies and Articles of the one, and from the Confession and Catechisms of the other, as well as from one or two Continental Protestant authorities, thus demonstrating that in its leading principles, PROTESTANTISM IS ONE.

Roman Catholics manifest great anxiety to father upon Protestantism, the modern heresies of the Church, and even some of its ancient ones. Mormonism is a phase of Protestantism, and Millerism is a form of Protestantism, if we may credit Roman Catholic controversialists ; but these champions forget, that we have an equal right to brand the Roman Catholic Church with Arianism, Pelagianism, Sabellianism, and a hundred other heresies which sprang up in the earlier centuries of the Church's history. Has this method been pursued in these lectures ? Because Arius was a Bishop of the Church, have I fastened Arianism upon it ? Has this been my course ? I leave yourselves to reply. Then I add, you have no right, in describing Protestantism, to associate with it Mormonism or Universalism ; or in writing about Protestants, to class them with those sections of the community, whose principles they themselves eschew with quite as much determination and consistency of purpose as the ancient Church eschewed the doctrines of Arius, and perhaps a little

more. I can hardly suppress a smile when I hear Roman Catholics boast of their own unity in contrast with the diversities of Protestantism. The more I have examined this subject, the more convinced am I that it is a hollow unity,—a mere crust which overspreads and conceals the fused and confused masses of cinerous and other substances that exist in the volcano beneath, and which are ready to belch out their fury and to involve in sudden destruction the myriads who walk over it with as much security as though it were an everlasting rock. Unity! consider the five sections into which the Roman Catholic Church is divided on the one subject of transubstantiation. Unity! Look at the almost innumerable opinions which exist in the Church of Rome respecting the seat of its infallibility. Unity! What shall we say of the three systems that prevail respecting the number and authority of Church Councils, some calling those general, and therefore infallible, which others designate particular, and therefore fallible? Unity! Look at the variations which exist as to the particular efficacy of Extreme Unction, and as to the kind of adoration which should be paid to images. Unity! What unity is there between the Doctors of one age and those of another? Where is the unity of the Fathers? Where is the unity of the Popes? Is there then any justice, any consistency, in affirming that visible unity belongs to the true Church, and then to unchurch Protestants, because they have it not. WHERE, I again ask, IS THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME?

2. Roman Catholics profess to object to Protestantism because of the alleged vicious character of the Reformers. I am not intending to defend either the acts or the opinions of the authors of the Reformation. There were many things said and done in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by Protestants, which the Protestants of the present day uniformly condemn; and I should indeed wonder if, in escaping from that pit of filth and corruption through which I have this evening conducted you, they had not retained upon their vestments some stains of pollution. What astonishes me is that they brought with them so few! But after all, the Reformers have been maligned, their failings have been magnified and multiplied to serve a purpose. Luther has been called a companion and disciple of the devil, because he dreamed at one time that he had a conflict with him, and at another time imagined himself to be actually contending with him. But what do you make of this? His dream or his imagination, merely put into physical form, what every one of us has every day to contend with spiritually,—and those who perpetuate this slur upon the character of the great Reformer, for want of something more tangible, would perhaps not be the worse of remembering what the Apostle Paul says: “We wrestle with principalities and powers and wicked spirits in high places,” or what Peter advised: “Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary the Devil as a roaring lion goeth about seeking whom he may devour.” I observe further, that these objections recoil with tenfold effect upon those who contend that the integrity of the Church was not affected by the

impurities that were lodged for centuries in the Papal Chair, and beneath the very altars of Christendom.

I must now conclude this series of lectures. I am grateful to God on my own account that I was led to undertake this task. It is profitable to investigate the truth of God, and I may say, without any fear of being misunderstood, that I see a greater beauty than ever in the Gospel of Christ, especially in its doctrines of saving grace. Some have gone so far as to predict that such an examination into the claims of Roman Catholicism as that which I have been undertaking, would lead to my adoption of the faith with which I have thus been contending. Now, I am free to confess that I have learned many things during this discussion which I never knew before, but amongst other things, I have obtained a deeper conviction than I ever yet experienced, that the foundation upon which rest the principles of our glorious Protestantism, is firm as the Rock of ages. We have our peculiarities, and our inconsistencies, and our failings; but the principles are sound and everlasting; the rock is not weakened by the limpets which cleave to its surface, or by the growth of weeds which fill up its chinks—neither is it affected by the winds which blow on its surface, or by the billows which rage at its base. “THE WORD OF GOD LIVETH AND ABIDETH FOR EVER.”

I intend to pursue in private the investigation of this great and momentous subject, and if in the order of Providence, my life be spared, and my lot should be to continue among you, I shall hope within a year from this time to conduct you through a somewhat similar,

though perhaps shorter investigation of the principles of Roman Catholicism. Hitherto we have defended the principles of Protestantism, hereafter it may be desirable and profitable to investigate and to describe the features of Roman Catholicism.

I am thankful also that an opportunity has been afforded me of proclaiming to such large numbers, both Protestant and Catholic, the saving doctrines of the Gospel. Oh! my hearers, this glorious gospel of the blessed God is beyond all price. It stands out from every ecclesiastical system—it soars above creeds, formularies, liturgies, orders of ministers, churches, altars, vestments, relics, masses. What are all these in comparison of the glorious system of saving truth? We acknowledge that there are spurious forms of Protestantism, but real Protestantism goes forth amongst the children of men and exclaims with Paul, “I determine to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified.” The boast and only boast of true Protestantism is, “I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.” If you ask me for a brief view of genuine Protestantism, my reply is: “God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.” If you demand from me an epitome of a Protestant’s faith and experience, here it is:—

“ Could my tears for ever flow,  
Could my zeal no languor know;  
These for sin could not atone,  
THOU must save, and THOU ALONE,  
In my hand no price I bring,  
Simply to the CROSS I cling.”

My fellow-sinners, suffer me, before I take my leave, to remind you that we are all hastening towards the eternal world, and that we shall all have to stand before the judgment seat of Christ. At that judgment bar, it will not be demanded, are you Protestant or Catholic, but are you IN CHRIST JESUS? At that dread tribunal, we shall have to give an account of all that we have done in the body. I shall have to give account of what I have spoken to you in these lectures, and you will have to give account of what you have heard. You have been reminded of your sins; has the view of them which you have obtained, humbled you before God? You have been directed to the Saviour; have you approached his cross for mercy? You have been besought, by unnumbered arguments, to forsake the wickedness of your way; have you returned to the Lord who has promised to have mercy upon you and abundantly to pardon? O come this evening to the altar of our common Christianity—the altar of prayer, the throne of grace! Come; though you feel yourself to be the chief of sinners: Come; though your eyes be suffused with tears, and your heart be heavy with grief. Come through your only priest, the High Priest of our Christianity, Jesus Christ. Come, through the precious blood of his only sacrifice which speaks and pleads on your behalf before the throne of God. Come, for all things are now ready:—The Gospel is ready to instruct you; the Holy Spirit is ready to influence your minds and enlighten your hearts:—the Saviour is now ready to save you. The Father is now ready to receive

his returning prodigal ; Angels are now ready to rejoice over your salvation ;

“ All heaven is ready to resound,  
The dead's alive, the lost is found.”

God bless you, my dear hearers ! On earth, we shall never all assemble together again. When we next meet, it will be at the bar of the Eternal ! May it be at the right hand of our glorious Judge ! And with this view let us cry to him in some such language as the following :—

“ Jesus vouchsafe a pitying ray,  
Be Thou my Light, be thou my Way  
To glorious happiness ;  
Ah ! write the pardon on my heart,  
And whensoe'r I hence depart,  
Let me depart in peace.”

AMEN.

## NOTE TO LECTURE X.

---

Additional testimonies, by Roman Catholic authors, of the corruption of the Church of Rome previously to the Reformation.

1. *St. Elizabeth, the Virgin, of Germany.* "These things saith the Lord to the prelates. 'The iniquity of the land, which ye have hidden, for the sake of silver and gold, ascends up before me like the smoke of a furnace. Are not the souls of whom you suffocate in eternal fire through your avarice, more precious than silver and gold? Therefore your religion accuses you before me. For behold you have caused your holiness to stink in the sight of the people, and it is turned into an abomination to me.'"

2. *William of Paris*—A monkish historian. "The clergy have neither piety nor learning, but rather the foul vices of devils, and the most monstrous uncleanness and crimes. Their sins are not mere sins, but rather the most prodigious and dreadful crimes. They are no Church; but rather Babylon, Egypt, and Sodom. The Prelates, instead of building the Church, destroy it and make a mock of God."

3. *St. Catherine of Sienna.* "In former times the clergy were moral and faithful, but in the present day they are wicked. And as formerly, the bad were rare, so now the good are seldom seen. Wherever you turn, you behold all the clergy, both secular and religious, prelates and those subject to them, small and great, old and young, infected with crime, pursuing riches and delights, neglecting the support of the poor and the care of souls, applying themselves to secular affairs, simoniacally selling the grace of the Holy Spirit, and mismanaging the affairs of the Church. Woe to their wretched and unhappy life. That which Christ purchased with his

sufferings on the cross, they waste with harlots; they corrupt souls redeemed with the blood of Christ. They nourish illegitimate children with the patrimony of Christ."

4. *John Robitzana*—Archbishop of Prague. "I openly declare that the Church of Rome is Western Babylon, and that the Pope is Anti-christ, who has overwhelmed the worship of God with a heap of superstitions. There are few priests followers of Christ; and almost all of them are avaricious, proud, ambitious, hypocritical and idle. They preach lies for the truth, and surpass their people in wickedness, instead of being their guides in every kind of piety."

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

~~~~~  
Just Published,

SECOND AND CHEAP EDITION

OF

THE FAITHFUL MINISTER:

A Memorial

OF THE LATE

REV. WILLIAM SQUIRE,

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT OF THE WESLEYAN MISSIONS IN EASTERN  
CANADA.

*Elegantly Bound in Cambric and Embellished with a  
Portrait Engraved on Steel.*

Price 1s 6d.

---

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

“Remarkably well written--printed with great beauty. One of the few books which one likes to read through, almost without stopping; will have a very wide circulation, not only among Methodists, but Evangelical Christians generally.”—*Montreal Witness*.

“A faithful and touching narrative.”—*Pilot*.

“To thousands in Canada this book will be acceptable, and will not only be read with pleasure now, but laid up and transmitted to other days and families as a precious memento of departed worth. The author has delineated the character, life and labours of Mr. Squire with great exactness and beauty.”—*Canada Temperance Advocate*.

“A pleasing view of the character of an ‘Israelite indeed.’”—*Christian Guardian*.



# Wesleyan Methodist Book Depot,

## MONTREAL.

---

WESLEY'S WORKS. 14 vols. 8vo. Cambric.  
WESLEY'S WORKS. 14 vols. 12mo. Cambric.  
WATSON'S WORKS. 13. vols. 12mo. Cambric.  
BENSON'S COMMENTARY. 6 vols. imp. 8vo.  
CLARKE'S COMMENTARY. 6 vols. imp. 8vo.  
SUTCLIFFE'S COMMENTARY. 2 vols. imp. 8vo.  
FLETCHER'S WORKS. 8 vols. 12mo.  
WESLEY'S SERMONS. 3 vols. 12mo.  
SMITH'S SACRED ANNALS. Vols. 1 and 2.  
RULE'S MARTYRS OF THE REFORMATION.  
ARTHUR'S SUCCESSFUL MERCHANT.  
LIFE OF MRS. CRYER. By A. BARRETT. 12mo.  
LIFE OF REV. JOSEPH ENTWISLE. 12mo.  
WESLEY'S HYMNS in all sizes, and styles of binding.  
WESLEY'S HYMNS, Sunday-school edition, 64mo., at 15s-  
per dozen.  
WESLEYAN CATECHISMS, Parts 1, 2, and 3.  
JUVENILE AND MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS.  
REWARD BOOKS.

Application to be made to

**E. PICKUP,**

**32 Great St. James' Street.**

Who supplies SABBATH-SCHOOL LIBRARIES on the same terms as issued by the Methodist Book-Room, New-York, and the Sunday-School Union, Philadelphia.  
THE NATIONAL MAGAZINE, published monthly, price \$2'00 a year, payable in all cases in advance.

N. B.—Parties of four will receive four copies of "The National" for \$7'00 for one year.

*Standard Theological, Biblical, Biographical, Historical, Educational, and other works always on hand.*