

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

look around and witness everywhere the beneficent results of his wise and benevolent administration, our souls with a full gush of rapturous emotion involuntarily exclaim: "The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice, let the multitude of isles be glad thereof."

ARTICLE III.

INTELLECTUAL AND MORAL INFLUENCE OF ROMANISM.

A Dudleian Lecture delivered before the University in Cambridge, May 14, 1845. By Prof. Edwards A. Park, of Andover Theological Seminary.

WHEREFORE BY THEIR FRUITS YE SHALL KNOW THEM.—Matt. 7: 20.

THE character of a religious system may be learned, first, from the relation of its principles to the standard of reason and scripture; secondly, from its influence on the soul of man. The influence of a system may be ascertained by an examination either of its inherent fitnesses or of its actual operations. If we confine our regard to its inward tendencies we may become visionary; our speculations not being verified by facts. If we limit our view to the consequences which have apparently flowed from it, we may become empirical and mistake the appendages of the system for the effects of it. In order to be certain that its real influence is good or evil, we must combine a philosophical inquiry into its adaptations, with an historical inquiry into its consequences; each of these different views serving to illustrate and complete the other. Our survey of Romanism, for example, may be too superficial, if we dwell on the circumstances that have occurred in its train, and pass by the commentary which they receive from the essential fitnesses of the system. Its more skilful advocates will allow that its history is stained with many dark scenes, but they affirm that although conjoined with certain evils as accidents, it has not been united with them as appropriate developments; that it has *happened* to be allied with political despotism, with the Feudal system, with the peculiar tastes of the middle ages, and has been tinctured in this manner with influences which are far from being congenial with its own spirit. We say in reply, that the evils connected with Romanism have been prominent through so many successive ages, in so many different

nations, for so long a time and with such marked uniformity, as to give evidence of emanating from the very nature of the system, rather than from its ephemeral position. Certainly we may know a tree by its fruits, when we have observed these fruits for many seasons, and in various climes. Still, in all our inferences from the event to the cause we feel the more secure when we analyze the cause itself, and find *a priori* that it is intrinsically adapted to work out the same things as effects, which have been noticed as its uniform adjuncts. We may therefore be justified in attempting to show, on the present occasion, that the essential tendencies of Romanism are injurious to the mind and heart of man.

They are injurious to the mind. Our Maker intended to leave the evidences for religion such as not only to try the feelings, but also to sharpen the intellect. He designed to invigorate the reason, as well as discipline the will, by allowing arguments of real weight to exist in favor of what may be proved on the whole to be false, and in opposition to what may be proved on the whole to be true. But the Romish idea of the infallibility of the church is, in itself and its results, at variance with the nature of moral reasoning, and encourages a spirit of dogmatism incompatible with a due regard to the evidence which exists for and against the truth. Catholic¹ theologians have assumed that to their cardinal doctrines nothing can be properly objected, and have deemed it a kind of religious suicide to call in question any

¹ Many object to the term Catholic as applied to the church of Rome, because the term expresses a Christian virtue for which that church is not distinguished. Some refuse to employ the word, because it implies that the Romish church differs from every other in the fact of its being a visible corporation, capable of being extended over the whole world and including under one hierarchy all individuals of all nations. There is no reason, it is said, why the Romish church should monopolize the designation, Catholic, more than the Anglican Church. It is indeed true that names are things, and that a good name is precious in its influence; but when usage has so generally sanctioned the application of this term to the church of Rome, it appears hopeless to attempt a change. There is in itself no sufficient reason why those who believe in three orders of the clergy should assume the title—Episcopalians, in order to distinguish themselves from such as believe that all ordained ministers are bishops. The believers in the parity of the clergy might as well assume the title—evangelical, in order to distinguish themselves from such as exalt the diocesan bishop above the preachers of the word. If the work of giving names to sects were now to be commenced we might invent a more distinctive and expressive vocabulary than has yet been established; but we cannot, at this late day, make an innovation upon the current phraseology without more labor than profit. Still the phraseology is unfortunate. See Whateley on the Errors of Romanism, pp. 359—367.

principle which is essential to the stability of their faith.¹ They compare the evidences for their theology to those for their personal existence and identity. They fear that in canvassing the proofs for an essential dogma, they will lose their implicit faith in it, and have therefore believed without asking for a reason, or have searched for arguments rather than for the truth. Their system appears to have logical props instead of logical grounds; to have been made up first, and afterward confirmed by reasonings which had no influence in its formation. They object to untrammelled inquiry, because it results in diversities of opinion, in skepticism, in pride of intellect. These are indeed evils; but they are avoidable, are at the worst incidental to a positive good, and withal are less to be feared than the inanity and deadness and corruption which come from an unthinking reception of a human creed.

Nor is it merely by discouraging the investigation of first principles that Romanists have injured the tone of the intellect. They have done the same by checking the instinctive longings of the soul for progress in the science of divine things. "However some men may deride new light," says Dr. Owen, "he will not serve the will of God in his generation, who sees not beyond the line of foregoing ages." The spirit of the Reformation is that of improvement, the principle of the Romanists is that of hyper-conservatism. Their œcumenical councils are supposed to have established the faith of the church; the decisions of these councils are deemed infallible, and no private scholar has a right to impugn them. Now the human mind was not made to be thus stationary. It is wronged when forbidden to examine and reject the errors of past, especially of dark ages. We are but mocked, when we are told that we have powers for research, and may

¹ "The certainty which the church has of the truth of her tenets, is immediate; for she received her doctrines from the mouth of Christ and his apostles, and they are indelibly stamped upon her conscience, or, as Irenæus says, upon her heart, by the power of the Divine Spirit. If she were obliged to ascertain her doctrines first by means of a learned investigation, she would fall into the most absurd contradiction with her own self, and would annihilate herself; for, as it would be the church that seeks for the ground of her doctrines, she would be presupposed to exist, inasmuch as she examines; and at the same time not to exist, inasmuch as she is obliged first to obtain an existence, that is, to learn the truth, which is her proper being, the very thing in which and by which she is. She would seek for her own self, and this can be done only by an insane man. She would resemble the man, who would first determine whether or not he had an existence by an examination of the papers written by himself!"—*Moebler's Symbolik*, §. 378.

exert them, and may use the multiplied helps of modern science in the pursuit of truth, still we must not cross a single boundary which the assembled bishops have prescribed; we may go onward freely, so long as we are hemmed in by the canons and anathemas of Nice and Chalcedon and Florence. It is impossible to proceed with our investigations in a proper spirit, when we feel compelled to end them at precisely the same results which had been attained before we began. The freshness and vivacity and vigor of the soul fade away when it is repressed within any other limits than those of truth; for truth is nature, and never enslaves the mind which it controls; but the restrictions of men upon the progress of thought are artificial, they keep the spirit ill at ease and thus impede its healthy action. We are indeed assured by Romish divines, that the science of theology may be advanced as a tree may increase in size and strength, the trunk and branches remaining the same, the leaves also and the fruit.¹ Nature, however, gives up the growth of the tree to its own laws, and does not cramp it with bandages of iron; but Romanism is so minute in its prescriptions as to intersect the lines of advancement in almost every point, and whatever of expansion it does not prevent it leaves sickly and ill shapen.

Equally injurious to the mental powers is the standard of thought and feeling which is held up in the Papal church. Religion ennobles the intellect by making it familiar with the eternal laws of reason and conscience, but the votaries of Rome exalt the traditions of antiquity above our own perceptions of truth, and degrade the mind by communion with triflers. The Bible, too, gives a spring and vividness to our intellectual nature. It has not laid down its instructions in the form of a condensed, methodical, inspired creed; for it would thus allay the inquisitive spirit, and repress intellectual enterprise. It has scattered its wisdom along its pages with so touching a simplicity as to quicken the mind in its search for still more of that truth which the angels desire to look into. But Romanism has done what the sacred penmen were too far sighted to attempt. She has given us creeds which claim to be inspired, and by thus compressing

¹ See Moehler's *Symbolik*, S. 383-4. "Imitetur animarum religio rationem corporum; quæ licet annorum processu numeros suos evolvant et explicant, eadem tamen, quæ erant, permanent. Multum interest inter pueritiæ florem et senectutis maturitatem: sed iidem tamen ipsi fiunt senes, qui fuerant adolescentes; ut quamvis unius ejusdem hominis status habitusque mutetur, una tamen nihilominus eademque natura, una eademque persona sit."—*Vincent of Lerins. Com. c. XXIX.*

her doctrines into a narrow compass, has saved her disciples from the invigorating toil of a study like that of the Bereans. One of her greatest sins against the intellect is, her elevating the digests of her Councils into an infallible standard of truth. She has made them equal to the Bible in authority, and superior in ease of reference, in systematic arrangement, in precise definitions. Hence the New Testament loses its appropriate place in her esteem; it is neither studied by her clergymen as the highest criterion of truth, nor read by her laymen as their familiar guide. The dogmas of the church are condensed into compends which have no freshness or vitality, and the apostles who are stimulating to the intellect, are superseded by the fathers, of whose words we cannot say as of the inspired, 'they are spirit, they are life.' We are bound to speak with reverence of the early Christian authors. We owe them a large debt, chiefly for their testimony to matters of fact, not so much for their opinion on matters of doctrine. We are grateful to them for reducing theology to a system. This work might and would have been done as well perhaps or better by moderns, but it was done by the ancients and we thank them for it. They did a noble work. Not a few of them were great and good divines, and their treatises, mutilated and forged as some parts of them have been, command our admiration. Still the fathers of the church were but men, and were never fitly trained to be authorities for our faith. We suffer a great intellectual loss when we accommodate ourselves to their illogical reasonings, their fantastic speculations, their half Jewish, half heathenish conceits. To revere their Gnostic or Platonic fancies as a standard of thought, is the cause as well as the effect of a vitiated taste and of unreasonable judgments. Romanism has fostered a love for the grotesque more than for the rational, by conforming to apocryphal scriptures and to scholastic digests of the fathers, rather than to the teachings of science or of the apostles. Some of her theories are literally made up of a perverted Aristotelianism, applied to the traditionary metaphrase of a few texts of the Bible. Her divines have not consulted the Stagirite in his purity, so much as the commentaries of the schoolmen upon him; nor is it the real meaning of the earlier fathers so often as the glosses made upon them by Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus and Peter Lombard, to which modern discoveries of truth are to be sacrificed. It is men and not principles; it is acute rather than wise men, subtle more than profound; men whom dark ages nurtured and who kept the ages dark;

it is these before whom we are to prostrate ourselves in a homage that enervates without truly humbling the spirit.

A low standard of thought and feeling is also presented in the worship authorized by Romanists. One hour of direct intercourse with the Judge of Heaven, is more invigorating to the mind than all their supplications to the souls of the dead. Yet it is easier for them to commune with saints than with God, and therefore, instead of refining their intellect by praying to the Spirit of truth, they often waste their time in calling on St. Anthony and St. Nicholas, St. Xavier and St. Cecilia to pray for them. They cherish an indolence of mind by their circuitous method of calling on inferior saints to implore the virgin Mary that she would beseech her Son to intercede for them before the Father. Our intellectual good requires that we pray directly to Jehovah in the name of Christ. In theory, Romanists distinguish between invocation and worship, and designate the homage which they pay to departed spirits by the word *δουλεία*, and that which they pay to God by the word *λατρεία*. Some of them regard this distinction in practice as well as theory; others do not, but apply the same language to those whom they invoke, which is proper for him only whom they adore. They debilitate their higher faculties by neglecting a thoughtful converse with the Redeemer of the world, and addressing sentimental praises to her whom they call the mediatrix between the Mediator and us.¹ Revering the Queen of heaven when they ought to be adoring an infinite spirit, they lose not only a degree of mental strength, but also that distinctive power of faith which dispenses with the aid of sight. Hence they require statues and pictures as helps to devotion, and thus enfeeble the intellect by the means which they employ to assist it. He who created the soul knew well the danger of sliding from the use of statues to the adoration of them, and therefore forbade all resort to these enervating expedients for easy worship. As men now use the crucifix, so there were Jews in the time of Hezekiah who employed the brazen image as a means of facilitating their approaches to Jehovah.

¹ The favorite mode of representing the Saviour as a child in the arms of a beautiful virgin, is exactly fitted to make the mother, more frequently than the child, the object of invocation, and to fascinate the eye with the graces of a human form more than to expand the intellect by an exhibition of divine excellence. She is familiarly addressed as "our Lady," "the Queen of the world as well as the Queen of heaven," "the Mother of mercy," "the Mother of grace," "the Mother of God," and is practically regarded, by Romanists in common life, as more kindly intent upon our welfare than is the Almighty himself.

No device of the kind could be more innocent; for this image had been once sanctioned of heaven for a moral purpose, and around it clustered the recollections of past deliverances. But it was seized and broken in pieces by the prophet, and called Nehushtan;¹ for he saw that the people would adore the memento of him who claims supreme worship for himself alone, and they would form gross conceptions of a deity who is accommodated to them through a gross medium. It is often said that the church of Rome is free from idolatry, because she reveres not the image but the spirit which it represents. Now there are three kinds of outward idolatry. One is the worship of a mere block or stone or plant; a second is the worship of the true Jehovah emblemized by some material object; a third is the worship of a spirit which is not the true Jehovah and which is bodied forth in some visible shape. The first kind of idolatry is chargeable upon no man that ever lived; for even the victim of feticism prays to a tree, not as mere wood, but as instinct with life, and that life is the object of his homage. The second kind is idolatry in form, though not in substance. If men worship the true God through an idol, then of course they are not revering a false God. The chief evil of this practice is that it leads to the third species of idolatrous observance, that which in its formal and essential characteristics is the adoration of a being other than Jehovah. Many of the Romanists are idolaters merely in mode not in spirit. The worship offered by their Fenelon may have been, for aught we know, even purer than that offered by our Leighton. But that some of them are idolaters both formally and really, is a truth as evident as it is unwelcome. The God who is often exhibited in their popular literature, in their pictorial representations, and in the host, is a venal and a partial and a sensuous being, fascinated with glittering ornaments, with vain pageantry. The statues which represent him are sometimes the identical figures which were carved for heathen divinities. Now it is improbable, that the image of Jupiter and Hercules will be a fit expression of the excellence which is found only in heaven. The *fac-similes* of pictures designed to give an idea of the powers that ruled on Olympus, cannot be expected to purify the Christian's faith in one who inquires, "To whom then will ye liken God, or what likeness will ye compare unto him?"² But even if the canvass and the marble suggested no false idea of

¹ 2 Kings, 18: 4.² Isaiah 40: 18.

Jehovah, still the use of any material representation of him deprives the intellect of a discipline, which God intended to be essential to its fullest development. There are some themes which may be illustrated by diagrams, but the divine attributes cannot be worthily studied except in spirit and in truth. The attempt to simplify them by any more visible symbol than "God is love," will bedim the mental vision as much as it gratifies the corporeal. Where men can walk by sight, they will not cultivate the principle of trust in him whom they have not seen. In order to become spiritual, they must *be shut up to the faith.*

It is not to be expected of men who allow a host of intercessors to obscure their view of the Holy One, and who use material representations even of these interceding saints, that they will place a high estimate on the preaching of the gospel. Accordingly we find that Romanism depresses the pulpit for the sake of aggrandizing the ceremony of the mass. In some ages of the church she has almost entirely discarded the sermon,¹ and sacrificed the instruction of the mind to impressions upon the sense. It is the prominence of the pulpit which gives impulse to general education, and the history of Romanism shows that where preaching is made secondary to forms, the mental character of both clergymen and laymen loses a quickening influence.

When a Protestant enters the sanctuary, he is made thoughtful by the words of prayer and the reading of the Scriptures; and we are unable to measure the degree of mental improvement which he receives from services thus adapted to his understanding. But the Romanist is not instructed by the reiteration of his stereotyped observances. He hears the Bible read in a language which imparts to him none of its meaning, and in some churches he cannot even distinguish the words of the scriptural lesson, for these are drowned in the tumult of the ringing of bells and the pealing of the organ, which are designed to honor the recital of what would be more truly honored, if it were simply made intelligible or even audible. The rational Protestant is instructed by the sacraments of Christianity. They were intended to be sermons to the mind, and thereby to the heart. But the genius of Rome has transformed them from symbolical discourses into a species of necromancy. They are described as operating not by rational appeal, but by a kind of talismanic in-

¹ See Father Paul Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, p. 169, Fol. Ed. Sozomeni Hist. Eccl. Lib. VII. cap. 19.

fluence. Protestantism would sanctify men by the truth which enlightens the intellect, but Romanism depends on the mechanical working of rites that supersede our own activity. Protestantism insists, first of all, on faith by which man is to be justified, and faith involves a vigorous exercise of reason; but Romanism lays chief stress upon external ordinances which can renovate the soul without a rational contemplation of the truth addressed to it. As the supply of thought will not exceed the demand, we cannot look for mental exertion in receiving sacraments which operate independently of such exertion. In their scriptural simplicity, baptism and the Lord's supper are eloquent expounders of great truths; but a recent author commends the Romish method of administering baptism because it "envelops the originally simple act in a great abundance of significant ceremonies," and of "the most diversified symbols."¹ This imagined excellence is one of our objections to the Catholic ritual. That ritual burdens the truth, and covers it up with outward trappings. It multiplies emblems, until the principle shadowed forth by them vanishes into thin air. It appeals to the fancy, and leaves the judgment uncultivated. It is a form of ocular worship which causes the mind to linger on the surface of things, and holds it back from profound meditation. It is arbitrary and artificial, and ceremonies which are not commended by a sober judgment cannot be repeated in the church without injury to the intellect. They foster a puerile habit of thought, and a taste for meretricious display. We can see little more than an unreasonable affectation

¹ See Moehler's *Symbolik*, Sechste Auf. S. 276. "As the Lord once cured the physical deafness of a man by a mixture of spittle and dust, so is that mixture applied in baptism likewise, for the purpose of denoting the spiritual fact, that the organs of the mind are now opened to receive the mysteries of the kingdom of God. The burning candle denotes that now indeed the divine light from above has fallen into the mind, and the darkness of sin is changed into a celestial brightness. The salt designates the wise man who is freed from the foolishness of this world. The anointing with oil designates the new priest, for every Christian is a priest in the spiritual sense of the word, who has entered into the inmost sanctuary and has renewed the most living communion with God in Christ Jesus. The white garment denotes that the believer, washed pure in the blood of the Lamb, desires hereafter to retain the innocence which he lost in the first Adam and regained in the second. All these symbols are used for the sake of expressing in the most diversified methods, the one idea that a complete, permanent change should take place in man, and a new, higher, and continued existence should begin in him."—S. 276, 277. But this one idea is far more perspicuously expressed when the ordinance is left in its original plainness, and not overlaid with the fantastic devices of idlers.

in the attempts of the Romish priest to portray the nature of his office by the quality, figure, and coloring of his vestments. He is a ruler in the church; why does he not wear a crown upon his head? He is the enemy of sin and the defender of his people; why does he not gird on the sword as an emblem of the sword of the Spirit? Why does he not present himself at the altar arrayed in the symbols of that panoply which is described in the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians? Why are there not twenty sacraments prescribed? There is as much reason for twenty sacraments as for seven.¹ We can see no grounds for adopting the Romish ceremonies and omitting others which the fancy may invent, save the fact that the former have been established already. But they were established for temporary or for local causes; and the same reason which at first suggested them, may now require a change. The truth is, our religious observances ought to express the reason of their institution. They ought to be chaste portraiture of such truth as can be portrayed in a manly way. They are healthful to the intellect when they are naturally appropriate to the things which they signify. The pensive brow of the preacher ought to be his mitre of gold; his look of kindness ought to be his sprinkling of the people with holy water; his elaborated discourses are more significant than his kneeling before an illuminated Bible; his earnest tones are an expressive substitute for his making the sign of the cross; and his freedom from artificial adornings should be the tasteful memento that his life is hid with Christ in God. This is a Puritan, this is a rational system of ecclesiastical forms; and as it obeys, so it improves an enlightened intellect. The antiquity of the Romish observances is indeed an argument in their favor, but their antiquity is often that of the darkest ages, and sometimes that of the letter merely, not of the spirit. There was once a reason for ceremonies which are still continued, after the excuse for them has ceased to exist. Before the invention of printing men were profited by hieroglyphical signs, more than they can be since books are become accessible to all. But the Catholic worship is a complicated system of hieroglyphics, and they are more numerous now than they were

¹ On the same principle that matrimony and ordination are sacraments, may the reading of the Bible, the giving of alms, prayer, the dedication of churches, civil oaths, the coronation of kings, and indeed all the more important acts of our life be considered sacramental.—See Nitzsch's *Prot. Beant. der Symbolik* Dr. Moehler's, S. 186, 187.

when circumstances partly justified them. There was once a propriety in using the Latin tongue in the services of the Roman Church. It was vernacular with those who heard it; therefore it was employed in prayer. At this day it is not a living language; the reason for its use has vanished; the use itself is retained in opposition to the principle which first recommended it. The original custom was to pray in the Roman tongue, but not the original custom to pray in words which had ceased to be understood; not the original and apostolic custom to use the Latin language in America; not the primitive custom to use a dead language either in America or Rome.¹ The form of the ancient practice, as now preserved, is subversive of its ancient spirit; for the principle of the early church was, that it is better to speak five words with the understanding, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.²

There is the same objection to the whole structure of the Romish theology. It is capricious and irrational, adhering to the letter of certain antique standards and rejecting the meaning of them. It encourages an arbitrary method of investigation by its tenacity of circumstances and disregard of the substance of things. It ascribes great authority to the metropolitan church at Rome. There was a time when that church deserved a peculiar deference, for it was the scene of apostolic labor; and if the very individuals who had been addressed in words of inspiration, still survived in that ancient city, they would still merit our homage. But the circumstances which gave at first a standard character to their church, have long since disappeared. What was begun with a valid reason, is continued without one; and the claims of that ecclesiastical body have become the more exorbitant, as the rightfulness of them has diminished. There was a day when tradition was the most important means of learning the truth. The Gospels were not published, and the only attainable knowledge of them was to be gleaned from those who had listened to the earliest preachers. Time enough had not then elapsed to allow confusing or corrupting changes in the traditionary accounts of

¹ It is not pretended that the Romanists allege no arguments for their use of the Latin language in worship beside the antiquity of the usage; but this is the real and original reason for which the custom is retained, and the other arguments in its defence seem to be devised as secondary supports of that which would be continued without them.

² In like manner the withholding of the Bible from the laity is often justified because it was the early custom; but the invention of printing has made the spirit of the modern practice entirely different from that of the ancient.

our Saviour. These accounts were the New Testament, written in the hearts of men. But now, what was once tradition has become Scripture; the oral instructions of the first teachers are transferred to the written page. Our appeal to the recorded Gospels is the same in substance with the primitive appeal to the remembered narratives; it is a reference to the authority of inspired men. But the Romanists adhere to tradition, as if it were as pure in the nineteenth century as it was in the first; as if the testimony of the early churches were as ancient as the record of the apostles themselves; as if that which was needful in certain circumstances were needed when the circumstances are essentially diverse. The original arguments for such antiquated dogmas having lost their force, new arguments are invented, and we know that all reasonings which are sought out and pressed into our service from afar, tend to impair the spirit of candor. The theology of Rome, symmetrical and artfully compacted as it is, yet is so constrained, and requires such fantastical explanations, as to make the mind of its students disingenuous. Even its "golden rule," as laid down by Vincent of Lerins, is one which cannot be obeyed without violence to the judgment. It sets up the standard of truth as *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*. It therefore obliges an inquirer for the right faith to reconcile the creed of the bishops in any one age or nation, with that of the same functionaries in every other. But this cannot be done without a tortuous and inept construction of words. The clergy of no two nations agree in every item of their belief; for they have their national peculiarities. The theologians of no two ages are precisely alike in the shading of their faith; for every age has its own spirit. Nay, if we could ascertain the exact meaning attached by independent men to the same terms, we should perceive that no two thinking divines, the world over, have adopted in all points the same views of truth. When the light shines, the rays will fall differently upon the retina of men in different positions; and the only way in which all eyes can be made to see alike is, to leave them in total darkness where they may agree in seeing nothing at all. There is a standard of truth; but the attempt to discover it among the writings of the church-fathers and schoolmen, is an attempt to coërcé them into a system which they never in all particulars believed. It is an attempt to *create* in their writings what never existed there. It leads to a process of special pleading, that vitiates the sensibilities for the truth. It may exercise a subtlety like that of the doctors

of the Sorbonne, but does not train the mind to an enlarged Christian philosophy. We acquire a love for the truth by seeking it in the standards which God has written for us, in the volumes of nature and grace; but we imbibe a jesuitical spirit, by endeavoring to fabricate a theological creed from materials which can be fitted into their desired position only by distorting them.

These tendencies of Romanism are illustrated by fact. A deference for truth as such, does not characterize the Romish literature. Even the writings of Moehler,¹ Klee and Wiseman are distinguished for ingenuity rather than fairness. The Tridentine fathers displayed far less of disposition or ability to decide for themselves what is truth, than of cunning in transporting from the Quirinal palace the decisions which the Pope had made for them, and in securing a majority of votes for the decrees thus clandestinely prepared, although ostensibly inspired.² The themes with which Catholic authors are most intimate are of inferior worth. They are the endless genealogies of bishops, the fables of the apostolical succession, the niceties of the schoolmen, themes of external interest—seldom of inward dignity. It was the di-

¹ It is difficult to mention any modern theological work more ingeniously fitted to produce an impression which, on the whole, is incorrect, than Moehler's *Symbolik*, a translation of which has been published in England, and also republished in this country. See *Bib. Sac.* Vol. I. 554, 555. Its sophistry consists, first, in concealing the most obnoxious phases of the Catholic doctrine; secondly, in the undue prominence which it gives to such truths as have been defended by Romanists against the ill-judged attacks of Protestants; thirdly, in its appeal to the writings of individual Protestants with the same freedom as to publicly authorized Confessions of Faith, as if the works of Calvin and Melancthon were our Symbolical books; fourthly, in quoting the impassioned and extravagant remarks of Protestant controversialists, without attempting to modify those remarks by reference to the circumstances or the idiosyncracies of the men who uttered them;—a course of treatment which the writings of Martin Luther, for example, are peculiarly ill-fitted to endure; and fifthly, in tacitly assuming that the creeds and standard treatises of Protestants are as authoritative, as those of the Romanists; that the Augsburg or Helvetic Confessions are as completely and unexceptionably expressive of the private opinions of Lutherans or Calvinists, as the Tridentine Catechism or the Bull *Unigenitus* are indicative of the universal Catholic faith. Protestants, allowing as they do the right of individual judgment, are not to be bound down to their symbolical books, as Romanists are to theirs. The faith of Catholics is in their Councils; our faith is in the Bible.

² The disregard to truth, the sacrifice of principle to expediency, the dishonorable, not to say dishonest, methods of conducting theological discussion, which were sanctioned by the Tridentine Council, are well illustrated in Father Paul Sarpi's *History of that Council*, pp. 215, 346, 365, 497, 503, 621, 684, 815, et al. Fol. ed.

vine commendation of Aaron, "I know that he can *speak well*;"¹ but the Romish priest is required from the nature of his office to *chant well*, and to be a religious martinet, rather than a comprehensive reasoner. Where so little is demanded of the teachers of the people, what can be expected from the people themselves?

We have no wish to deny that many illustrious names are enrolled among the scholars of the Catholic church. The human mind will rouse itself into action in despite of all the sedatives that are applied to it. Nor would we intimate that Romanism is devoid of all tendencies to quicken the intellect; for it is not a tissue of unmingled error, and the truth which it retains is like truth everywhere, of renovating power. We yield high praise to many of the Benedictine and Augustinian monks; of the Jesuits and the Jansenists. But when we reflect on the leisure, the retirement, the wealth and the vast multitude of the Romish clergy, we ask why are there so few accomplished scholars among the hosts who ought to have been our intellectual benefactors. There must be some radical fault in the system which has reared from its millions of preachers so small a number like the French Triumvirate, and from its cloistered students so few philosophers like Malebranche, Campanella and Des Cartes; and of these few, so large a proportion who "groaned being burdened" under the faith which had been imposed upon them. We admit that Romanism encourages a spirit of inquisitiveness into the history of the past; but why has it trained no more historians like Du Pin and Jahn and Dollinger, and why has its historical curiosity been so far controlled by its sectarian interests? We commend the Romish priesthood, that they kept the records of ancient wisdom during the middle ages; but was it not characteristic of them to *keep* these records to themselves rather than disseminate them among the people? We praise them that they have fostered a taste for the fine arts; their theology is more indebted to Raphael and Michael Angelo than to all their Hugs and van Esses. But does not the taste that is nurtured by Romanism in painting, music and architecture, favor a gaudiness of ornament, an overlading of beauties? We further concede, that a rare talent for controlling the popular mind is nourished by the distinction of orders and offices in the Catholic hierarchy; by its leisure also, by its facility of transmitting principles of finesse from one generation of its priests to another, and again by the

¹ Ex. 4: 14.

very fact that it has an established character for sagacious diplomacy, and this character is retained from age to age, as by prescriptive right. Woolsey, Fleury, De Retz, Richelieu, Ximenes and Mendoza learned many lessons of cunning from their mother church. But the powers and inclinations for intrigue need not be fostered by a *religious* institution. The very circumstance that the Romish clergy will gain by artifice what they lose in argument, gives an intimation of the peculiar intellectual spirit of their system. But the most impressive commentary on its influence is seen in the fact that learning revived when the Reformation began; that the mother church of Rome has trained for the last three hundred years a smaller number of original thinkers than have arisen from even a half of the Protestant churches, all of which united are a minority when compared with the Papal. Why at the present day are Lucerne, Freiburg and Uri so much less enlightened than Basle and Berne and Geneva? Why is Spain so much more degraded than Holland, Portugal than Denmark, Ireland than Scotland? Why are the Austrian clergy so far inferior to the Prussian, the Bavarian to the Saxon, the French to the English? Why have the universities under the Papal system so much less of scientific enterprise, than those under the Protestant? The fundamental reason is this; the inward tendencies of Romanism are to encourage the swinging of censers more than the contemplation of truth, the adherence to authority more than principle, to systems for which there was once an apology more than to those which now vivify the intellect. Romanism is so contrived as to save men the trouble of thinking for themselves. It adopts the principle of vicarious reasoning, as well as of vicarious virtue. It does not harmonize with the natural laws of evidence; it bends them into conformity with itself and thus makes the very science of theology sectarian. It does not look outward and upward for light, but searches into its own history for justification, and seeks the living chiefly among the dead.

As feeling is elicited by thought, we must presume that a theological system which is unfavorable to the intellect will also be injurious to the heart. The doctrines of Romanism become, often, morally injurious by means of their peculiar tendency to be perverted. Many of them involve so much nicety of distinction, that they cannot be safely stated without being critically explained. But the whole system of Romanism is averse to explanation. It needs in a preëminent degree the discussions of the pulpit, but it gives little time for those instructive addresses without which its

dogmas will be misunderstood. It teaches the intellect so seldom, and beguiles the fancy with such a gorgeousness of rites, that the people will often imbibe pernicious ideas of even the truths which it unfolds. Its appeals to the imagination are so striking, and to the judgment so feeble, that men will form such notions of it as are most agreeable to their vitiated tastes. When a man is bowed down under a thought of his sinfulness, and is therefore simply commanded to eat no meat for a month, he will not understand the nature of faith, and will misunderstand the nature of Christian works. There is danger, in promising a stricken penitent that, if he will give alms to the church, he may have a dispensation from rehearsing the prayers which had been required of him as a penance. He will thus regard prayer as an evil, and simony as a virtue. There must be danger, in exposing the relics of saints or of the true cross to the gaze of men, who are not cautiously guarded against the deification of that which so overawes their sensibilities. There is great danger, in employing more of religious machinery than is often and fully, in its working and its nature, explained to the people. Romanism makes shipwreck of the faith, because she has so much more sail than ballast.

There is, for example, some truth in the doctrine of satisfactions for sin, as laid down in a few standard treatises of the Catholic church.¹ The doctrine is, that certain temporal evils ensue from moral delinquency, and that these evils may be removed or at least mitigated by certain penitential acts. These acts are termed satisfactions, and may, whenever the punitive evils can be prevented without them, be dispensed with by the church. These dispensations are called indulgences; and indulgences from one form of penance, may sometimes be procured by submitting to a different form of it. But there is reason to fear, that men who have made satisfaction for the temporal penalties of the law, will consider themselves as having satisfied its eternal demands. If their sins are cancelled for this life, they will presume on the life to come. If they can obtain a dispensation from one species of suffering by the endurance of another, they will endure the loss of money as an equivalent to some physical torture; and their willingness to part with their silver will be regarded as the proof of their contrition; and their contrition, as the means of

¹ See Catech. ex decreto Concil. Trident. pp. 343, 347, 362; Moehler's Symbolik, 275—298; Wiseman's Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, pp. 36, 66, 69.

their deliverance from punishment here below; and this their temporal deliverance, as a pledge of their never ending blessedness. Thus the whole scheme of penances and satisfactions tends to abuse. It may be explained as comparatively innocuous; but it is very seldom thus explained by the clergy, still more seldom is it thus understood by the laity; and the history of it shows, that it encourages a spiritual commerce, a barter in the things of heaven, and converts the spirit of the Gospel into a gross speculation at the shambles.¹

Romanism becomes injurious to the moral feelings by the mystical working of its machinery. It is a discriminating remark of Schleiermacher, that "Protestantism makes the relation of an individual to the church dependent on his relation to Christ, but Catholicism makes his relation to Christ dependent on his relation to the church."² Irenaeus, has said, "Where the church is, there also is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the church and all grace."³ Now the Protestants insist on the last clause of this sentence, as true independently of the other; the Romanists insist on the first clause as true, even when they deny the second. The most accomplished Catholic Symbolist of modern times avows, Our doctrine is that "the visible church comes first, then comes the invisible; the former is the origin of the latter. The Protestants say, on the other hand,

¹ The expression that the doctrines of the Church of Rome are peculiarly liable to be misunderstood, is far milder than the truth will justify. Her dogmas are commonly taught in a far more objectionable form, than that in which her standards express them. The people do not generally pervert the instructions addressed to them, when they believe that the Virgin Mary has divine attributes, that penances in this life will supply the place of punishment in the life to come; that indulgences are a legitimate article of traffic, etc. Romanism, as taught by the Council of Trent, leads to abuses; as taught by the majority of its priests, it is abused. It may be said indeed that the system of the Tridentine fathers is not and never has been the Catholicism generally prevalent in the Papal church. Dangerous as that system is, it is far better than the theology with which the laymen of Italy, Austria, Spain and France have been contaminated. For an exposition of Romanism as it is, in distinction from Romanism as it is described by its apologists, see Letters to N. Wiseman, D. D., by William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford. The sophistry of Catholic theologians is often manifested in confining the attention to their system, as cautiously expressed in their most ingenious symbols, and hiding from their readers the system, as it is commonly taught and believed. It is therefore necessary to show that, in its most plausible form, their theology exerts a deleterious influence.

² Glaubenslehre, I. S. 24. 2. Aufl.

³ Adv. Haer. Lib. 3.

that the visible church comes from the invisible, and the latter is the ground of the former.¹ According to the Romish doctrine, there can be no Christian goodness save that which is derived from membership of an ecclesiastical body; and the first duty of men is, not to be what they ought to be, but to connect themselves with the church; and then, nor till then, will they receive a power of doing what their conscience assures them is binding at present. Here is a collision between the ecclesiastical ethics and those of the moral faculty; and the vigor of that faculty is impaired when its demand for inward goodness is postponed to the claims of a mystical institution. The Tridentine fathers assert that man is renewed by the baptismal water,² and hence, reversing the biblical arrangement of precepts, they enjoin on men to be baptized and repent. Our feeling of moral responsibility must be weakened when we are turned away from meditation on a spiritual duty, and directed to appear before a font, where we are to receive, as by a spell, the virtue that ought to be required of us as an immediate exercise of our free will. Conscience receives its most healthy stimulus from the mandate, "Work out your own salvation," and is made inert by the proposal, that we become the passive recipients of a change wrought by the manipulations of the priest. The pressure of immediate obligation to perform our duty, is also relieved by the Romish doctrine of the Lord's Supper. That doctrine does not require us to bring our feelings now into harmony with the divine, but to make use of a sacramental charm from which will ensue a mysterious new life. It calls on us not first to live, and then to eat of the sacred emblem; but first to receive the wafer, and then to be raised from the dead by its miraculous energy. No wise method is this, however, of securing the active virtue of a Christian. We must be summoned to walk in the right way, not merely in the way to that way; summoned to do the very thing which is itself an imitation of Jehovah, not merely to perform the means of doing that thing; summoned to reduce our own wills into a state of unison with a spiritual law,

¹ Mochler; see Nitsch's *Protestantische Beantwortung der Symbolik Dr. Mochler's*, S. 233.

² Per baptismum Christum induentes nova prorsus in illo efficiamur creatura, plenam et integrantem peccatorum omnium remissionem consequentes. Concil. Trid. Sess. 14. Recte et apposite definitur, baptismum esse sacramentum regenerationis per aquam in verbo; natura enim ex Adam filii irae nascimur, per baptismum vero in Christo filii misericordiae renascimur. Catech. Rom. 2, 2, 5. See also Catech. Rom. 2, 2, 44 and 2, 2, 50.

while God worketh within us to choose that which he demandeth of us; summoned to a rational work, by rational motives, and in a rational way; not to use an amulet by which evil may be spirited from our hearts, and virtue mystically diffused through them. The great complaint of the Reformers against the Catholic system was, that it does not represent religion as resulting from profound thought so much as from sensuous impression; that it does not, like the Gospel, work from within outward, but from without inward; that it represents a sacrament as communicating, rather than presupposing, a fitness to receive it; as an *opus operatum* in itself, and dispensing with the *opus operantis* in the recipient.¹ It is true, the Council of Trent insist, that a partaker of the divine ordinances shall not interpose an obstacle to their efficient action; the forbidden obstacle, however, is not sin as such, not sin in the general, but a particular species of it,—sin against the church,—and this is the sin unto death.² Even Bellarmine, who demands of such as receive the sacraments a certain

¹ Melancthon says, in his Apology, Art. 7, *Hic damnatus totum populum scholasticorum doctorum, qui docent, quod sacramenta non ponendi obicem conferant gratiam ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis. Haec simpliciter iudaica opinio est, sentire quod per caeremoniam iustificemur sine bono motu cordis, h. e. sine fide.*

² Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novae legis non continere gratiam, quam significant: aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non conferre, — anathema sit. Si quis dixerit, non dari gratiam per huius modi sacramenta semper et omnibus, quantum est ex parte Dei, etiamsi rite ea suscipiant, sed aliquando et aliquibus, anathema sit. Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novae legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinae promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere, anathema sit. Sess. VII. Can. 6, 7, 8. From these canons it is evident that no positive excellence, but only a negative state is required of the person receiving a sacrament. The phrase *opus operatum*, used in reference to a sacrament, denotes, according to Bellarmine, that the sacramental grace is conferred "ex vi ipsius actionis sacramentalis a Deo ad hoc institutae, non ex merito agentis vel suscipientis," and thus excludes the idea of requiring a positive Christian virtue from either the individual administering or the individual receiving a sacrament; See Guerike's *Symbolik*, § 54. From the administrator it is simply required, that he have intentionem saltem faciendi, quod facit ecclesia; Conc. Trid. Sess. 7. Can. 11; and from the recipient it is also barely required that he have the intention of receiving what the church imparts. In performing the rite of baptism it would appear absurd to demand of the recipient, that he exercise a Christian grace antecedently to his being made a Christian at the font; this would be a demand for the effect before the cause, the fruits of regeneration before regeneration itself. See Nietzsche's *Prot. Beant. der Symbolik* Dr. Moehler's, S. 159, Wiseman's *Lectures on the principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*, Vol. I. pp. 63, 64.

kind of faith and of sorrow for sin, does not yet venture to require that distinctive grace which constitutes the Christian life. He simply insists on a preparative for this grace. He teaches, if we may borrow one of his illustrations, that as the wood to be burned must first be dried, and thus fitted for combustion, so that the fire may of its own energy consume the wood; in like manner must the soul be chastised into a state of recipiency for grace, before the sacrament can exert its transforming power.¹ This state of recipiency is altogether distinct from one of holiness, being a freedom from that specific obduracy which is manifested in a disrespect for the ordinances of the church, and not being a freedom from that generic sinfulness which is the ruin of the soul. Nothing but evil ensues, however, from so lightening the burden of duty as to ask for a merely negative excellence, or a merely ecclesiastical virtue. The heart will be influenced by the standard with which it is required to conform, and when our Saviour bids us to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect, he holds up a criterion which tends to elevate the character; and if men do not really attain perfection, they may with heaven's aid reach a higher degree of improvement than if they had aimed at a lower mark. Is it not the experience of every day, that when an outward observance is deemed the preliminary to inward goodness, and a holy motive is not insisted on as a prerequisite for the service of God, then the feelings are debased by so ignoble a standard, and religion becomes a bodily exercise that profiteth little? If baptism be regeneration, then no evidence exists that any of the apostles, except one, were ever regenerated; and even that one felt thankful that he had never performed this renovating miracle at Corinth, except upon Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas.² If it had been useful to regard the sacrament as an indispensable channel³ of grace, would

¹ Si ad ligna comburenda primum exsiccarentur ligna, deinde excuteretur ignis ex silice, tum applicaretur ignis ligno, et sic tandem feret combustio; nemo diceret, causam immediatam combustionis esse siccitatem, aut excussionem ignis ex silice, aut applicationem ignis ad ligna, sed solum ignem, ut causam primariam, et solis calorem seu calefactionem, ut causam instrumentalem. Bellarm. de Sacramentis, Tom. III. p. 109, quoted in Moehler's Symbolik, S. 257. That the faith and penitence which Bellarmine requires are not true holiness, is further evident from his remark, that they "solum tollunt obstacula, quae impedirent, ne sacramenta suam efficaciam exercere possent, unde in pueris, ubi non requiritur dispositio, sine his rebus fit justificatio."—lb.

² 1 Cor. I: 14, 16.

³ Quasi alveus, as the Tridentine Fathers express themselves.

the failure to administer it have been pronounced by an inspired man a fitting cause of gratitude or of submission? Would the Lord's Supper have been instituted by our Saviour in so informal a method, and left with so few rules for its observance, if he had looked upon it as a magical ceremony, or as claiming precedence of the silent graces of the heart?

The Romanists affirm that their view of the eucharist enlivens the believer, while ours is cold. There is a warmth in their doctrine, but an animal warmth. The mystery startles the natural sensibilities, more than it edifies the spirit. We, more than they, may be cheered by the Real Presence, not indeed of a material nature, but of an unseen friend who is ever with us at the breaking of the bread. We more than they may be animated by a transubstantiation, not indeed a gross and repulsive change of the fruit of the vine into literal blood; but the ennobling transference of the virtues of Jesus to our souls. It is a subjective transubstantiation, and therefore refines the spirit which is made sensuous by an objective one.

But nowhere is the mystical agency of Romanism so injurious as in its reference to the ministers of the gospel. It affects their personal qualifications. The Protestant regards them as teachers, and therefore requires them to possess and exhibit worth of character. The Romanist regards them as Priests rather than instructors, and assigns to them, as their principal duty, the offering of a vicarious sacrifice. The manœuvres which they perform at the altar demand but little of moral excellence; and what is not demanded of us, we seldom furnish as a gratuity. But more; the qualifications which they receive for their chief, that is, their sacramental duties, are not so much personal as official. Their whole doctrine of the priesthood abstracts the officer from the man. The grace bestowed upon the clergyman, is said by the schoolmen to be *gratis facta*, but not *gratum faciens*. It is by an electric influence from another's hands that he receives his sacerdotal virtues. Better were it for him, if they were to be obtained only by a prolonged discipline of his own heart. There is committed to him a jurisdiction over the body of Christ, but there is required of him a mere intention to fulfil the design of the church in communicating the mysterious elements. This intention is not a moral but simply an ecclesiastical one. If he do not purpose to give the real body and spirit of Jesus to the layman, then is the sacrament null.¹ Like the mesmeric performer, he may

¹ Conc. Trident. Sess. 7. Can. 11. Catech. Rom. 2. 1. 25.

refuse to will, and the mysterious change does not take place. If there were certain defects in the laying on of hands, then his ordination was not valid; he did not receive the imagined ecclesiastical virtue, nor did he ever become a true priest, even although he may have been inwardly consecrated by the chief Shepherd of our souls. We know that it is uncertain whether Archbishop Tillotson were ever baptized at all; whether he were ever ordained a deacon, and whether his ordination as a priest were canonical. He appears to have been an instrument of good in the church; but whether he *did* accomplish what he *seems* to have done, will depend in great measure, according to the Romanist, on the question of his receiving or not receiving the requisite grace through the sacramental avenues. If he did receive it, then all of his apparently good influence may have been really good. If he did not receive it, then of course he could never have imparted it, could never have regenerated man at the font, nor confirmed him at the altar, nor revived him by the eucharist. The same talents, the same learning, the same moral worth, the same weight of character, which appear to have been a blessing to the church, may have been, through a mere formal inadvertence, the means of deluding thousands of souls into a false and fatal security. But can it be of other than mischievous tendency, to represent the minister as indebted for his influence to the manual contact of a fellow creature, more than to his own virtues, received by communion with his bishop in the heavens? Is not his heart sluggish enough, even when the interests of a church depend upon his sanctity, and will it not become still more sensual, when he prizes his baptism with water above the baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire? The spirit of ministerial unfaithfulness goeth not out save by prayer and fasting; and he who relies on the magic of an ordination for his official excellence, will be the less inclined to purify his soul by obeying the truth through the Spirit. If a sermon be in its nature fitted to exert a good influence, and if the preacher be in his character fitted to give emphasis to his sermon, may he or may he not anticipate success? The Romish doctrine is, that all depends upon his ecclesiastical relations; that distorted truth, from one canonically ordained, will have a better influence than well arranged truth from one whose anointing was not according to the rubric; and even a Protestant divine has recently sanctioned the idea that a substance which is little better than poison out of the true church, becomes nutritious within it; and falsehood, though deadly when uttered in unsanc-

tified places, becomes instructive when it falls from the lips of a preacher apostolically ordained.¹ Where then is the motive for high religious culture in one who may fulfil the duties of his calling by a sacramental incantation, rather than by wrestling with his own spirit? And when the ministry, which is the heart of the ecclesiastical body, becomes enfeebled through want of moral stimulus, what shall we expect in the extremities but languor and disease?

This is another evil ensuing from the mechanical view of church officers. Such a view injures their public influence. They come to be regarded as conduits of gold or iron, through which a virtue flows, but into which it does not penetrate, and laymen become the inert receivers of a good thus mysteriously and coldly conveyed to them. Hence they look up to their pastors with awe, but feel little sympathy with them as brethren in Christ. The fact that a priest is thought to have a magnetic power, and that the people are dependent upon his will for their salvation, gives him a degree of spiritual authority that can be safely entrusted to no son of Adam. He is induced to claim and to receive a homage that is appropriate only to Jehovah. Earthly rulers bear sway over the present, but he extends his dominion over the present and future. Monarchs can afflict the body, but he has a mysterious power to destroy both soul and body in hell. Therefore does an emperor become a vassal of the confessor. The throne of the Caesars courts the favor of the Vatican. By the Pope kings reign and princes decree justice, and almost the

¹ The excellent Mr. Melvill, in his discourse on Heb. 8: 2, speaks of "a succession of men who derive authority in an unbroken series from the first teachers of the faith," some of whom may be "deficient and untaught, so that (their) sermons exhibit a wrong system of doctrine;" some may administer the sacraments with "hands which seem impure enough to sully their sanctity;" and yet the ministrations of them all may be made useful by the Saviour, "superintending their appointments as the universal bishop, and evangelizing, so to speak, his vast diocese through their instrumentality." "We behold the true followers of Christ enabled to find food in pastures which seem barren, and water where the fountains are dry." "When everything seems against them, so that on a carnal calculation, you would suppose the services of the church stripped of all efficacy, then, by acting faith on the head of the ministry, they are instructed and nourished, though in the main the given lesson be falsehood, and the proffered sustenance little better than poison." Christ is represented as so taking "upon himself the office of preacher, as to constrain even the tongue of error to speak instruction to his people." These imitations of Romanism are intermingled with remarks both rational and important, and thus are made the more deleterious by the truths with which they are connected.

omnipotence of God is wielded by the vanity and selfishness of man.

Romanism exerts an unfavorable influence upon the heart by the monotony of its observances. In all lands and in all ages it seeks to preserve the same routine of forms, and thus exhibit an appearance of unity. Wherever her children wander on the earth, she aims to cheer them with the identical words, as well as gestures, that have been hallowed by their earliest associations. There is something of good in this arrangement, but more of evil. The heart of man craves a variety of appeal. It longs for a different spirit in the ceremonies observed in hours of gladness, from that which breathes through the forms for affliction. And if one man require a change for the varied circumstances of his life, much more must the wants of different men, and especially of different nations, still more of dissimilar ages, be diversified. But Romanism approaches a dying bed with the same pomp and over-awing authority with which it dedicates a cathedral. The Catholic who expires with the blessing of his priest marches forward to meet the eternal One amid the illumination of sacred candles, the glitter of a crucifix and costly vases, and with a company of those who serve at the altar, all of them arrayed in white garments like angels of light, and escorting the anointed sufferer from the church militant, to that which will prepare him for the church triumphant. The same spirit of exact discipline and of etiquette, diffuses itself through the nuptial rites and those for taking the black veil. If the expression of the ceremony for one of these occasions were appropriate, that very circumstance would render it inappropriate for the other.

It is only on a superficial view that the evil of this undeviating formality can be deemed unimportant. When the rites of a church cease to be congenial with the peculiar circumstances of men, they cease to be inlets of instruction. The fact that they are inflexible, makes them ostentations. The fact that they are ostentatious, withdraws the mind to them, and away from what they ought to signify. The fact that forms are made more attractive than meditation, converts the spirit of piety into a love of display; and when even the altar becomes a scene of parade, what must we look for in places of inferior sanctity. Some observances of the church ought to be private. It chills or shocks or degrades our sensibilities, to make known the most sacred of our feelings in methods exposed to the ribaldry of coarse men. But when these observances are stereotyped, they become pub-

lic. They destroy the delicacy of emotion that shrinks away from the world's gaze, and check the spontaneous development of a religion that is healthy no longer than it is left to its own impulses. The practice, for example, of auricular confession is in itself innocent. Men ought to confess their faults one to another; but at the prompting of their own hearts, and in a manner accommodated to their peculiar susceptibilities. When that which ought to be voluntary becomes an exacted form; when the layman, who is bound to confess his sins to those who are sinned against, is required to divulge them to a priest,¹ and doomed to a penal infliction unless he succumb to this demand; when the confessor is seated in an inquisitorial chair, and the story of the penitent is whispered through a grate, in a kneeling posture, and before a crowd of strangers who are tremblingly waiting to pass through the same ordeal, then that which was a duty becomes a ceremony; attracts to itself the confidence of its performers; is regarded as a substitute for inward penitence; is transformed from a gushing out of warm feeling that cannot be repressed, into a cold and forced obedience to a law; and hence the confessional, one of the appropriate sanctuaries of piety, has been a scene of which we blush to repeat what we have heard, but of which not the half will be made known, till all the dark things which have been *whispered to the ear* in closets shall be revealed upon the house-tops.²

The influence of Romanism appears unfavorable to the heart, in its tendency to separate religion from good morals. The essence of morality consists in such constitutional affections as are amiable, and such external deportment as is in harmony with them. The essence of religion consists in holy exercises of the will, in making all our emotions and external deeds subordinate to the universal good. Religion, therefore, is the life of morals. It can no more safely be separated from them, than the soul from the body. But Romanism undervalues morality as distinct from religion, and thus gives a false idea of religion itself. It represents our obligations to Heaven as synonymous with our duties to the church; and our duties to the church, as synonymous with certain outward observances; and those observances, as the

¹ The Romish "confession to the priests," is not regarded by them as a confession to their fellow men, so much as to God, who is represented by the priest.—Mochler's *Symbolik*, S. 284.

² The early Reformers denominated the confessional, *Carnificina conscientiarum*.

proofs of that love which is the fulfilling of the law. It so commends the use of the rosary, as to make a small matter of the doing of justice. The kissing of a golden crucifix is one of its most honored ceremonies in worship; and it therefore seems a comparatively humble virtue, to speak the truth. A pilgrimage to Jerusalem is esteemed of more value than the performance of one's domestic duties, and a crusader is canonized when an honest man is forgotten. There are passages in the discourses of so good men as Massillon¹ and Bossuet, which tend to divorce morality from piety, exalting the latter on the ruins of the former. Not only from the writings of Sanchez, Escobar, Molina and Lipsius, but even from the records of the infallible councils, we should be led to predict, that many Romanists would call certain frauds pious, and would therefore practise them, would keep no faith with heretics, would trust in the goodness of the end for the sanctifying of the means; that priests would ostensibly perform miracles when the people were ignorant enough to be deluded, and would cease to perform them when the laity were able to detect such imposition; that cunning men who had succeeded in their displays of miraculous power, and had made certain sacrifices for the church, would be admitted to the calendar of saints in the ages of darkness, but that promotions to this sacred class would be less frequent in the days of increasing light. All such things we should predict as the legitimate results of Romanism; but its tendencies are better developed in history than in prophecy. What is suggested as probable by the very genius of the system, is found to be actual in the narratives of freebooters who have been careful to say the apostles' creed as soon as they have secured their prey; of assassins who have made atonement for their profitable crimes by enriching their priests; of cathedrals erected, monasteries endowed, and bishops' palaces adorned at the expense of innocent men who were plundered of their treasures for the glory of religion. The spirit of mediæval piety was in too fearful a degree the spirit of robbery and burnt-offering; of falsehood and devotedness to the church; of Ave Maria on the lips and carnage in the act. It is in the records of monks and nuns who have left their duties in the world for the observance of fasts and vigils,

¹ See a discourse of Massillon on giving his benediction to the standards of the regiment of Catenat, and the comments made upon one of its paragraphs by Adam Smith in his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Part III. chap. II, and by Frederic von Raumer, in his *Discourse on Frederic the Great*, delivered before the Berlin Academy of Sciences, p. 25.

that writers on conscience have found their most humiliating examples of the perversion of that faculty; of complacency in immoral conduct when associated with ecclesiastical observances; the immorality being the more stubborn because it was sanctioned as religious, and the religion being made the more powerful by its sympathy with the natural selfishness of the heart.

It is often claimed, that to some of our constitutional emotions, Romanism is peculiarly beneficial. It is said to have a favorable influence upon the principle of fear. It does indeed arouse this emotion, but not so as to make it harmonize with a proper self-respect, with manly courage, with firmness of resolve. It inspires an awe in view of the priest who openeth and no man shutteth, who shutteth and no man openeth; but this dread of man precludes that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom. All his life long is many a Romanist held in bondage by the thought of the enginery of punishments, that may be plied against him by the church. Thus is engendered a craven spirit, predisposing him for the endurance of ecclesiastical and political tyranny. Thus also is cherished a dread of suffering, more than of wrong; of God's punitive inflictions more than of his inward disapproval. The doctrine of purgatory too, is a heavy burden upon the mind of its believers. It presses them down with the dread of a retribution from which "the pitifulness of Christ's great mercy" may not deliver even the penitent. The dying man, although of a contrite and trustful heart, is not cheered with the hope of being this day with his Redeemer in Paradise; but a long and tedious process of purification awaits him after death, and too often must he profane his last hours with calculations on the price to be paid for his ransom from suffering. Pervading the literature of Rome there is more of an effort to intimidate men than to cheer them. The spirit of Thomas à Kempis even, and of Pascal, is not exactly that of adoption. They have an asceticism that is not found in the gospel, all the breathings of which are of peace and good will to such as receive it. Many of their imitators have less of that love which casteth out fear, than of that fear which suppresses love. They seem not to have solved the enigma of being sorrowful yet always rejoicing. Their sorrow is too much a thing by itself; and their cheerfulness too little attempered by the penitence for sins forgiven. Their practical theology is too mercantile, unctured not enough with the scheme of grace, too much with that of penances and satisfactions. Instead of representing wisdom's ways as ways of pleasantness, it often exacts the most sacred

duties as punishments for sin. It commands the *Pater Noster* to be repeated five times in the day, not because the repetition is a cordial to the soul, but because it is a fitting penalty for past misdeeds. Romanism hires men to perform holy acts by a promise of indulgences; and thus implies that such acts are in their nature distasteful to the soul of him who submits to them through fear of something worse. It says too much of the mortifying of self, and too little of the fulness and freeness of divine grace; it says too much of ecclesiastical discipline, and too little of brotherhood with the Saviour; it has imbibed too many influences from heathenism, and has incorporated with itself too many of the Jewish peculiarities, to breathe into the spirit that peace which passeth all understanding. It is a hard religion to bear, and its subjects lie under it rather than live in it.¹ It holds forth a chilling doctrine concerning sins after baptism; and no man can heartily believe that doctrine, and at the same time be truly glad in the spirit. Not but that they are often happy; but it is one thing to rejoice, and another, to rejoice in the Lord. Not but that we are bound to cherish what the apostle calls a godly fear, but we must

¹ Protestants are said to contradict themselves in calling the Romish system, at one time, more austere than their own; at another time, less so: see Wieman's Lectures, Vol. 2, pp. 27, 28. But the two charges are mutually consistent; for in some relations Romanism is too onerous and severe; in other relations, too easy. First, it multiplies austerities which are not needed, which do no good; and it may with justice be denominated cruel, simply because it inflicts upon its believers unnecessary hardships, imposes burdens which are not demanded by the conscience, which do not impart spiritual peace. Its numerous physical inflictions are, in themselves, difficult to be borne; and the more so, because they do not relieve the necessities of our moral nature. Protestantism, on the contrary, requires the performance of such duties only as are rational, and conducive to the tranquillity as well as the sensitiveness of the moral powers. It is an easy system, because it imposes upon us nothing more than is requisite for our spiritual good. Secondly, Romanism is difficult in its relations to our constitution. Its pains and penalties are disagreeable to man as man. The Protestant religion is difficult in its relations to our depraved nature. Its duties are burdensome upon man not as man, but as a sinner. On the other hand, Romanism is comparatively pleasant to man as a depraved being; for it substitutes external performances for the moral submission which he dreads: and the Protestant system, though hard to our vitiated nature, is easy to our constitutional powers; for it demands only such exercises as are congenial with the principles of the soul as God originally made them. Just so, "the way of the transgressor is hard," as it ultimately affects the human constitution, but easy, as it gratifies our depraved inclinations; and the yoke of Christ is difficult to be borne by a man, viewed as one whose "heart is fully set to do evil," but is not burdensome to a man viewed as one made for the purpose of wearing it, having a constitution fitted for it, as well as fitted by it.

avoid an excess of natural fear ; for perfect love casteth out all inordinate dread ; there is no ill proportioned fear in love ; and that fear which exists without love, is often one of the most debasing passions of our nature.

It is cheerfully conceded to the Romanists, that their system fosters, in some respects, a spirit of reverence. Too often, however, it inspires a veneration for some ancient relic more than for the genius of a man like Luther ; for the casula and holy oil more than for such piety as that of Huss or Wicliffe. An undue veneration for what is subordinate, leads to a comparative disrespect of what is of higher worth. The extravagant estimate which has been placed upon baptism, has in part occasioned the levity with which the usage of our mother tongue now treats the word Christening.¹ If it be the intimate association of contraries that produces the ludicrous, we cannot expect that even an ordinance truly noble will be regarded as such, when it is raised above its appropriate sphere, and described in phrases incompatible with its nature. Neither can we expect that the sublime mysteries of our religion will be revered as they should be, when they are brought down from the region of spirit into that of sense. We do not venerate that which costs us no effort to understand. Intellectual truths receive a deeper homage than ocular representations. But the whole tendency of Romanism is to lower the dignity of the gospel, by attempting to make its principles easy of entrance into the mind through the eye. It allows the spirit to be controlled by symbols, instead of using them as servants. The sight of a cross may fill the beholder with awe for a time, but will lose its permanent influence unless it be preceded by a devout contemplation of its meaning. Romanism, however, obtrudes this sign upon us before we have subdued our hearts to a feeling of its import, holds it out on the tower of the cathedral and at the corners of the streets, amid the tumults of business and in the moments of mirth. The cruciform church does not perpetuate a feeling of veneration for the image, part of which is daily trampled under foot. Neither does the ceremony of the Mass cause us to reverse the principle involved in the crucifixion, when that ceremony is known to be in part a theatrical exhibition of the scene that oc-

¹ A similar remark may be made in reference to the words *priest*, *purgatory*, etc. Centuries will not banish the real irreverence, which has been occasioned by the attempt to give these words a more awful import than the truth will justify. See this subject well illustrated in Whately's *Errors of Romanism*, pp. 21—80.

carred on Calvary. Some of the priestly vestments are designed to represent the garments worn by our Saviour in his last hours. The sacristy is sometimes made to resemble his tomb. In the darkness of that tomb we may discern an image made like unto the Son of Man, lying a corpse with the linen napkin about his head. Wax figures are employed in many churches to illustrate the occurrences at Gethsemane. The darkness that covered the earth from the sixth hour to the ninth, is rudely imitated in the *Tenebrae*; so is the quaking of the earth and the rending of the rocks. Nay, there has sometimes been a living imitation of the Saviour's punishment on the cross, of his burial, and rising again, and ascending toward the skies. We even see in many Catholic churches pictorial representations of God himself; one person in the Trinity is painted as an aged man, another as a youth, a third as a dove. But where is the limit to this infatuated symbolism? We cannot define the precise limit. We must have some symbols; we do employ them in the structure of language, in figures of speech, in the very exercise of the imagination. We may use any symbols which do not supersede the exercise of faith, nor interfere with the spirituality of our devotion, nor satisfy the mind with the show instead of the substance. There is a religious tact, which will determine their number and character, better than any rule can define them. And it is this Christian sense which decides that the symbols employed by Romanists are so multiplied, so complicated, so ostentatious, as to stifle man's reverence for the power of godliness, and in the end for the very form of it. The same effect is produced by some of the Romish phraseology. What profaneness were it to speak of a Jehovah College, or a God church-edifice; yet we hear of a Trinity College, and a Trinity house of worship, from those who believe the name Trinity to be synonymous with Deity.¹ We hear of a Society among the brethren of Jesus, that is called "the Society of the Holy Ghost." From this kind of familiarity with sacred things, we should anticipate what we find, the frequent display of an irreverent spirit at the Romish altars. Not at all wonderful is it, that even the Bishops of Trent exhibited sometimes a profane and sacrilegious temper even in their worship at the holy convocation.²

¹ In some places the street, contiguous to the Trinity church, is called Trinity street, the school-house in the neighborhood is distinguished by the same epithet, and this "incommunicable name" is even applied to the parsonage, the sexton, etc. etc.

² Sarpi's Hist. pp. 714, 727, 726.

Not at all wonderful is it, that the world has never witnessed such revolting forms of infidelity, as where the church has demanded so great reverence for her trinkets, that men at length lost their veneration for real worth. When we first think of the blasphemies of Voltaire, we are surprised at his depraved tastes; but we learn to regard him as no causeless phenomenon, by considering the tendency of the religion that was paraded before him, to provoke the scorn which a more modest ceremonial might have allayed. Men had learned in the sanctuary to combine dissimilar ideas, and it was in the extending of this combination that the wit of the French infidels in great measure consisted. It was a baleful wit; it was without excuse; but never would it have been so effective upon the people, if they had been trained by the church to revere principle and character, more than officers and their gewgaws. Never had the goddess of reason been so worshipped, if men had honored the true God more rationally; nor would "crush the wretch" have been so popular a watchword, if Jesus had been revered in the life as much as in the host,—if his instructions had been venerated, as much as the pictures of his infancy, or some feigned relic of his garments.

There is another emotion on which the influence of Romanism is said to be favorable, but on which it is really injurious. That emotion is the love of power. A multitude of offices, one excelling another in the splendor of its insignia, tends to inflame the desire of preëminence. A domineering temper is fostered by the very nature of the Romish priesthood. When the mother brings her only child before the man of God, and feels that from his hands must issue the mysterious essence without which it had been good for that infant had it never been born;¹ when in the darkness of the night the minister with his retinue moves from the temple, from the altar, from the tomb of Jesus, to the chamber of the dying, and bears with him the body of the Lord of hosts, whereof if the dying eat he shall hunger no more; when the weeping children hang around the neck of the only one whose prayers will be availing to save their deceased father from the severities of purgatorial discipline, then is the priest clothed with a majesty and an awe which frail man was never made to associate with his own person. Seldom, seldom is it in the nature of one who has this strong hold on the sympathies of the ignorant, to resign the crown which they are so eager to place upon one's head.

¹ See Conc. Trid. Sess. 7. Can. 5. Cat. Rom. 2, 21.

There is something too in the selection of the clergy of Rome which increases their eagerness for power. The great majority of them are from the lowest of the people. They are flattered by their elevation from such great obscurity to such singular honor. Almost at one bound they spring from a menial service to an intimacy with the papal See, and are prepared to be obsequious to the dignitaries by whom they have been made kings and priests unto God. Their numerous relations are elated with the idea, that here and there a vicegerent of heaven has been chosen from their own families. Thus are they rendered submissive to any exactions which may be made by the sacred college. Being required to live in celibacy, the priests are distracted by no household cares, they have an undivided heart, and that is given to the church. On the other hand, there is a limited number of those holding the keys of heaven, who are selected from noble families. It has always been the policy of Rome to adorn its priesthood with some of royal lineage,¹ and this band of the Lorraines and the Francis de Borgias receive as much obeisance from the plebeian clergy, as the latter receive from the mass of the people. Such a gradation of honors affords a like temptation and a like indulgence to the ambitious spirit of all, from the pope and the cardinals down to the acolyths and the ostiarii. It is this spirit that suggested the seven orders of the clergy, and the ordination of even the doorkeepers of the church. The very structure of language gives proof, that the tendencies of Romanism to foment the desire of power have been developed in fact. We have the word *bishopric*, but not the word *servantdom*. We hear much of *hierarchy*, never of *hierodoulia*. The Romish polity is thought by its friends to have been suggested by an intelligence superior to the human; and they can adduce no better argument for their belief than the exquisite fitness of this polity for holding dominion over the mind of man. Its very genius is to make the officer despotic, and the people submissive. Hence has one of its learned proselytes, Frederic Schlegel, been successful in his attempt to prove that Romanism is the natural ally of a monarchical government. It so flatters the love of power, that it will be probably sustained by kings, long after it has been abandoned by scholars and philanthropists.

Another principle to which the tendencies of Romanism are less favorable than has been claimed, is that of benevolence.

¹ See Paul Sarpi's History of the council of Trent, pp. 489, 490, 737.

The very effort to coërcé men into a unity, prevents their desired communion. The system which encourages a love of office, must occasion feuds; and where there is a contest for preëminence, there is but little kindness of feeling, either in him who obtains, or him who loses the mastery. The visibleness of the Catholic religion narrows the sphere of its charities. Baptism is a sign that cannot be mistaken, and whoever has received this sign is thereby both designated and made an heir of bliss. Now it is dangerous for any man to feel assured, that such a rite has made him a favorite of Heaven. He needs something more than a baptismal regeneration, to save him from an uncharitable temper toward those who have not received this decisive token of their good estate. It is dangerous for any man who obtains his Christian spirit only from the wafer, to be confident of his elevation above such as live without this discriminating sign. If a man will not bow the knee at the lifting up of the host, he pours upon religion a contempt which is odious, and which is the more profane because the neglected service is so easy. And is there not danger of losing a brother's attachment for one who is thus evidently excluded from the precincts of mercy. No easy thing is it, to harbor in the embraces of earthly fellowship those who are daily incurring the anathemas of the church that we believe to be infallible. Difficult must it be to sympathize with those who are distinguished from us as by a mark upon the forehead, the mark of such as are given over to uncovenanted mercy. Our Maker never designed that the evidences of his approval should be paraded upon our persons, so much as exhibited in our life. He never intended that we should know his true friends by any superficial tests, but by their conduct. And as the conduct of a man is not always uniform, we are taught to be slow in deeming him a reprobate, and to have a charity that hopeth all things. It lies, however, in the very nature of a system that multiplies tangible criteria of discipleship, to nourish a pharisaical temper, and to confine all the benevolence of its disciples to their own clan. Such a system draws a dividing line between the church and the world, not according to developments of moral principle, but according to distinctions of form; and whenever we judge of men by their outward badges more than their general character, we imbibe an exclusive spirit which makes a sectarian of one who ought to be a Christian. By no means, then, is it a mere concomitant of Romanism, but rather its inherent tendency, to look upon all whom it shuts out from its communion, as worthy

of punishment, and to regard persecution here, as a means of saving them from greater woes hereafter. It has been in its very principle a persecuting religion, and has not only practised but *reasoned* on the ground, that if man cannot be converted save by its forms, and if the pincers and the rack can induce him to comply with these forms, then such instruments of cruelty must be used, and a benevolence seeing far into the future should suppress the impulses of kindness for the present. Wherever the ecclesiastical spirit prevails over the Christian spirit, persecution comes to be regarded as a duty, and conscience adds impetus to revenge.

It is the principle of faith, to which the Romanist claims that his theology administers peculiar strength; and he even adopts as a commendation, what Hume intended as a sarcasm, in the remark, 'our holy religion is founded on faith, not on reason.' Now faith, viewed as a moral principle, is a spirit of love to the truth wherever found, and has no sympathy with the disposition to inquire 'who is the man that speaks,' rather than, 'what is the word spoken.' The treasures of excellence that are spread out before us by Fenelon and Bossuet, we as Protestants rejoice in, if we have faith; for this principle causes goodness as such to be our delight. But when the amiable sentiments of a Zinzendorf or a Spangenberg are presented to the Romanist, are they welcomed by him? Is it not a sacrilege to receive instruction from one who is not connected with the apostles by the only chain which conveys the needed electric influence; from one who being unbaptized and unordained falls under the anathema of the church for venturing upon the sin of Korah, Dathan and Abiram? There is not another sect made so impervious by its very constitution to the influence of a candid statement, as that which calls itself no sect but the church, and a dissent from which is viewed as in its nature schismatic and heretical.—The principle of faith is also distinct from an unwarranted confidence in human merits. But the genius of Romanism is a trust in the supererogatory performances of the dead, and the genuflections of the living. Its cardinal dogma, that we are able to do no more than God requires of us, tends to inspire a confidence in ourselves which is incompatible with true reliance on the grace of heaven.—The principle of faith is likewise a feeling of dependence on the one sacrifice upon Golgotha; but the faith of the Papist is too often a trust in the sacrifice that is offered in the daily mass. He beholds the body broken and the blood shed under a gorgeous canopy, amid clouds of incense and the melting strains of the harp

and the dulcimer. He *sees* a real sacrifice, miraculous in its origin and influence. He sees one whom he believes to be a God, offered as a victim by a man, and he confides in what he sees, rather than what he has read of as done in Judea of old. Why not? Vision is more impressive than memory; an oblation made before our eyes, than one looking dim through the vista of ages. The priest who offers the beautiful and wonderful sacrifice to-day, imposes on the eye and the fancy, while the ancient man of sorrows who was meek and lowly, hath no comeliness, that men should love him or hold him in remembrance. In fact, his crucifixion is not remembered, by multitudes, who suppose themselves to be redeemed by the missal oblation. This is the profaneness of Romanism. It thrusts itself between the throne of mercy and the suppliant. It practically makes an atonement of its own; and the High Priest of our profession, who was the only Mediator between God and man, is thus shorn of his distinction, and every performer of a mass becomes, by that ceremony, a Redeemer.

I might continue this train of remark, and show that Romanism encourages a haughty temper, by teaching among other things of like kind, our competence to perform works of supererogatory merit; that it fosters a spirit of indolence and procrastination, by teaching, with many things of the same character, that our present life is not our sole opportunity of preparing for heaven, and that after we are dead we shall be subjects of prayer. But I must close. I should not have detained you so long, did I not believe that our beloved land is threatened with serious evil from the inroads of the papal church. This church is the work of ages. Thousands of minds have contributed to the perfectness of its organization, and it is so modelled that, wherever it exists, it will have influence. It will, at least, infuse its peculiar spirit into other religious systems. Such is its ecclesiastical police, that it will be more efficient than Protestantism, in its control over those men who act in masses. Its tendencies are so congenial with our vitiated inclinations, that argument will often give way before it. It will attract the poor by its tinsel, and the rich by its outward magnificence; the ignorant by its dispensing with the need of erudition, and the learned by the scholastic air of its literature. It allures the historian by the extent of its records, and the poet by the romance of its nunneries; the painter and the sculptor, the architect and the antiquarian, it fascinates by its masterpieces of art. It overawes the timid, and enlists the ambitious in its ser-

vices. It captivates the proud by doing homage to their good works, and deceives the humble by its parade of self-mortifications. Some men will feel the power of its exclusiveness, and regard it as the safest church, if not the only true one. Others will be overcome by its dogmatism, and carried away by the mere positiveness of its claim. Some will be charmed with its ostensible oneness; many will be taken captive by the stratagems which it is so well contrived to employ; and many more will be consoled and flattered with its allowing them to be religious by proxy, with its making the priest a vicarious officer for the layman. Conservatives will admire it for its steadfastness, and radicals for its innovation upon our Puritan usages. Men of influence will often sustain it, because it gives facilities for managing the populace. Infidels will be glad of its conquests, because it makes war upon the spirituality of religion. Some of the bereaved will be drawn toward it, by its pretending to retain an influence over their departed relatives; some friends of the truth will love it, because in some things it has "kept the faith;" and all may be affected by it, because it becomes all things to all men.

As this church will have an influence, so this influence will be peculiarly injurious to a republic. Our government requires the diffusion of learning through the multitude. Romanism prefers the concentration of it among a few leading minds. Our government requires that every citizen be himself a man; forming his own judgments, acting agreeably to his independent moral principle. Romanism encourages the majority not to think for themselves, but to do what the reverend chapter may think out for them. A republic will best flourish when each of her citizens has a personal interest in her soil; but the papacy aims to monopolize for itself what is due to the State. Each of its ordained leaders is divorced from the world, and married to the church. "He hath no children," and nearly all his interests are garnered up with the Holy See.¹ He is, besides, amenable to a transatlantic government. This is said to be a spiritual government, but it is also a temporal one, and as such, is intimately allied with European despotisms. At the best, it is difficult to separate altogether our religious from our civil relations; and the court of Rome, which has been so long addicted to political manœuvres,

¹ See the arguments for celibacy and kindred abuses in Father Paul Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent*, pp. 469, 680.

will be slow to abandon a policy which its unerring Councils have sanctioned. Its conservativeness of ancient customs is an omen of its continuing to interfere with the affairs of State.¹ It has more than one imperious motive for mingling in our political contests, and making them subservient to itself. As it has the motives, so it has the means for attempting to modify the operation of our government. Many of its friends have avowed their purpose of using these means. Many, who have formed no such purpose, are blind instruments in its execution. For the truth is, it is not congenial with the nature of a Republic, that a compact multitude of its voters should put their moral sense into the keeping of a few individuals; especially, of individuals who are accustomed to use authority instead of argument; still more, of individuals who are absorbed in their church more than in the common weal; who are ecclesiastics rather than citizens, and Jesuits more than patriots; who hold their office by tenure from a foreign power; who are accountable for their conduct to transatlantic overseers, the professed enemies of our republican system; who are banded together in an organization having all the efficiency and all the evils of secret societies, and depending for its influence, if not for its maintenance, on such a state of public feeling as is congenial with political despotism, but averse to the very constitution of a self-governing people. The danger is, that these uneducated masses of laymen will be bought and sold by their leaders to political demagogues. The very existence of such a multitude who may be disposed of in the gross, is a temptation to a species of chicanery which a free government is not fitted to endure. Our institutions were not made for embracing an eccle-

¹ It is one of the most discouraging characteristics of the Church of Rome, that she regards her past history with so much reverence as to make it a model for her future conduct. This veneration for herself, as she existed in times gone by, creates a repugnance to all change, even where the change would promote her interests. Her former faults will be her future character, because she incorporates herself with her history. If her past developments had been more consonant with the spirit of the gospel, her tenacity of ancient customs would be a virtue; but now her reformation is made the more improbable by the fact that she has needed, for ten centuries, to be radically reformed. This necessity of a thorough improvement has become part of her unchangeable character, and the fact that she deems herself infallible, perpetuates the most grievous of her faults. Her misfortune is, that her past history has settled down like a permanent incubus upon her spirituality; that her character is established, and that she is determined to perpetuate whatever has been already sanctioned. Hence all attempts, like those of Luther, Ronge and others, to abrogate her time-honored abuses, must end in secession from her community.

siastical empire within their elective forms; especially an empire whose history has been one of contest for sway.

I am no alarmist. I have strong confidence in the Protestant mind. It will at last prevail over Papal discipline. Our system is sustained by reason; and in the sweep of years reason will prevail over tradition. Our system is favored by conscience; and in the end conscience will triumph, though her victory be long delayed. Our system is founded on the Bible, and the word of the Lord endureth forever. We must imbibe, however, somewhat of the zeal of our aggressors. We must be munificent to our schools of learning. We must dedicate them, as this is dedicated, "to the truth,"¹ not to prejudice; to Christ first, as the incarnation of benevolence, and then to the church, as the company of all the good; not to the church first as an outward corporation, and to its spiritual Head as the second object of homage. We must be rational Christians, and thus oppose the spirit of Romish credulity; liberal Christians, and thus rebuke the sectarianism which excludes from the covenant of grace all who follow not us. We must be evangelical Christians, and thus condemn the formality of those who boast of fasting twice in the week; biblical Christians, and thus reform the faith of such as lose the Bible among the tomes of the fathers. We must be Christians, and thus reprove the partialities of Romanism. We must be patriots, and thus resist its tendencies to monarchical discipline. We must be men, and thus frown upon the spirit of bondage that has so long made the layman a slave of his confessor. If we have no pictures of the saints, our life must be a *fac-simile* of his who went about doing good. If we have no imposing cathedrals, we must make even our bodies the temples of the Holy Ghost. *So will he who is mighty do great things for us, and holy is his name.*

¹ Two of the ancient mottos of the University are, "Veritati," and "Christo et Ecclesiae."